



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—Thursday, September 5, 1968

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy holy name.

Give, we beseech Thee, to these servants of the Commonwealth clear vision, clean hands, and pure hearts as, facing great tasks and grave responsibilities, they ascend this holy hill of the Nation's life.

In this age of ages telling, steady our purpose to give the best that is in us—body, mind, and spirit—to the right that needs assistance; against the wrong that needs resistance; to the future in the distance and the good that we may do.

Grant us to pass this day in glad service and in inner peace, without stumbling and without stain. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 4, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF THE ATLANTIC-PACIFIC INTER-OCEANIC CANAL STUDY COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 380)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the fourth annual report of the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission. The report covers the period July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968.

During the past twelve months the

Commission has made significant progress toward accomplishing the objectives of its investigation. The collection of data was substantially completed on Route 17 in Panama, one of the routes being considered for nuclear excavation. In the Canal Zone, subsurface drilling for geological data was completed and an evaluation made of the suitability and cost of conventional canal excavation along Route 14. In Colombia the first full year of data collection on Route 25 was accomplished.

The Commission has decided on a more extensive study of Route 10, a route for conventional excavation in the Republic of Panama close to the westerly limits of the Canal Zone. Extensive engineering measures would be required to insure the continued operation of the existing lock canal during the years of construction of a sea-level canal adjacent to and intersecting it. Also, the changeover to a sea-level canal on Route 14 would permanently close the existing canal. Route 10 would not have these disadvantages and could be competitive in cost. For these reasons, the Commission has now augmented its subsurface data collection program to produce a valid estimate of excavation costs on this route.

The Atomic Energy Commission has recently conducted the first two of the planned series of nuclear excavation experiments designed to determine the feasibility of nuclear excavation of a sea-level canal. The favorable results of these experiments are encouraging. Funds in the FY 1969 budget will permit continuation of this test program. I hope that the experiments will demonstrate the practical possibility of using this technique in building a new canal.

On June 22, 1968, I signed Public Law 90-359 in which the Congress granted an extension of the Commission's reporting date to December 1, 1970 and the additional appropriation authority needed by the Commission to complete its investigation. With this amending legislation, the Commission is now able to carry out its field surveys in both Panama and Colombia as originally planned to accomplish the mission given it by the Congress in Public Law 88-609.

The investigation has provided no final conclusions to date. However, no insurmountable technical problems are foreseen in the construction of a sea-level isthmian canal by conventional means. The best location for a new canal and the technical and political feasibility of construction by nuclear excavation are yet to be determined.

This anniversary sees the canal inves-

tigation well beyond the midpoint of its planned studies, and I take great pleasure in forwarding the Commission's fourth annual report to the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 5, 1968.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing the nomination of Doris L. Oldham to be postmaster at Fishertown, Pa., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Elmer J. Holland, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14314) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school-age dependents of employees, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14314) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school-age dependents of employees, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the

Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1484 and 1485.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2687) to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for judicial review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments on page 2, line 23, after the word "order" insert a colon and "Provided, That upon the filing of a petition within sixty days of the date of service of the order complained of, the court, for good cause shown, may extend the time for filing a petition to review such order for an additional period not exceeding sixty days."; on page 7, line 5, after the figure "23", strike out "and 43"; and in the same line after the word "Act" insert "and section 3 of the Act of February 19, 1903 (49 U.S.C. 43)"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 17) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (10) through (12) as subsections (11) through (13), respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately after subsection (9) the following new subsection:

"(10) (a) The United States courts of appeals shall have exclusive jurisdiction to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend, in whole or in part, all final orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission made reviewable in accordance with the provisions of subsection (9) of this section: *Provided*, That orders of the Commission involving only the payment of money shall be subject to judicial review only in the district courts of the United States pursuant to sections 1336(a) and 1398(a) of title 28, United States Code, and orders of the Commission made pursuant to the referral of a question or issue by a district court or by the Court of Claims shall be subject to judicial review only in accordance with sections 1336 (b) and (c) and 1398(b) of title 28, United States Code, such jurisdiction shall be invoked by the

filing of a petition as provided in this subsection.

"(b) The venue of any proceeding under this section shall be in the judicial circuit in which the residence or principal office of any of the parties filing the petition for review is located.

"(c) (1) Any party aggrieved by a final order reviewable under this subsection may, within sixty days from the date of service, file in the court of appeals, in which the venue prescribed by paragraph (b) lies, a petition to review such order: *Provided*, That, upon the filing of a petition within sixty days of the date of service of the order complained of, the court, for good cause shown, may extend the time for filing a petition to review such order for an additional period not exceeding sixty days. The petition shall contain a concise statement of (A) the nature of the proceedings as to which review is sought, (B) the facts upon which venue is based, (C) the grounds on which relief is sought, and (D) the relief requested. The petitioner shall attach to the petition, as exhibits, copies of the order, report, or decision of the Commission. The clerk of the court of appeals shall serve, by registered or certified mail, a true copy of the petition upon the Commission and the Attorney General of the United States.

"(1) Unless the proceeding has been terminated following grant of a motion to dismiss the petition, the Commission shall file in the office of the clerk of the court of appeals in which the proceeding is pending the record on review, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Until such record has been filed by the Commission, the Commission may at any time, upon such notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any order, report, or decision made or issued by it and which is attached in a petition for review. Upon the filing of such record with it, the jurisdiction of the court of appeals to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend orders of the Commission shall be exclusive.

"(d) Petitions to review orders reviewable under this section, unless determined on a motion to dismiss the petition, shall be heard in the court of appeals upon the record of the pleadings, evidence adduced, and proceedings before the Commission. If a party to a proceeding to review shall apply to the court of appeals, in which the proceeding is pending, for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of such court (1) that such additional evidence is material, and (2) that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence before the Commission, such court may order such additional evidence and any evidence the opposite party desires to offer to be taken by the Commission. The Commission may modify its findings of fact, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken and may modify or set aside its orders and shall file in the court such additional evidence, such modified findings or new findings, and such modified order or the order setting aside the original order.

"(e) The Commission may be represented by its own counsel, and the United States, through the Attorney General, shall be entitled to intervene in any proceeding. Any party or parties in interest in the proceeding before the Commission whose interests will be affected if an order of the Commission is or is not enjoined, set aside, or suspended, may appear as parties of their own motion and as of right, and be represented by counsel in any proceeding to review such order. Communities, associations, corporations, firms, and individuals whose interests are affected by the Commission's order may intervene in any proceeding to review such order.

"(f) The filing of the petition to review shall not of itself stay or suspend the opera-

tions of the order of the Commission, but the court of appeals in its discretion may restrain or suspend, in whole or in part, the operation of the order pending the final hearing and determination of the petition. Where the petitioner makes application for an interlocutory injunction suspending or restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of, or setting aside, in whole or in part, any order reviewable under this section, at least five days' notice of the hearing thereon shall be given to the Commission and to the Attorney General of the United States. In cases where irreparable damage would otherwise ensue to the petitioner, the court of appeals may, on hearing, after reasonable notice to the Commission and to the Attorney General, order a temporary stay or suspension, in whole or in part, of the operation of the order of the Commission for not more than sixty days from the date of such order pending the hearing on the application for such interlocutory injunction, in which case such order of the court of appeals shall contain a specific finding, based on evidence submitted to the court of appeals, and identified by reference thereto, that such irreparable damage would result to the petitioner and specifying the nature of such damage. The court of appeals, at the time of hearing the application for an interlocutory injunction, upon a like finding, may continue the temporary stay or suspension, in whole or in part, until decision on the application. The hearing upon such an application for an interlocutory injunction shall be given preference and expedited and shall be heard at the earliest practicable date after the expiration of the notice of hearing on the application provided for above. Upon the final hearing of any proceeding to review any order under the provisions of this subsection the same requirements as to precedence and expedition shall apply.

"(g) An order granting or denying an interlocutory injunction under paragraph (f) of this subsection and a final judgment of the court of appeals shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari as provided in section 1254(1) of title 28, United States Code: *Provided*, That application therefor be duly made within forty-five days after the entry of such order and within ninety days after entry of the judgment, as the case may be. The United States, the Commission, or an aggrieved party may file such petition for a writ of certiorari. The provisions of sections 1254(3) and 2101 (e) of title 28, United States Code, shall also apply to proceedings under this subsection.

"(h) The orders, writs, and process of the courts of appeals arising under this subsection and, of the district courts in cases arising under sections 20, 23, of this Act and section 3 of the Act of February 19, 1903 (49 U.S.C. 43) may run, be served, and be returnable anywhere in the United States."

SEC. 2. Chapter 157 of title 28, United States Code, and any other provision of law inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any proceeding or case pending before a district court under such chapter on the effective date of this Act shall remain under the jurisdiction of such court until a final order, judgment, decree, or decision is rendered by such court: *Provided further*, That any such cases or proceedings referred to in the first proviso may be appealed to the Supreme Court as provided by section 1253 of title 28, United States Code, and, if remanded, such case may be referred back to the court from which the appeal was taken or to the court of appeals for further proceedings as the Supreme Court may direct.

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed

for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1499), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 2687 is to make orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission reviewable in the same general manner as the orders of all other major regulatory agencies. This would be accomplished by amending section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for judicial review of ICC orders in the U.S. courts of appeals, with review by the Supreme Court by the discretionary writ of certiorari. At present, judicial review of ICC orders is under the jurisdiction of a district court of three judges, at least one of whom shall be a judge of the court of appeals. The decisions of such courts are reviewable in the Supreme Court by appeal, rather than by certiorari.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

At the present time, judicial review of the Commission's orders is governed by various sections of title 28 of the United States Code which are summarized in appendix A. Briefly, such review is in a U.S. district court of three judges, at least one of whom must be a judge of the court of appeals. The decisions of such courts are reviewable by the Supreme Court by appeal, rather than by the discretionary writ of certiorari. These provisions were initially enacted as part of the Urgent Deficiencies Act of 1913 and, with minor changes, have remained unchanged since that time.

The following year, in the Federal Trade Commission Act, the then circuit courts of appeals were designated to review orders of that agency. Thereafter, as new regulatory agencies were created, usually, judicial review of their orders was vested in the courts of appeals. While certain orders of the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Department of Agriculture were originally made reviewable under the Urgent Deficiencies Act procedure, the so-called Hobbs Act or Judicial Review Act of 1950¹ transferred review of the orders of these agencies to the courts of appeals, thus leaving only orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission reviewable in the three-judge district courts.

In recent years, this procedure has been criticized by members of the Federal judiciary in the course of reviewing orders of the Commission as being "cumbersome" and "inefficient."² In an opinion dealing with a phase of the complex litigation arising out of the Commission's order approving the Penn-Central merger, the Court observed that counsel for all the parties participating in that litigation " * * * who have demonstrated that the long outmoded machinery for review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission by a suit before a three-judge court can be made to work although with creaks and strains that ought to be eliminated."³

In commenting on a provision requiring review by a three-judge court, the Supreme Court has stated that this mode of review " * * * particularly in regions where, despite modern facilities, distance still plays an important part in the effective administration

of justice * * * [D]islocates the normal operations of the system of lower Federal courts."⁴

The existing procedures have also been criticized by the Administrative Conference of the United States which, in its report to Congress in 1962,⁵ recommended legislation similar to that proposed in S. 2687. Legislation of this type was also recommended in 1962 by the Special Advisory Committee on Interstate Commerce Commission Practice and Procedure, an advisory committee of practitioners established by the Commission, and by several sessions of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

The most fundamental change in existing law made by S. 2687 would be to shift judicial review of the great majority of the Commission's cases from the district courts to the U.S. courts of appeals. In place of the existing law, which permits direct appeals from the district courts to the Supreme Court, review by that Court would be by the discretionary writ of certiorari. In so doing, this bill would make orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission reviewable in the same general manner as the orders of all other major Federal regulatory agencies, such as FPC, CAB, FCC, SEC, FMC, FTC, and NLRB.

The committee is advised that it is desirable for a number of reasons to provide for judicial review by the courts of appeals. Those courts are regularly engaged in the review of orders of various other Federal agencies, while most district courts rarely do so. The courts of appeals have rules governing judicial review proceedings. Before long, it is expected that they will be applying uniform rules for all of the courts of appeals, promulgated by the Supreme Court under the authority granted by Congress.⁶ In contrast, there are no court rules governing judicial review proceedings in the three-judge courts, with the result that their procedures are on an ad hoc basis.

S. 2687 would amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act, designated as section 17(10), so that the statutory provisions for the review of the Commission's orders will appear in the same statute which gives the Commission authority to make such orders, thus following the general pattern with respect to many other statutes creating administrative agencies and providing for judicial review of their orders.

ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN PRESENT LAW

A comparative analysis of existing law of S. 2687 is set forth in appendix B. A summary of the more important changes proposed in S. 2687 follows.

JURISDICTION

The major change made by S. 2687 is the shifting of judicial review of the Commission's orders from district courts of three judges to the several courts of appeals. This change, summarized as item 1 in appendix B, is set forth in paragraph (a) of S. 2687. With certain specified exceptions, S. 2687 covers judicial review of all final orders of the Commission issued under any of the four parts of the Interstate Commerce Act. Specifically exempted from this paragraph are:

- (1) Final orders involving reparations or other orders for the payment of money.
- (2) Final orders made pursuant to a referral from a district court or the Court of Claims.

The purpose of these two specific exemptions is to preserve existing practice⁷ wherein

cases in these two categories are initially heard in either single-judge district courts or the Court of Claims as the case may be. Claims for reparations and other actions for money damages are essentially private actions and analogous to other types of civil damage actions, therefore, the committee deems it desirable to retain jurisdiction in the district courts for these cases. Nothing in S. 2687 would change the present jurisdiction of the district courts over criminal or civil cases involving only fines, penalties, or civil forfeitures for violations of the Interstate Commerce Act. The jurisdiction of a court of appeals would be invoked by the filing of a petition for review.

VENUE

The venue for filing a petition is set forth in paragraph (b) of S. 2687, summarized as item 2 of appendix B. This provision is derived from existing law⁸ and provides that venue for a petition shall be in the judicial circuit wherein the party filing the petition for review either resides or has his principal office.

Paragraphs (c) and (d), summarized in item 3 of appendix B make a number of important changes in existing law and practice. Together, these two provisions specify the initial and subsequent procedural steps to be followed in a proceeding involving a Commission order.

Under the provisions of S. 2687, first, any party aggrieved by an order of the Commission will be required to file a petition for judicial review with the appropriate court of appeals within 60 days of the service order complained unless, for good cause shown, the court grants a 60-day extension for filing a petition. The purpose of this provision is to cure an omission in existing law which, except for the uncertain and rarely applied doctrine of laches, imposes no statute of limitations for judicial review of the Commission's orders. The 60-day limitation is found in most modern judicial review provisions. While still providing a reasonable opportunity for an appeal to be taken, the committee considers that such a provision is both desirable and useful in protecting the security of transactions authorized by the Commission and providing assurance to parties affected by a Commission order that it will not be challenged by a belated appeal.

Second, S. 2687 attempts to deal with the problem of appeals being taken in different courts over a single Commission order. The venue provisions of S. 2687, like existing law, permit an appeal to be taken in any court wherein any of the parties resides or has his principal office. Pursuant to this provision, any aggrieved party may pick any court meeting these requirements. Although this poses no problem in the majority of cases, in large and complex proceedings, such as a large railroad merger, this freedom in choosing a forum the committee has been advised can, and has, created serious problems because of the bringing of suits in different courts over a single Commission order. For example, in the recently concluded litigation⁹ arising out of the Penn-Central merger, the Commission's order was challenged in three different courts.¹⁰ Similarly, in the so-called Northern Lines merger, challenges were brought in the district courts in Washington, New York, and the District of Columbia. While the Commission has usually been successful in obtaining consolidation of multiple proceedings in one court by persuading the other courts to stay their proceedings, the process involved is time consuming for all

¹ *Phillips v. United States*, 312 U.S. 246, 250-51 (1941).

² Administrative Conference, final report, S. Doc. No. 24, 88th Cong., first sess. (1963), VII, pp. 10-11. (Recommendations 3, 4, and 5.)

³ 28 U.S.C. § 2072 (supp. II, 1967).

⁴ U.S.C. sec. 1336(a) and 1398(a); 28 U.S.C. sec. 2321.

⁵ 28 U.S.C. sec. 1398(a).

⁶ *Penn-Central Merger Cases*, 389 U.S. 486 (1968) affirming *Erie-Lackawanna R. Co. v. U.S. et al.*, 279 F. Supp. 964 (S.D.N.Y.) (1967).

⁷ In addition to the District Court for the Southern District of New York, appeals were docketed in the Eastern District of Virginia, and the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

¹ 28 U.S.C. sec. 2341-2352 (supp. II, 1967).

² *Freight-Forwarders Institute v. United States*, 236 F. Supp. 460, 462 (S.D.N.Y. 1967) (Feinberg J.).

³ *Erie-Lackawanna R. Co. v. United States*, 279 F. Supp. 316, 324 (S.D.N.Y. 1967) (Friendly J.).

concerned. Providing for judicial review in the courts of appeals the committee is advised would largely put an end to this problem. Upon the filing of a petition, any subsequent suits would, by virtue of 28 U.S.C. § 2112, which governs the procedure in the court of appeals in appeals from administrative agencies, be consolidated in the court in which the first suit is filed. This change in the present law the committee considers to be desirable.

This bill also changes existing case law with regard to the submission of the complete record of proceeding before the Commission to a reviewing court. Under existing practice, the person seeking review has the burden of filing a certified copy of the record with the reviewing court. Under S. 2687, the Commission would be required to file the record with the clerk of the court of appeals in which the proceeding is pending.

Upon the commencement of a review proceeding, the Commission would be required to file with the court the original or a certified copy of the record of the proceedings before the Commission except that the court may permit the filing of a certified list of the contents of the record in lieu of the record itself, a practice now widely followed and expected to be made uniform. Under the present review procedure, the plaintiff bears the burden of filing with the three-judge court a certified copy of the record before the Commission. Although this change may impose some additional burden on the Commission, it will bring its practice into line with present procedures for the review of all other Federal agency orders. While placing upon the Commission the burden of supplying the record could encourage court challenges to Commission orders, any such tendency will be offset by the requirements of the courts of appeals for the parties to reproduce, by printing or otherwise, the portions of the Commission record on which they are relying. Under the present three-judge court procedure, reproduction of the record is not required. The committee was informed that in the experience of other agencies, most of this reproduction cost falls upon the private appellants.

S. 2687 makes a further important change in existing law in the elimination of the United States as a statutory defendant, shown in item 4 of appendix B, thus eliminating the present requirement¹¹ whereby all court challenges to an order of the Commission are formally brought against the United States rather than the Commission itself. The elimination of the United States as a named respondent would mean that any petition for judicial review would be brought automatically against the Commission as the named respondent. This change brings the Commission into conformity with the present practice of such agencies as SEC, NLRB, FPC, CAB, and FCC, which are named as the respondents in suits seeking judicial review of their orders. The committee is advised that the Commission's attorneys today assume the primary and principal responsibility for the defense of its orders in the courts.

This feature of S. 2687, among others, is opposed by the Department of Justice. In a letter to the committee, dated May 15, 1968, from Deputy Attorney General Warren Christopher, the Department states:

"However, the legislation (S. 2687) is objectionable insofar as it would remove the United States as the statutory defendant and repeal the Attorney General's responsibility for primary control of this class of litigation. Such dispersion of responsibility for the conduct of litigation involving the Government conflicts with prior efforts of the Executive Department and the Congress to centralize control of the Government's litigation in the Attorney General."

In the alternative, the Department suggests that the Commission be brought under the Hobbs Act,¹² after which S. 2687 is modeled.

The committee does not concur in the suggestions of the Department. While generally, the Department of Justice and the Commission have worked together in the defense of the Commission's orders, from time to time, there have been differences of opinion between the Commission and the Department as to questions of policy and statutory construction with the result that the Department has declined to defend the Commission's order in court. There have been a number of such cases. Because Commission orders are generally immune from direct attack under the antitrust laws, many of these differences in recent years have involved the issue of competition and its evaluation by the Commission in such complex areas as intermodal rate competition and railroad mergers. Although the Supreme Court has held that in such a case the duty of the Commission to administer and enforce the act carries with it the right to defend its orders in its own name when the Department declines to do so, the committee does not believe it necessary or efficient to continue the present practice. For this reason, as well as to give a reviewing court the most assistance, the committee believes that the defense of ICC orders should be placed directly with the Commission. As shown in item 3(b) and 4 of appendix B, this bill fully protects the rights of the United States by requiring that a copy of the petition for review be served on the Attorney General as well as the Commission and by permitting the Attorney General to intervene in a Commission case as a matter of right.

The balance of S. 2687 deals with review of decisions by the courts of appeals in the Supreme Court and certain miscellaneous provisions.

REVIEW IN THE SUPREME COURT

Under the present law,¹³ a decision of a three-judge district court is subject to a right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court. This is a so-called appeal as of right, in the sense that the Supreme Court does not purport to exercise discretion as to whether or not to review the case on its merits.

Paragraph (b) of S. 2687, summarized as item 6 of appendix B, would provide for Supreme Court review by certiorari, rather than by appeal. This conforms to the method of seeking Supreme Court review which is applicable to all other Federal agencies. This paragraph would also preserve the Commission's present right to seek review in the Supreme Court with or without the concurrence of the Department of Justice by stating that, "The United States or the Commission or an aggrieved party may file such petition for a writ of certiorari."

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Paragraph (h) of S. 2687, shown in item 7 of appendix B, preserves a portion of the existing law,¹⁴ the balance of which is repealed by section 2 of S. 2687. This paragraph provides for nationwide service of process, orders and writs issued by the courts of appeals in cases arising under final orders of the Commission covered by this bill and proceedings arising in the district courts under sections 20 and 23 of the act and section 3 of the Elkins Act, all of which deal with the enforcement of various accounting, reporting, and tariff requirements of the act and, the rights of the shippers to nondiscriminatory treatment by the carriers. This provision is an exception to the general rule that a court's process does not run outside the State in which it

is located, in the case of the district courts, or the circuit, in the case of the courts of appeals. The committee believes its retention is desirable because of the widespread operations of the Nation's carriers.

As shown in item 8, of appendix B, section 2 of S. 2687 repeals those parts of existing law which contain the present procedure for review of the Commission's order in three-judge district courts. All of these provisions are superseded by the provisions of section 1 of S. 2687 and thus are rendered obsolete. S. 2687 does not change other sections of existing law which also deal with the review and enforcement of the Commission's orders since they will still be applicable to cases involving reparations, fines, penalties and forfeitures which are not transferred to the courts of appeals by this bill. In order to insure an orderly transition from the present mode of review in the district courts to the courts of appeals, S. 2687 provides for a 60-day transitional period and that cases pending in the district courts on the effective date of this act will be processed to conclusion in such courts with the right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court as under the present law.

AMENDMENT OF THE DEFINITION OF "FELONY"

The bill (S. 3738) to amend the definition of "felony" in title IV (adding chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code) and title VII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3738

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraphs (13) and (14) of section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, are amended by striking out the phrase "by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the words "as a felony".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 921 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) The term 'felony' means, in the case of a Federal law, an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, and, in the case of a State law, an offense determined by the laws of the State to be a felony."

(c) Paragraph (3) of section 921(b), subsections (c), (e), and (f) of section 922, section 924(b), and subsections (b) and (c) of section 925 of such title are amended by striking out the phrase "by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the words "as a felony".

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) (2) of section 1202 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-351) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) 'felony' means, in the case of a Federal law, an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year and, in the case of a State law, an offense determined by the laws of such State to be a felony."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1500) explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to amend the definition of "felony" in title IV (adding ch.

¹² Ch. 158, 28 U.S.C.; 28 U.S.C. sec. 2341-2351.

¹³ 28 U.S.C. sec. 1253.

¹⁴ 28 U.S.C. sec. 2321.

¹¹ 28 U.S.C. sec. 2322.

44 of title 18, U.S.C.) and title VIII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

STATEMENT

In both titles IV and VII of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets of 1968, restrictions on the acquisition and ownership of firearms are placed upon persons convicted in either State or Federal courts of a felony which is defined as a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year. Title IV also places restrictions on persons under indictment or fugitives from justice as to such crimes.

After investigation of the applicable State laws, the Judiciary Committee has found that several State legislatures have a practice of making essentially trivial offenses broadly punishable in order to give the sentencing judge discretion in dealing with repeated offenders or particular cases involving aggravated circumstances. In other words, many crimes which would traditionally be classed as misdemeanors are punishable by more than 1 year in prison in some States.

Consequently, the committee believes that the sections of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 may have far-reaching consequences on the right of persons convicted under State law in the past of relatively minor misdemeanors to acquire and possess firearms.

The original act recognizes in part, that there should be a differentiation between right of those convicted of a serious crime and those convicted of a minor offense to acquire and possess firearms. For example, title IV excludes certain business and regulatory offenses from the act; however, this exclusion does not apply to title VII which would have the greatest impact on a citizen's right to purchase a firearm.

Therefore, the committee feels that the purpose of titles IV and VII would be better served by changing the definition of the word "felony" as used in the act to mean, in the case of Federal law, an offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year, and, in the case of State law, an offense determined by the laws of such State to be a felony.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on June 17 of this year, the distinguished ranking Republican in this body, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], and I introduced joint resolutions, seeking to bring about a change in the present electoral system. One of the resolutions provides for a national primary to replace the happenstance primaries which are used today, and which are so expensive and so inconclusive as well. This resolution would also abolish the electoral college. Another of these resolutions would extend the right to vote to 18-year-olds—a privilege our young people have earned for a number of well-authenticated reasons. Finally, there is included a resolution that calls for a limit on the Presidency of one 6-year term.

No mention was made of conventions in the resolutions, because the convention itself is an extralegal institution. Conventions do not come within the laws of the United States, either those enacted by Congress or under the Constitution.

With these resolutions, it was not necessarily our intention to abolish conventions as such, but simply to do away with the convention as it exists and is used today. However, it was our intention to provide that the national primaries—not the delegates—be the voice of the people in selecting the nominees for the Presidency and the Vice-Presidency of the major parties. It was our intention to provide that, once the choices had been made in the national primaries, a convention might then be convened and attended in the main by the State chairmen and chairwomen, the national committeemen and national committeewomen, and the members of the respective national committees located in Washington.

At the time it was thought that once the people, not the delegates, had made their choice, this convention of the major representatives of the parties in question could then determine what remained to be done.

Mr. President, I rise at this time to ask of the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], to hold hearings on these proposals this year; because, while we are approaching the end of a session, I believe it never will be too soon to face up to the problem which confronts us at this time, which was shown so graphically to the American people and to the world during the past several weeks and months.

A VETERANS' STANDING COMMITTEE IN THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the fact that the American Legion convention will be held in New Orleans beginning Monday, September 9, is a reminder that we have never done anything with the resolution calling for the creation of a Veterans' Standing Committee in the Senate. That matter has been debated and discussed on the Senate floor and in committees, individual Members have ventilated their views on it from time to time, and several rather yeomanlike efforts have been made in order to consummate this matter.

I observe now that the convention of the majority party adopted in their platform a provision putting that party on record in favor of such a committee. We have been on record on that matter for quite a long time. My understanding is—and I am not sure whether I am correctly informed—that the resolution is presently pending before the majority policy committee, and therefore that committee has not reported on it, and that is the reason why the resolution is not on the Senate floor.

The distinguished majority leader could probably advise me about that. But it does take on a new character in view of what is recited in the 1968 platform of the majority party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I can

well appreciate the concern of the distinguished minority leader, and I am indebted to him for calling to my attention the fact that this particular plank is in the Democratic platform.

I would point out that this body, some months ago, passed a legislative reorganization bill in which it was stipulated that a Committee on Veterans' Affairs would be created.

It has been the hope of the policy committee, and it is still the hope of the policy committee, regardless of events over the past several weeks prior to the recess on August 2, that the House would see fit, in its wisdom, to take up this long overdue measure dealing with legislative reorganization and approve it, so that in that manner there would not be a duplication of effort on the part of the Senate through the consideration of a new proposal.

However, I wish to assure the distinguished minority leader that if the House of Representatives does not take any action, this matter will once again be brought before the policy committee and, hopefully, action will be taken then.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the words of the distinguished majority leader. I am quite certain, from consultations with House leaders, that they will undertake nothing in this regard. They are reluctant at this stage of the session to undertake anything more, and I was afraid the matter probably would die by default.

I earnestly request the distinguished majority leader to ask his policy committee about this matter in the hope that we can at least make a start and get this matter before the Senate for approval and lift it out of the reorganization bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senator certain in his own mind that the House of Representatives will not consider the legislative reorganization bill which passed this body so overwhelmingly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Based on the assertion of leaders there, that is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On that basis I will once again be happy to take it up with the policy committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the statement made by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], concerning the joint resolutions which he and other Senators have presented to the Senate asking for the abolition of the electoral college and the provision that candidates for the presidency of the respective political parties shall be chosen by direct vote of the people rather than by delegates chosen by political bosses in big cities and having the delegates vote in accordance with what is sometimes a warped judgment and, in many instances, not at all reflecting the thinking of the people within their States.

It is rather an anomaly to believe that in this modern day, with all the talk about the one-man, one-vote principle applicable to many operations of Government, we still adhere to a policy adopted more than 180 years ago providing for an electoral college to choose the President.

Every bit of reasoning argues for the elimination of the electoral college. Cold rationalization, delicate consideration of justice, all cry out within our democracy that presidential nominees shall be chosen on the same basis as the eventual President is chosen; namely, by direct vote.

Mr. President, I do not know whether I can have my name added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Montana. If I can, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to become a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE COMMUNIST WORLD IS BREAKING UP

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is evident from the invasion of Czechoslovakia that the present rulers of the Kremlin are fearful that the Communist world is breaking up. The invasion and subjugation of Czechoslovakia, an independent nationalist Communist country and a part of the Soviet bloc of European nations, is the most shocking aggression that has occurred since Hitler's conquest of Czechoslovakia with his storm troops and air power in 1939. This is a particularly shocking manifestation of the apparent fear on the part of leaders of the Kremlin of this small Communist nation displaying self-government free from Soviet domination.

Top officials in the British Foreign Office and some U.S. ambassadors in Europe are convinced that the invasion of Czechoslovakia marks the beginning of the end of international communism. Also, Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, for many years director of the Research Institute of Columbia University on Communist Affairs and regarded as an authority on international communism, stated:

The Soviet Union had the choice of either accepting a community of independent Communist states and thereby acting in the spirit of Communist internationalism or of acting like a major imperialist power motivated purely by nationalist interests. The Soviet Union chose the latter course.

If the reactionary elements in the Kremlin prevail in subjugating Czechoslovakia, then it may be that they will commence to bring pressure against Rumania and Yugoslavia which, very definitely, are not Soviet satellites but are nationalist Communist countries.

Dubcek and other leaders in Czechoslovakia sought to transform communism in their own country on the model of Tito's Yugoslavia. They and Communist leaders in Rumania are veering toward capitalism. Evidently the hard-line Communists of the Soviet Union feared this further breaking away from the Soviet Communist orbit. It is terrifying that the Soviet leaders in apparent desperation are defying the opinion of the world by a military takeover of this little country seeking to pursue its own course of development and change. It appears that the forces of reaction, the old Stalinist crowd in the Kremlin, now becoming desperate and acting in disregard to world opinion, seek to extinguish

by force the national aspirations for self-government which animate not only the leaders in Czechoslovakia but the leaders in Yugoslavia, Rumania, Hungary and other nations of Eastern Europe.

The frightened Communist leaders in the Soviet Union are seeking to preserve the old order. This will only speed its disintegration. Czechoslovakia sought to and will continue to be a nationalist Communist country on the order of Tito's Yugoslavia. The conservative Communist leaders in the Soviet Union, fearing that the liberalization of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia was a threat to them, in desperation invaded this little country, tiny in comparison with the vast expanse of the Soviet Union and with a population of only 14 million. In the end they are bound to fail and the old communism of the Soviet Union, to use a Marxist phrase, is destined to the scrap heap of history.

This invasion and crushing of Czechoslovakia does not solve any problems for the Russians. It creates new problems. It may be, and let us hope this will happen, that reason will prevail in Moscow and that the Russians will withdraw their forces from Czechoslovakia. However, if they do not and if these bitter men continue to hold power in the Kremlin, then the entire free world has reason to be fearful of the Soviet Union. This was a blunder on the part of Communist leaders of Russia. Nevertheless, blunderers in charge of a powerful government such as the Soviet Union are even more dangerous to the peace of the world than wicked, but wise leaders. We know now that the present leadership in Moscow in some state of desperation was capable of committing this stupid act, so who knows but that they might try to pull the free world back to that era of Stalin which we all hoped was behind us.

The invasion and takeover of Czechoslovakia, an independent Communist nation, is an affront to national decency and a despicable act of aggression against a valiant, but defenseless people who seek to build a nation nominally dependent upon the Soviet Union but, in fact, free of domination on the part of that Communist giant. It is a grave misfortune that this little nation of Czechs and Slovaks who united in one nation total but 14 million people, has been taken over by 500,000 invading fighting men. If the United Nations offers any hope of maintaining peace in the world, the time is at hand for this agency to take appropriate and forthright action. The world should not be compelled to witness such a crude and brutal display of power and force and must not permit to be extinguished the national aspirations for self-government within the Soviet bloc which animate not only the Czechs and Slovaks but the Hungarians and Rumanians as well. No doubt it is for these reasons that the Soviets struck without warning.

The treachery of the Russian imperialists and their contrived transparent falsification of reasons for the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia have caused turmoil again in the cold war that envelops the world today. It was the hard-line attitude of a few members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party that was being chal-

lenged by the liberalism of the Czech party leader, Dubcek, and Premier Oldrich Cernik. This challenge was succeeding in its fight to liberate the soul of Czechoslovakia from its bondage to the Soviet Union. But the bellicose and reactionary men in the Kremlin saw this new political leadership as dangerous and too independent of the ideals and principles of the U.S.S.R.; therefore, they ordered the military invasion of Czechoslovakia. Their attempt to forcibly remove the specter of freedom from the Czech spirit has actually inadvertently succeeded in strengthening the Czechoslovaks' will to fight for freedom and independence of their homeland.

The chaotic events of the Russian-led occupation have made clear that the mood of the Czechoslovakians is not to be dominated by the sphere of Soviet influence or controlled by the military strength of Soviet forces. It is clearly evident that the Russians made a political blunder of unimaginable dimension when they first seized Dubcek and led him away manacled.

The people of Czechoslovakia have overwhelmingly rejected any denunciation of Dubcek and any compromise with Moscow. They seek and hope for full restoration of their political sovereignty and complete withdrawal of the Soviet occupation forces.

The courage of the Czechs has opened the eyes of all people to the deplorable and treacherous tactics used by the Soviet Union in order to exert her influence. It has also opened their eyes to the other deplorable situations existing throughout the world. Today the Russians stand side by side with the United States for condemnation by other countries for aggression. The circumstances of the Czechoslovakian invasion and the war in Vietnam are not directly similar, but their purposes are now seen as one by many people of this Nation and those of other nations. We, as well as the Russians, must desist from this violent and inexcusable use of force to spread our ideals and principles.

Alexander Dubcek is a true representative of the aspirations of his countrymen to throw off the yoke of Soviet control. He sought to humanize communism. He sought to bring some degree, even a small degree, of democracy and decency to his people and to deviate only slightly from the Leninist Communist doctrine. Because of this he was arrested, handcuffed and taken to Moscow. Now he has been returned to Prague. Let us hope this is a first step on the part of the Russians to permit the return of self-rule to that presently unhappy country. The entire civilized world should ring with condemnation of the Soviet Union. Then let us hope the Russians will withdraw from Czechoslovakia as they did from Cuba in October 1962.

BATTLE OF AVERASBORO

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on August 18, 1968, I had the honor of making the dedicatory remarks at the unveiling of a beautiful monument to the memory of the soldiers of the Confederacy commanded by General Hardee who fought

the Union forces commanded by General Slocum at Averasboro in Harnett County, N.C., on March 15 and 16, 1865.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BATTLE OF AVERASBORO

As one who venerates the precious heritage of valor and sacrifice bequeathed to us by the men and women of the Confederacy, I am grateful for the privilege of being with you on this memorable occasion.

We meet upon an historic battlefield to dedicate a beautiful monument which pays reverence to the soldiers of the Confederacy who fought the Battle of Averasboro at this spot 103 years ago.

We do well to do this.

"If their memories part
From our land and Heart,
'Twould be a wrong to them,
And a shame for us."

It seems appropriate to consider the events which precipitated the Battle of Averasboro, and the role which those who fought the battle undertook to play.

After the fall of Atlanta on September 1, 1864, the victorious Union forces under General Sherman and their infamous camp followers, "the bummers", waged total war against the people of Georgia and the Carolinas. In so doing, they pillaged and burned and in that way lay waste the areas they traversed.

Their objective in carrying on this cruel form of warfare against the civilian population of Georgia and the Carolinas was twofold: First, to disable these States to continue supplying Lee's Army of Northern Virginia, which faced Grant's Army of the Potomac before Richmond and Petersburg; and, second, to weaken the will of the South to prolong the conflict.

As Sherman knew, nothing could have been more demoralizing to the thousands of Georgians and Carolinians fighting with Lee in Virginia than the sad tidings that the virtually defenseless folks they had left behind in comparative safety were being badgered and plundered by a relentless foe and its vicious camp followers.

With 60,000 combatants, Sherman ended his notorious "March to the Sea" at Savannah in December, 1864. Shortly thereafter, in January, 1865, he moved northward across South Carolina by way of Columbia, Florence, and Cheraw, looting and burning as he went. By March 8, his entire army reached the neighborhood of Laurel Hill in what is now Scotland County, North Carolina. From that place he proceeded to Fayetteville, which he occupied on March 11, destroying the public buildings and the industrial plants and extending his pillage throughout the adjacent area.

During the last part of his march from Savannah to Fayetteville, Sherman was preceded by a force of retreating Confederates, whom he outnumbered 10 to 1 and whose mission it was to watch and report his movements. These Confederates were commanded by an intrepid Georgian, General William J. Hardee, one-time commandant at West Point and author of "Hardee's Tactics."

Hardee crossed the Cape Fear River shortly before Sherman entered Fayetteville, and took position near Averasboro in Harnett County on the road leading from Fayetteville by way of Smithfield to Raleigh, which traversed at this point the area lying between the Cape Fear on the west and the Black River on the east.

At this time Hardee's command totaled 6,000 men. Among them were the officers and men of the Fiftieth North Carolina Regiment commanded by Colonel George Wortham, the

Seventy-Seventh North Carolina Regiment commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Wheeler Hancock, and the Tenth North Carolina Battalion of Heavy Artillery commanded by Major Wilton L. Young. These North Carolina units constituted a part of the brigade commanded by Colonel Washington M. Hardy and of the division commanded by General Lafayette McLaws, one of the work horses of the Confederacy.

It is worthy of note that Company H of the Fiftieth North Carolina Regiment, which was captained by Joseph H. Adkinson, and Company B of the Tenth North Carolina Battalion, which was captained by H. M. Barnes, were composed in large measure of residents of Harnett County.

While Sherman was marching northward through South Carolina, General Lee had dispatched General Joseph E. Johnston, a tactician who could do much with little, to North Carolina with instructions that he should assemble all the available Confederate units operating in the area at some suitable place and obstruct Sherman's further advance.

Johnston was implementing Lee's instructions when Sherman seized Fayetteville. Being uncertain whether Sherman would attempt to capture Raleigh, the Capital of the State, or move on Goldsboro to join General Schofield, who had been directing Union operations in eastern North Carolina before his advent, Johnston undertook to concentrate the remnants of the once powerful Army of Tennessee, General Robert F. Hoke's division, General Wade Hampton's cavalry, and other units in the vicinity of Smithfield midway between Raleigh and Goldsboro. He expected Hardee to join him soon. Because of the disparity between the 14,000 men available to him and the 80,000 available to Sherman, Johnston realized that his hope of success was contingent on his striking and defeating separate columns of the foe while Sherman's forces were divided.

At this juncture Sherman turned his army east toward Goldsboro. His Fourteenth and Twentieth Corps under General Slocum undertook to proceed by way of Averasboro and Bentonville while his Fifteenth and Seventeenth Corps marched on a parallel road some miles to the South.

Johnston ordered Hardee to delay Slocum at Averasboro so that he could complete the concentration of his forces and be ready to strike the Fourteenth and Twentieth Corps on their arrival at Bentonville.

These events precipitated the Battle of Averasboro, which is well described in Captain Samuel A. Ashe's "History of North Carolina." I quote his words:

"Hardee, on crossing the Cape Fear, took the road leading to Smithfield and Raleigh. On the 15th of March he occupied a position four miles from Averasboro, and that evening a Federal column, being the Fourteenth and Twentieth Corps, approached and there was some skirmishing. Hardee's position was well chosen, the Black River nearly approaching the Cape Fear at that point, and he made excellent dispositions, but had only six thousand men. Early the next morning the Federals, General Sherman being on the field in person, attacked with vigor, using their artillery to advantage; but their infantry was always repulsed. In the early afternoon they moved a heavy force farther to the east, completely flanking the left of Hardee's position, which necessitated a retirement of that wing about four hundred yards to the main line. Here again and again, every assault was repulsed. During the night the Federals proceeded to fortify their position and threw heavy columns across Black River; and Hardee, being thus flanked, fell back towards Smithfield, leaving Wheeler's men in position."

Thus ended the Battle of Averasboro, a fight in which Union casualties totaled 682, and Confederate losses approximated 500.

By his gallant delaying action at Aver-

asboro, Hardee enabled Johnston to concentrate his total available forces of 14,000 men and boys at Bentonville. Here, on March 19, Johnston surprised Sherman's Fourteenth Corps. John Gilchrist Barrett summarized the Battle of Bentonville in this wise in his "North Carolina as a Civil War Battleground":

"For awhile it looked as though the Confederates would carry the day, but Federal reinforcements late in the afternoon blunted the Confederate offensive. More Union troops reached the field during the 20th, and by the 21st Sherman had his entire Army at Bentonville. That night Johnston withdrew his forces to Smithfield. Sherman was victorious at Bentonville, the largest battle of the war fought on North Carolina soil, yet he failed to follow up his success by pursuing the enemy. Instead he marched his army into Goldsboro."

Bentonville was the bloodiest battle ever fought in North Carolina. Confederate casualties amounted to 2,606, and Union losses totaled 1,646.

Despite the valor displayed by her sons at Averasboro, and in hundreds of other engagements on land and sea, the doom of the Confederacy was sealed by Grant's war of attrition against Lee in Virginia, and Sherman's total war against the people of Georgia and the Carolinas. As a consequence, Lee capitulated to Grant at Appomattox on April 9th, and Johnston surrendered to Sherman at the Bennett House near Durham on April 26th.

The conquered banner was now furled.

When one ponders the story of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederacy who fought at Averasboro and in countless other engagements on land and sea, he cannot avoid putting this question to history: What inspired these men to fight so bravely, always against great odds and oftentimes unto death.

The assertion that they fought to perpetuate slavery does not suffice to answer the question. Most of them did not own or expect to own a single slave. Indeed, few of them had any material stake whatever in the victory of the Confederacy.

The question has been answered by one who knew these men well and loved them much. Almost 2 score and 10 years after he had served with gallantry as a lieutenant of the Confederacy at Gettysburg, Dr. Randolph McKim, a beloved Episcopal minister of Washington, answered the question in words of unforgettable beauty, which are engraved upon the memorial erected by the United Daughters of the Confederacy to the Confederate dead at Jackson Circle in Arlington National Cemetery.

Here are Dr. McKim's words:

"Not for fame or reward, not for place or for rank, not lured by ambition or goaded by necessity, but in simple obedience to duty as they understood it, these men suffered all, sacrificed all, dared all, and died."

As we meet upon this battlefield and dedicate this beautiful memorial to the soldiers of the Confederacy who fought here, we know that they and their comrades who fought elsewhere on land and sea taught by example this precept of their great chieftain, Robert E. Lee: "Duty * * * is the sublimest word in our language."

Like the memorial to the Spartans who fell at Thermopylae, this is a monument to the vanquished and not to the victors.

I end with a prayer. As long as fame her record keeps, may this memorial join history in bearing to the generations the message that the soldiers and sailors of the Confederacy fought for the cause they loved in simple obedience to duty as they understood it and that they illustrated by their lives and by their deaths in a fashion unsurpassed in the annals of time this eternal truth:

"Defeat may serve as well as victory,
To shake the soul and let the glory out."

OUR NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, our national parks are a source of pride to all as well as an oasis for healthful relaxation and enjoyment. I think it is especially noteworthy at this time that they will be the feature attraction of an event scheduled for the television screen. I refer specifically to the National Geographic special which will be seen as an hour-long color presentation over the full CBS national network on October 23. I consider this of such significance as to warrant our attention and endorsement for its educational and entertainment value.

The first of four National Geographic specials, this program will be an informative, entertaining, and realistic documentation of people, places, and events in our national parks. It will honor the men of our Park Service in telling their story of dedicated service. Its entire content will provide the kind of wholesome, worthwhile television fare that can be welcomed into every American home without question as to its appropriateness or propriety. This is in marked contrast to the all too familiar themes of violence and sex on television and is, I believe, worthy of our commendation.

It is a source of pride to me personally that one of the Nation's great corporations with headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Hamilton Watch Co., of Lancaster, has chosen to cosponsor these programs which represent television at its highest level of quality and good taste.

The very nature of the National Geographic specials, as well as their value to people of all ages throughout the country, inspired Hamilton sponsorship. Each of these programs offers an hour of great beauty and lasting value, qualities traditionally associated with Hamilton's fine watches.

There is evidence that the public recognizes and values these qualities. Last year, the National Geographic specials attracted audiences of up to 40 million people. One of the programs based on the Amazon River received the Peabody Award which is the television industry's highest honor for excellence. The series has been widely acclaimed by critics for the artistic merit reflected in its programs. It also has been praised by educators throughout the country for its significant treatment in dealing with subjects of lasting interest and importance. Many teachers assign National Geographic programs as required viewing, because they have found these shows stimulate students' curiosity and eagerness to learn through a fine combination of education, entertainment, and real-life adventure.

The National Geographic Society has been producing four television specials a year since the 1965-66 season. As Senators know, it is headquartered right here in the Nation's Capitol and has been a successful publisher for the past 80 years. During more than 60 years of this time Hamilton has supported the society with advertising. I believe this is the oldest advertiser-publisher relationship in the history of American magazine publishing. The extension of this fine relationship into television is a very favorable development toward assuring worthwhile

programs and illustrates for us how commercial interests can produce both profits and artistry for the furtherment of man's knowledge and culture.

In this major investment in national television, Hamilton joins another outstanding American company—Encyclopædia Britannica, a continuing sponsor of the National Geographic specials. Encyclopædia Britannica's interest in education and in the youth of America is well known. Its standards of quality parallel those of Hamilton. Under the co-sponsorship of these two great business organizations, the October 23 program on our national parks will take audiences on a trip of adventure from Hawaii to Cape Cod, from Maine to the Virgin Islands to show how the men of our Park Service face a continuing challenge, excitement, and even danger.

I feel these fine organizations are to be congratulated for their business statesmanship in selecting a television program that furthers the public's interest in and knowledge of our national parks, a source of great pride to all of us as individuals and as a nation.

NLRB INTERPRETS TAFT-HARTLEY ACT TO MEAN MORE THAN CONGRESS INTENDED, WISHED, OR IMAGINED

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the current issue of the Small Business Bulletin, published by the National Small Business Association, contains an article written by me describing the recent hearings held by the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers on the National Labor Relations Board and its relationship to Congress and the courts.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NLRB INTERPRETS TAFT-HARTLEY ACT TO MEAN MORE THAN CONGRESS "INTENDED, WISHED, OR IMAGINED"

(By Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., Democrat of North Carolina, chairman, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Separation of Powers)

(About the author: Senator Ervin, always aware of and sympathetic to the problems of the small business man, has again rendered the country a great service by conducting hearings on the National Labor Relations Board and the way it functions. Labor law and its application by the NLRB is one of the most sensitive areas of government relations for the small business community, yet Congress, except for Senator Ervin's Subcommittee hearings, has given scant review to whether the NLRB is obeying the will of Congress.)

Earlier this spring the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Separation of Powers conducted a series of hearings on the National Labor Relations Board. The object was to determine how faithfully the agency has been performing its congressional mandate to administer the nation's labor statutes.

The Subcommittee on Separation of Powers is part of the Senate Judiciary Committee and, unlike the Labor Committee of Congress, is not expert in the field of labor law. Its study was undertaken to determine how well the Board has been performing its role—whether it has applied labor law as declared by Congress or whether, on the contrary, it has applied the law according to its own notions of proper national labor policy. The Subcommittee's object was not to evalu-

ate the desirability of the congressional policy or to propose substantive changes in it.

Notwithstanding the many hours of hearings and hundreds of pages of testimony received in the past few months, the Subcommittee has barely scratched the surface of so complicated a subject as the NLRB's administration of labor law. A thorough review of this subject requires the full-time attention of a Senate subcommittee expert in the field. A number of tentative findings can be made, however, based on a preliminary evaluation of the testimony.

First, the Congress has been lax in the exercise of its responsibility to oversee the Board's administration of labor law.

Despite the continuous controversies surrounding its administration, there have been only a few congressional investigations of the Board since 1947 and these have been devoted to fairly limited aspects of its jurisdiction. The Board's actions have been subject only to restricted review by the courts. As the hearings demonstrated, judicial review is inadequate to ensure that Board-sponsored erosion of statutory language does not occur.

Second, it is clear that in a number of areas the Board has developed a law governing labor relations which has little relevance to statutory language.

Union members no longer have the same right to obtain decertification elections that Congress provided in the Taft-Hartley Act. Their statutory rights have been narrowed and modified by a number of Board-evolved doctrines, with the end result that it is extremely difficult for employees to disestablish a union once it gains majority status. Similarly, employees' statutory rights to refrain from union activities have been qualified and limited by Board decisions which stress organized action. In some circumstances the right to refrain is, in practice, completely at the mercy of the union leadership. Language defining bargaining rights, the duty to bargain, and the class of topics which are subject to bargaining has been "interpreted" by the Board in such a way that the statutory phrases now mean more than Congress intended, or would have wished, or could have imagined. Employee election rights have also been adversely affected. The Board has developed a combination of doctrines which de-emphasize significance of elections, especially when the results of the election do not favor unionization.

These are just a few of the substantive areas where the testimony indicates a deviation by the Board from the intent of Congress as expressed in the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have not mentioned the Board's curious interpretations of "free speech"; the improper use of its judicial powers; its refusal to give force and effect to the rulemaking powers which Congress charged it to use; the apparent failure of the Board to act evenhandedly when different parties seek its protection; the political sensitivity of the Board as evidenced by the rapid changes of its decisions in response to changing political circumstances; the power of the General Counsel to bar or delay recourse to the Board; or the other unfortunate tendencies of the agency which were disclosed during the Subcommittee's sessions.

Obviously more is involved here than merely mistaken or inadequate administration by the NLRB. For example, National Small Business Association's strong statement to the Committee presented case after case showing alleged disregard of Congressional intent by the Board. If the NLRB or other administrative agencies do display a generous tendency to apply statutory law as they see fit, then this has serious implications for our governmental system. Instead of public policy being established according to the wishes of the people through the representatives they elect and send to Congress, policy is being made by a small group of government officials responsive not to the

American people but to other forces. It means that labor law is being devised to serve the interests of unions or management, or the Board itself, but not to serve those of the American working man.

If this is indeed true, then the fault ultimately lies with Congress. It is Congress's responsibility to take a greater interest in the work of the NLRB and other agencies, and to impress upon them Congress's determination to see that its legislative will is being obeyed.

THE NATURE OF THE HEARINGS

The recent hearings on the NLRB are part of a general study by Senator Ervin's Subcommittee into the present-day meaning and significance of the constitutional principle of "separation of powers". The National Labor Relations Board, like its sister agencies, the Federal Trade Commission, Securities Exchange Commission, and others, represents a deviation from a strict application of the separation of powers principle. The Board is, in theory at least, an organ of government combining portions of executive, legislative, and judicial powers. While it is independent of the direct control of the traditional branches, it is a creature of legislation and subject to a variety of controls and limitations imposed by the Congress, the courts, and the Executive. Controls imposed by Congress are, potentially at least, the most significant.

LOAN APPLICATION BY VALLEY CENTER MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF VALLEY CENTER, CALIF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an application by the Valley Center Municipal Water District of Valley Center, Calif., for a loan to assist in financing the construction of emergency and operational storage facilities and pipelines to connect the storage facilities to its existing irrigation water distribution system, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the 82d Airborne Division Association, Inc., Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant incentive pay to the airborne units of the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to give a chance for homeownership to those who presently cannot achieve it; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the 82d Airborne Division Association, Inc., Mansfield, Ohio, commending the foreign policy of the United States relating to Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Tribal Council of the Jicarilla Apache Tribe of Indians, Dulce, N. Mex., requesting that appointments be made promptly to existing vacancies within the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Ninth Guam Legislature, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a Status Commission for the Unincorporated Territory of Guam;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Governmental Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to certain immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the chamber of commerce of the city of Porterville, Calif., protesting the secondary boycott of California table grapes by AFL-CIO unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition, signed by Orlando E. Hartman, and sundry other citizens of the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation relating to extension of the National Labor Relations Act to cover farmworkers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Committee on Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated August 2, 1968, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Raymond H. Lapin, of California, to be President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 32 Army Reserve commissioned officers for promotion to the grade of major general and brigadier general.

I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Brig. Gen. John L. Boros, and sundry other U.S. Army Reserve officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Brig. Gen. Kenneth W. Brewer, and sundry other Army National Guard of the United States officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army; and

Col. Harry W. Barnes, and Col. Robert F. Wilson, Army National Guard of the United States officers, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 3999. A bill for the relief of Vladko Dimitrov Denev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 4000. A bill for the relief of Tsui Yan Wa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 4001. A bill for the relief of Sangvian

Boonbangkeng, Wea Lum Phian, Yau Fo, Shu Wah Ip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 4002. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of establishing an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area between Wood River, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 4003. A bill for the relief of Theodore Atsidakos, and his wife Helen, and two children, Mary and Erethilia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 4004. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate certain inequities involved in the taxation of employee stock options; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 4005. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEASIBILITY OF AN UPPER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study, investigate, and formulate recommendations concerning the feasibility and desirability of establishing an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area. This area would cover all or parts of the segment of the Mississippi River and adjacent lands between Wood River, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn. The area to be studied under the terms of my bill includes portions of my own State of Iowa, and the States of Missouri, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. This area is readily accessible to more than 20 million people of the Midwest and comprises a wealth of American culture.

Although this area is already widely used for outdoor recreation purposes, such use is heavily concentrated and tends to disturb and destroy values which most people wish to use and enjoy. Because this area has so much to offer the Nation and millions of people living nearby, I feel that a comprehensive evaluation of its recreation potential should be concluded as soon as possible. One reason for such a survey is that adverse activities might endanger the prospects of future development of public outdoor recreation facilities.

The Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army has conducted some significant studies in this regard. These studies should be more helpful in compiling a meaningful evaluation and report at the earliest possible time while also holding down the cost of the study called for in my bill—such cost being estimated at less than \$100,000.

Mr. President, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has favorably reported a bill containing the same provisions as I am introducing. I urge the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to consider this bill at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the

RECORD and also printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 4002) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of establishing an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area between Wood River, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4002

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall study, investigate, and formulate recommendations on the feasibility and desirability of establishing an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area all or parts of the segment of the Mississippi River and adjacent lands between Wood River, Illinois, and Minneapolis, Minnesota, in the States of Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. The Secretary shall consult with other interested Federal agencies, and the State and local bodies and officials involved, and shall coordinate the study with applicable outdoor recreation plans, highway plans, and other planning activities relating to the region.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress, within two years after the date of this Act, a report of his findings and recommendations. The report of the Secretary shall contain, but not be limited to, findings with respect to—

(a) the scenic, scientific, historic, outdoor recreation, and the natural values of the water and related land resources involved, including their use for driving for pleasure, walking, hiking, riding, bicycling, boating, swimming, picnicking, camping, forest management, fish and wildlife management, scenic and historic site preservation, hunting, fishing, and winter sports;

(b) the potential alternative beneficial uses of the water and related land resources involved, taking into consideration appropriate uses of the land for residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and transportation purposes, and for public services; and

(c) the type of Federal, State, and local program that is feasible and desirable in the public interest to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use the values set forth in subsection (a), including alternative means of achieving these values, together with a comparison of the costs and effectiveness of these alternative means.

SEC. 3. Pending submission of the report of the Secretary to the Congress, the heads of Federal agencies having administrative jurisdiction over the Federal lands within the area referred to in section 1 of this Act shall, consistent with the purposes for which the lands were acquired or set aside by the United States and to the extent authorized by law, encourage and provide maximum opportunities for the types of recreation use of such lands referred to in section 2(a) of this Act.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, not to exceed \$100,000.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next

printing, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as a cosponsor of my bill (S. 3777) to establish the U.S. section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 179) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination and election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 387—RESOLUTION CALLING FOR EMERGENCY MEETING OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND DECLARATION OF DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH CZECHOSLOVAKIA

THE MEANING OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before the Kremlin staged its treacherous invasion of Czechoslovakia in the midnight hours of August 21, there were many in the Western World who believed that the Soviet leaders were reasonable men who were committed to the existence of the détente and who would therefore take no rash actions in Czechoslovakia.

Much more died in consequence of the Soviet invasion than the brave new freedom which had suddenly emerged in Czechoslovakia after its long totalitarian night.

The myth of the détente also died with it, as well as the false feeling of security which this myth had spawned.

I have no doubt that, when the present crisis has passed, this myth will burgeon again, just as it did in the period after the suppression of the Hungarian revolution. But, for the moment at least, the eyes of the free world have been opened to the harsh fact that there is no essential difference between the communism of Brezhnev and Kosygin and the communism of Joseph Stalin.

It remains committed to the destruction of freedom for the simple reason that the contagion of freedom constitutes a deadly menace to the total tyranny of communism.

This is something that I have been trying to tell the American people for many years now. Within the past 2 months alone I have taken the floor of the Senate on three occasions to warn against the myth of the détente and against the possibility that the Soviet Union would intervene by force to put down the freedom movement in Czechoslovakia.

I did so for the first time on July 15, in introducing a resolution reaffirming our support for Captive Nations Week. This resolution, in which I was honored to be joined by 13 other Senators, expressed the hope that the captive peoples would "in the years to come be permitted to determine their own future without the threat of external intervention."

On July 22, in speaking again about

the crisis in Czechoslovakia, I submitted a resolution calling for the publication of the U.N. report on Hungary as a Senate document. I said that it was my hope that the republication of this report would serve the dual purpose of reminding world opinion about what happened in Hungary and that, if the Soviet leaders contemplated intervention, it would cause them to pause and reconsider.

Regrettably, this resolution was put over by the Rules Committee because of the pressure of last-minute business.

In the same speech I called for a more vigorous State Department policy, and said that the diplomacy of doing nothing will accomplish exactly nothing.

On this point, now that the deed has been done, I wish to read from an editorial assessment which appeared in the New York Times for September 3:

As this melancholy political tragedy proceeds, Americans would do well to assess soberly this nation's responsibility for last month's rape of Czechoslovakia. From Mr. Dubcek's triumph last January until the Soviet invasion, Washington did almost nothing to show serious goodwill toward the liberal regime. The excuse offered then was that the State Department feared to provoke Moscow action against Prague. In the face of the devastating blow Soviet troops actually did deliver, a more tenable view is that Washington's studied near-indifference to Prague developments was correctly seen in Moscow as assurance the Kremlin could do as it pleased in bringing Czechoslovakia to heel. It is not a pretty chapter of American diplomacy.

On August 2, the final day before recess, I delivered a major speech on the myth of the détente in which I warned again that the Red army might invade Czechoslovakia.

And on August 21, on the heels of the invasion, I issued a statement calling for an emergency session of the U.N. General Assembly to deal with the matter of Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia.

I still believe such a session should be convened, and this is a major purpose of the resolution which I am introducing today.

Essentially my resolution is an action resolution, because, in the situation that confronts us today, pious declarations of sympathy are not enough.

A member nation of the United Nations has been invaded without warning and without cause of any kind by the military forces of five other member nations.

And although, nominally, the Kremlin is permitting the Czechoslovak Government to continue in office, in practice it is enforcing a ruthless dictatorship.

It has compelled the Czechoslovak Government, against its will, to reintroduce a rigid censorship over press and radio.

It has demanded the banning of Czechoslovakia's most popular literary and political magazine, *Literarni Listy*.

It has virtually forbidden Czechoslovak trade with the West.

And according to recent information received by the American chapter of PEN, the world association of writers, Soviet intelligence agents, disguised as ambulance drivers, have been apprehending and beating up prominent Czech writers and removing them to undisclosed destinations.

Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia,

moreover, has raised the specter of further Soviet aggression in Europe.

On the heels of their occupation of Czechoslovakia, the Red Army and its satellite armies embarked on a series of threatening maneuvers on the frontiers of Rumania and Yugoslavia, similar to the maneuvers which preceded the invasion of Czechoslovakia. And these activities are all the more alarming because they have been synchronized with a violent propaganda campaign against the Rumanian and Yugoslav leaders which resembles the propaganda campaign against the Czech leaders prior to the invasion.

Only yesterday the crisis in Europe was dangerously enlarged when the Soviet Ambassador to Bonn presented to the West German Government a list of arrogant demands which bore some of the earmarks of an ultimatum. Among other things, the Kremlin demanded that the Bonn government call off its efforts to establish normal cultural and trade relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

Against the background of Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia no one can say for certain just how far the Soviets are prepared to go. Against this background, too, it becomes clear that Soviet promises and guarantees are utterly worthless.

The coming period will be a period of testing that will require all the wisdom and all the resolution of which we are capable.

There are many measures that must be taken to secure the peace and to deter the Soviets from further aggression. But, in my opinion, the first of these measures is resolute action on the part of the free world to condemn the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, to bring the Kremlin to bar before the United Nations, and to mete out punishment in the form of economic sanctions.

That is why I am submitting my resolution.

My resolution calls upon the administration to designate September 30, the anniversary of the infamous Munich agreement, as a day of solidarity with the Czechoslovak people.

I think that it is altogether fitting that the enslavement of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet tyranny be observed in conjunction with the anniversary of the pact which paved the way to its enslavement by the Nazi tyranny.

On this day let us, by every proper means, tell the Czechoslovak people, that, in their battle to win for themselves the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," they have the fervent support of the American people.

Let us demonstrate.

Let us protest.

Let the church bells ring out across the country.

And let us as a nation reinforce our condemnation by taking those essential diplomatic, political, and economic actions spelled out in the resolution which I submit today.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution calling for an emergency meeting of the General Assembly and calling for the administration to declare September 30 as

a day of solidarity with Czechoslovakia, because that is the date of the Munich betrayal.

Mr. President, in submitting my resolution I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a number of articles and editorials dealing with the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and with the intellectual ferment in the Soviet Union which made the Soviet leaders so fearful of the contagion of freedom.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of my resolution.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution, articles, and editorials, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 387) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 387

Whereas the Congress of the United States is on record as supporting the struggle of the captive nations to recover their national freedom and their basic human rights; and

Whereas the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia on August 21, abetted by the armies of four Communist satellite governments, constituted a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of the rule of law in the affairs of nations; and

Whereas, as President Johnson has pointed out, "The excuses offered by the Soviet Union are patently contrived. The Czechoslovakian government did not request its allies to intervene in its internal affairs. No external aggression threatened Czechoslovakia"; and

Whereas the Soviet secret police, under the protection of the Red Army, are now in the process of liquidating the hard-won freedoms of the Czechoslovak people and re-installing a police state dictatorship; and

Whereas, in the past fortnight, the Soviet Army and its satellite armies have been conducting threatening maneuvers on the frontiers of Rumania and Yugoslavia, similar to the invasion of Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas the Soviet Government further enlarged the crisis by submitting a list of outrageous demands to the Government of West Germany; therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) that the administration should call for an emergency session of the U.N. General Assembly to deal with the Czechoslovak crisis and with the wider crisis this has produced throughout Central Europe;

(2) that at this session the administration, with the support of other free nations, should ask for the imposition of economic sanctions against the aggressor countries, until they abandon their aggression and remove their troops from Czechoslovakia; and that, despite any protests that may come from the now captive government of Czechoslovakia, the administration should also ask for the establishment of a special U.N. committee, similar to the U.N. Committee on Hungary, to gather all available information and to report back to the General Assembly;

(3) that, in advance of such action, the administration should impose an immediate embargo on the shipment of all industrial and technological equipment to the Soviet Union and to the communist bloc countries which participated in the invasion, and that it should invite the other free nations of the world to join in parallel action;

(4) that, in conjunction with the anniversary of the Munich agreement on September 30, the administration should proclaim a day of solidarity with the people of Czechoslovakia, to be manifested in appropriate

observances across the country, and that it should invite the participation of other free governments with a view to making this day an international day of solidarity with the Czechoslovak people in their heroic struggle to retain their freedom; and, finally, be it

Resolved, That the Senate will support such measures as may be necessary to reduce the threat of further Soviet aggression in Europe.

The articles and editorials ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

1. THE SOVIET OCCUPATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA [From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1968]
SADNESS AND FEAR ARE DESCENDING ON PRAGUE—CZECHS SEE THEIR 8 MONTHS OF LIBERTY IS NEAR AN END—HELPLESSNESS IS VOICED

(By Clyde H. Farnsworth)

PRAGUE, August 30.—A heavy sadness has descended on this beautiful city, which Goethe described as "a gem in the crown of the world." You feel the sadness when walking on the Charles Bridge across the Vitava with a young blond law student who says repeatedly, "I am not afraid"—but you know she is.

You pass several Russian soldiers munching bread at the entrance of a Soviet-occupied building on the Opera Square. She looks at them and then, almost with tears in her eyes, says, "It is terrible what they have done."

There is an older Czech talking quietly with an American in a coffee house near Maxim Gorki Square. A third party, unknown to either of them, sits down at their table. The older man suddenly finds an excuse to leave.

FEAR IS COMING BACK

It is the fear that personal liberties, so much enjoyed over the last eight months, are suddenly being taken away—the fear that the Government can never resist the overwhelming Russian military pressures to end the political reforms.

Now, Czechs are again afraid of being informed, afraid of the secret police.

The Russians have pulled most of their troops out of the city. But the tanks are not far away and, three miles southeast of the city center in the suburb of Vrsovice, heavy mortars have been emplaced. They could fire their shells into Wenceslaus Square.

The informed Czech tells you that the plight is tragic. To prevent bloodshed the Government has to accept Russian demands and curb political freedom. But in doing this it loses the confidence of the people.

This reality, the feeling of helplessness beside the tremendous display of Russian power, explains the poignant sighs and pauses when Czechoslovak leaders address the nation.

It explains the bitter tone of the underground poetry plastered on the storefronts:

"Welcome friends—

You have come as brothers,

And now our blood lies on the ground.

"Welcome friends—

Thank you for the roses

On the graves of our children.

"Welcome friends—

With salt in our eyes

We welcome you."

Underground writers quote Talleyrand's words to Napoleon: "You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them."

The writers also refer to an old Czech saying: "After three days a guest and a fish begin to smell."

With most of the tanks removed, Prague looks normal again. During the day there is business as usual and there are traffic jams in the streets.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1968]
**ELEVEN CZECH WRITERS REPORTED SEIZED—
 PEN IS INFORMED DISGUISED SOVIET AGENTS
 ARE BEATING AND ARRESTING AUTHORS**

(By Henry Raymond)

The American chapter of P.E.N., the world association of writers, said last night it had received word that Soviet intelligence agents in Czechoslovakia, disguised as ambulance attendants, were secretly rounding up writers and journalists.

The report was received by Robert Halsband, president of the American center, in a cablegram from the association's international headquarters in London. Mr. Halsband said the cablegram was based on information given by "a reliable source," a writer who had just arrived from Prague.

The cablegram said that at least 11 Czech writers, including Ladislav Mnacko, the novelist, and Prof. Adolf Hoffmeister, president of the Czech center of P.E.N., had been beaten unconscious by Soviet secret "agents disguised as ambulance attendants" before they were driven to an undisclosed destination.

NOVEL SATIRIZED LEADERS

The cablegram asserted that ambulances were used for the arrests to "divert attention of Czechoslovak citizens and police." The following writers and newspapermen were listed as having been seized:

Professor Hoffmeister, Mr. Mnacko, Bohumil, Hrabal, Karel Kosk, Alexander Kliment, Vaclav Have, Ludvik Vaculik, Milan Uhde, Jiri Kolar, A. J. Liehm and Vladimir Blazek.

The report was the first indication of Mr. Mnacko's fate following the invasion Aug. 21. The stocky, 49-year-old former journalist fled Czechoslovakia last year in a protest against Prague's pro-Arab policies, but he returned some months ago to participate in the liberalization movement of Alexander Dubcek, First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. He is best known in the West for his novel "The Taste of Power," a satire on the Communist party leadership that was published here earlier this year by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc.

The cablegram, signed by David Carver, the international secretary of P.E.N.—the initials stand for Poets, Essayists and Novelists—jolted American members of the association who had hoped conditions in Czechoslovakia would ease following the talks in Moscow last weekend.

"This is shocking news," said Arthur Miller, the playwright and president of the international P.E.N. Club.

Reached at his home in Connecticut, Mr. Miller said he would begin "right away" to gather signatures from American writers and poets for an appeal to the Soviet Government and the Union of Soviet Writers on behalf of their Czechoslovak colleagues.

PROTEST SENT TO PODGORNÝ

Mr. Carver's communication arrived shortly after Mr. Halsband and Mr. Miller had sent a routine protest to President Nikolai V. Podgorný appealing for the release of Czechoslovak writers arrested during the Soviet occupation. They said the information about the arrests was based on newspaper reports and had not been independently confirmed.

Several hours after receiving the report of the new arrests, Mr. Halsband and Mr. Miller sent two more protests, one to the president of the Soviet Writer's Union and another to the Ministry of Interior in Prague.

The message to President Podgorný was made public by Mr. Halsband early yesterday afternoon, a few hours before he received Mr. Carver's cable. The message said:

"P.E.N.'s American Center joins with International P.E.N. in urging release of Czech and Slovak writers reported held following occupation of Czechoslovakia. We ask this in a spirit of deep concern and hopefulness on behalf of the world community of letters."

Mr. Halsband, a professor of English literature at Columbia University, acknowledged that the association had been asked by several Czech writers to delay their protest, contending that it might further harden the Soviet attitude.

"We waited for almost a week, until we became convinced that the situation was not improving," he said.

APPEAL TO SOVIET WRITERS

The appeal to the Soviet writers said:

"As fellow writers, the American Center of P.E.N. urges you to exert your influence to protect writers in Prague from reported arrests. We make this appeal in the name of the world community of letters.

Mr. Miller said that, while his first protest to President Podgorný was based on rumors, "we now have concrete information just out of Czechoslovakia of a real wave of repression."

The author, who returned yesterday morning from Chicago, where he attended the Democratic National Convention as a delegate from Connecticut, said that he would probably have a new petition ready over the weekend.

Mr. Miller predicted that the Czechoslovak crisis would become a central issue at the annual meeting of P.E.N.'s executive committee, which opens in Geneva Oct. 6. The meeting is scheduled to be attended by at least a dozen from Eastern Europe.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 2, 1968]

SEVEN DAYS OF INTERVENTION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA—ENTRY BY SOVIET-LED ARMIES STIRRED RISE OF WIDE RESISTANCE

(NOTE.—The following reconstruction of events in the first seven days of the occupation of Czechoslovakia was prepared by Tad Szulc and Clyde H. Farnsworth, New York Times correspondents in Prague.)

PRAGUE, September 1.—A Soviet MIG-21 jet fighter screeched over the roofs of sleeping Prague a few minutes after 1 o'clock on the morning of Wednesday, Aug. 21. As it landed at Ruzyně International Airport, its wing companion flew on a direct approach to the airport.

There was silence for a few minutes, and then the first Antonov-12 four-engine turbo-prop transport pierced the clear night sky over this city, its green and red running lights blinking against the darkness on its descent to Ruzyně.

Within a minute another heavy AN-12 followed from the east. Then, the roar over the capital was unabating as, at 50-second intervals, transport planes touched down at Prague Airport, disgorging crimson-bereted Soviet airborne troopers.

Two hours earlier, a column of Soviet T-55 tanks had crossed the Czechoslovak frontier from East Germany at Cinovec, a quiet village, 60 miles northwest of Prague, and now its forward elements were nearing the residential suburb of Kobylisy. Young Soviet tankmen in black leather headgear peered out of their turrets, their hands on their 50-caliber machine guns.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia had begun. At 1:50 A.M., the city was told in a Prague radio broadcast, delivered in quiet tones:

"Last night, Aug. 21, about 11 P.M., the armies of the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Bulgarian People's Republic crossed the national frontiers of Czechoslovakia without the knowledge of the President of the Republic, the National Assembly, the Government, the First Secretary of the Communist party or any of their bodies."

Then the radio station went off the air. The airlift was the biggest ever carried out by the Soviet Union outside its frontiers. Within the first seven hours, 250 aircraft put down here a full airborne division complete with small armored vehicles, fuel and supplies.

Along with the Soviet, East German, Polish, Hungarian and Bulgarian columns entering Czechoslovakia through 18 crossing points from the north, northwest, south and east, this airlift formed the vanguard of what in days to come was a massive invading army reported to number 650,000 men equipped with the most modern and sophisticated weapons in the Soviet military catalogue.

Prague alone was filled and ringed with 100,000 troops and 2,000 tanks, while, at the Kremlin in the evening of Tuesday, Aug. 27, Czechoslovak leaders were being forced into signing an agreement giving Moscow total control over the destiny of this republic of 14 million people.

The events of the intervening seven days ranged from the drama of the early street battles in Prague and other Czechoslovak cities between Soviet tanks and youths armed with sticks and Molotov cocktails to the poignant tragedy of the secret Moscow negotiations with the Czechoslovak leaders freshly released from Soviet captivity.

RECONSTRUCTION OF 7 DAYS

This article is a reconstruction of the seven days based on the accounts of the Czechoslovak clandestine radio network formed after the invasion, the testimony of participants, information supplied by Communist sources and direct observations by correspondents of The New York Times.

As the Soviet columns rolled through Prague's darkened streets at dawn on Aug. 21 and as dozens of cars careened throughout the city with honking horns to summon the citizens to a protest meeting at the Old Town Square, 20 men were gathered in a four-story domed and marble-pillared building on the right bank of the Vitava River, which flows through Prague.

They were the 11 full members of the ruling Presidium of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist party, its three alternates and the party secretaries, and they had been meeting continuously since 2 o'clock in the afternoon to try to deal with the situation.

The meeting had been called by Alexander Dubcek, the First Secretary of the party, the man who personified Czechoslovakia's democratization effort begun last January and defiance of Moscow's orthodoxy.

DECEPTIVE MILDNESS

Mr. Dubcek, a deceptively mild-looking but tough man of 47, had called the session to debate a letter he had received the day before from Leonid I. Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist party berating him for allegedly failing to honor agreements made at the confrontations in early August between the Czechoslovaks and their Soviet-led critics at Cierna and Bratislava.

These confrontations left the public impression that the Warsaw Pact nations had grudgingly accepted Czechoslovakia's democratization with some minimal restraints.

At the Presidium meeting, held in a small conference room with modern decor and heavy armchairs, the Dubcek liberals clashed with the pro-Moscow conservative members.

The principal battle was over a 13-page report on the internal situation in Czechoslovakia, prepared by Drahomir Kolder, a Presidium member, and Alois Indra, a party secretary. These two conservatives sought approval for their report, which in effect constituted acceptance of Soviet demands for eradication of the democratizing experiment.

Mr. Kolder and Mr. Indra suggested, in fact, that the Presidium lay aside the Bratislava agreement and reconsider instead the so-called Warsaw Letter sent by the Soviet Union and its four allies in mid-July and calling for a virtual political surrender.

EVENLY DIVIDED

The Czechoslovak party leadership was fairly evenly split between liberals and con-

servatives, but the moderates complicated the situation by their uncertainty. At one point, for example, Frantisek Barbirek, a Slovak member of the Presidium, deliberately absented himself for a prolonged period to avoid participating in several inconclusive votes.

Premier Oldrich Cernik, one of Mr. Dubcek's closest associates, called the Kolder-Indra proposal a "betrayal" of the Bratislava accords. Frantisek Kriegel, another liberal member of the Presidium, said the proposal should be withdrawn because it "negates Cierna and Bratislava."

Vasil Bilak, then the Slovak party leader and a member of the national Presidium, took the side of Mr. Kolder and Mr. Indra. Antonin Kappek, an alternate Presidium member and head of the large C.K.D. machinery plant in Prague, also lined up with the conservatives.

The atmosphere in the room was reaching an explosive point when Premier Cernik went out to an adjoining office to make one of his periodic phone calls to Col. Gen. Martin Dzur, the Defense Minister.

SOVIET AIRLINERS LAND

Reports had been reaching the Presidium all day of Soviet troop movements along Czechoslovak frontiers. A Moscow report in mid-afternoon spoke of an urgent session of the Soviet party's Central Committee. Mr. Cernik knew that at 10 P.M. an unscheduled Soviet Aeroflot airliner had landed at Ruzyně Airport.

This was the first thing to alarm him. The plane, he had been told, did not unload passengers but simply sat in the darkness on a taxiway. At 11 P.M., Mr. Cernik was informed that another unscheduled Aeroflot flight had arrived from Lvov in the Soviet Ukraine.

A group of unidentified civilians left the airport and rushed to the city. Later it developed that they had gone to the Soviet Embassy, in the tree-shaded Bubeneč district of Prague, which was to be the command post for the invasion.

The first Aeroflot plane, as Mr. Cernik and his friends discovered later, was a mobile air-traffic control post brought to Ruzyně to direct the airlift.

PRESIDIUM GETS NEWS

When Mr. Cernik returned to the meeting at 11:40 P.M. having spoken again with Defense Minister Dzur, he was pale. He whispered a few words to Mr. Dubcek. Visibly shaken, Mr. Dubcek rose and announced to the group:

"The armies of five countries have crossed the frontiers of our republic and are occupying us."

Commotion broke out in the room, and Mr. Dubcek tried to restore order.

"It is a tragedy," he said, his voice cracking. "I did not expect this to happen. I had no suspicion, not even the slightest hint that such a step could be taken against us."

The men were excited, talking, shouting, gesticulating. Some of them left the room to make telephone calls, then returned.

Tears were streaming down Mr. Dubcek's face. He said: "I have devoted my entire life to cooperation with the Soviet Union, and they have done this to me. It is my personal tragedy."

CONSERVATIVES NOT UPSET

An official who attended the meeting said later that the conservatives—Mr. Indra, Mr. Kolder, Mr. Bilak and Oldrich Svestka, a Presidium member and editor of the party newspaper Rude Pravo—"did not seem terribly upset or even surprised." They soon left the building.

Mr. Dubcek telephoned President Ludvik Svoboda at Hradcany Castle, and the two men discussed the situation. Then Mr. Dubcek and Premier Cernik drafted a proclamation to the nation that the Prague radio began to broadcast at 1:50 A.M.

After having stated that the invasion had

taken place without the knowledge of the Czechoslovak authorities, the proclamation urged Czechoslovaks to remain calm and not to resist. The armed forces were given the same order.

The first elements of the Soviet airborne division had already secured the airport and were moving into the city.

Premier Cernik left for the one-story building housing the Straca Military Academy across the Vitava River from the Central Committee to preside over an emergency session of his Cabinet. Mr. Dubcek and his liberal colleagues remained in the Central Committee building to await developments.

LEADERS ARE SEIZED

These developments came quickly. At 3 A.M., as the capital was wide awake and stunned, Soviet armored personnel carriers and armored scout cars drew up at the Military Academy. Airborne troopers, their sub-machine guns at the ready, surrounded the building.

A detachment burst into the academy and arrested Mr. Cernik and the ministers with him. Soldiers tore up the telephone switchboard. At gunpoint, one witness said, they forced some of the ministers to give up their wristwatches. Mr. Cernik was led to an armored car and driven away.

Shortly after 4 A.M., airborne units and some of the tanks that had advanced from the East German border surrounded the Central Committee building. A few minutes later, three armored cars led by a black Soviet made Volga automobile arrived.

Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Kriegel, Josef Smrkovsky, the President of the National Assembly; Cestmir Cisar, a party secretary, and Vaclav Slavik, a member of the secretariat, were around a table discussing their next moves. They were the hard core of the party liberals.

A squad of Soviet soldiers and several civilians rushed into the meeting. They grabbed Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Kriegel and Mr. Smrkovsky and led them to one of the armored cars. Mr. Cisar was taken out separately. Somehow Mr. Slavik escaped detention.

The armored car with Mr. Cisar went to central police headquarters at Bartolomejska Street in midtown and he was placed in a cell. The vehicle carrying Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Smrkovsky and Mr. Kriegel drove to the airport. Premier Cernik was already there under guard.

The four men were led to a Soviet transport plane, pushed with rifle butts. The plane took off immediately, and one hour later it landed at Try Duby military airport in Slovakia. The four men were driven to a barn outside the nearby spa of Sliac and kept there under guard. They were treated harshly and insulted. As Premier Cernik was to tell the Cabinet later, "I feared for my life and that of my comrades."

As the news of the invasion spread in Prague by the clanking of the tanks, the roar of the troop transports and telephone calls from neighbors and friends, young workers and students rushed to the Prague radio building on Vinohradská Street to erect barricades.

So long as the radio continued broadcasting, the young people felt, the world would know what was happening. It was a race against time. The Russians had already achieved their first objectives by neutralizing the centers of the government. Later in the morning, they would surround Hradcany Castle and place the President under virtual house arrest.

Buses, trucks and the street cars were commandeered by the youths to try to block the progress of the tanks from the nearby National Museum toward the radio building.

As dawn broke, thousands of youngsters poured into Wenceslas Square just below the National Museum and moved toward Vinohradská to man the barricades. They hurled

rocks at the tanks and waved the Czechoslovak flag while screaming defiance at the Russians, who were nervously manning their machine guns.

SHOOTING BREAKS OUT

Most of the Russians were puzzled by the reaction. They had been told that they had been invited to help crush a counterrevolution and they expected to be welcomed.

Tanks slipped through the barricades and fires ranged in the twisted wreckage of overturned buses and trams. By 7:25 A.M. the radio building was surrounded by infantry soldiers, and tanks were rampaging trying to scatter the crowds.

The first blood was spilled shortly after 7 A.M., when a tense Bulgarian tankman fired his machine-gun, first, above and, then, directly into people on the sidewalks. Two unarmed Czechoslovak soldiers and a woman were killed.

The radio station went off the air at 7:21 A.M. after a woman had announced in an emotion-choked voice: "This is the end."

There were a few bars of Smetana's "Vitava Suite," and then the Czechoslovak national anthem, and finally silence. But an hour later, the radio came surprisingly back on the air, demanding the departure of the invaders and calling for a national protest strike and for blood donors for the wounded.

"DO YOU WORK HERE?"

The Soviet forces seemed to lack instructions on how to proceed.

At the television station on Maxim Gorky Square, a Russian army captain named Orlov jumped down from his armored squad car and pounded on the door. After several minutes the nightwatchman appeared. Captain Orlov told him:

"Step out of the way, we are going to occupy the television station."

"Do you work here?" asked the elderly watchman.

"No," the stunned captain replied.

"Then you can't come in," said the watchman, slamming the door in the captain's face. The nonplussed captain had to radio his command headquarters for further instructions.

The troops outside the radio building also did not seem quite sure what their mission was.

Tanks raced up and down the streets like charging bulls, while young men rushed out from the sidewalks with flaming gasoline-soaked rags trying to ignite the tanks' fuel stores. Five were set afire and one had to be abandoned. While the attacks went on, other tanks stood idle on the streets, their engines off, with crews quietly watching the show.

At 11 A.M. the troops surrounding the radio building finally got their orders to move inside and stop the broadcasting. The station went off the air, only to be replaced within a half hour by the first underground transmitter of the clandestine network.

The network, coordinating 15 stations around the country, not only provided news about the occupation, but became the chief rallying point for the developing passive resistance.

ADVANCE PLANNING

The planning behind it was the work of Jiri Pelikan, the articulate, bushy-haired, 42-year-old director of the state television. Weeks earlier he and his associates had devised a contingency plan. This advance planning and the services of professionals who went underground accounted for the high standards of the clandestine network.

The Russians tried to locate the stations but were slow in getting direction-finding gear to Prague. The radio itself was instrumental in delaying a train carrying the needed detection equipment. At Ceska Prevoza, a rail junction 80 miles east of the capital, Czechoslovak railroad workers refused to man a train after having been alerted by the radio. For hours the train was left to sit in the yard.

FACTOR IN PROPAGANDA WAR

The clandestine network was a major element of the psychological warfare that was developing between the resistance leaders and the occupiers. Unable to stop the transmissions, the Russians began to seize portable radios from listeners in public places.

One of the memorable posters pasted up after the invasion portrayed Russian tank men as Arab merchants with displays of transistors on carpets laid out in the streets.

The Russians, in attempt to make themselves heard by the population, set up their own station, Radio Vitava, but hardly anyone listened to its announcements, delivered with a foreign accent.

The clandestine radio urged citizens to engage the Russian soldiers in discussion to try to convince them that there was no counterrevolution in the country. Hundreds of people sought out the tank crews, infantrymen and paratroopers and asked the basic question: "Why have you come here?"

Most Czechoslovaks speak Russian, which has been a compulsory foreign language in school since the Communist take-over in 1948.

Most of the discussions were friendly enough. However, the Czechs found that many of the young Russian soldiers knew little about the outside world. The reply to the basic question was usually "we follow orders."

Some of the Russians held up what they said were unfired weapons to show that they had not been among those who had taken blood or scarred buildings.

One sensitive noncommissioned officer said he wished he could doff his uniform and merge with the crowd.

On the second day of the occupation, the radio advised the people to ignore the Russians. Though discussions continued, the groups were smaller.

But on Friday a general strike emptied the streets, leaving Soviet troops isolated, surrounded by almost total silence, for an hour. Not knowing what to expect, many fired indiscriminately into the air.

ROAD SIGNS OBSCURED

The clandestine radio also promoted what was perhaps the cleverest of the passive resistance measures—the obscuring of street signs and house numbers to confuse the occupying troops.

People put up spurious detour signs to delay additional tank columns coming from Poland. In the streets of Prague, signs went up showing Soviet troops the shortest way home, "Moscow—1,500 kilometers."

The radio campaign was supplemented by underground newspapers, printed on flatbed presses in secret basement plants and distributed by factory workers. The papers bore the names of many of the newspapers closed by the occupying troops.

Young men in cars and trucks drove swiftly through the city center, dropping off bundles of newspapers and leaflets. Crowds surged on the sidewalks to gather them up.

The Russians countered by dropping some of their own leaflets from helicopters and having the troops distribute the Moscow newspaper Pravda. A Czechoslovak who accepted these publications often found them snatched from his hands and was accused of collaborating.

Like the clandestine radio network, the equestrian monument to St. Wenceslas in Wenceslas Square became a symbol of resistance.

Youths gathered there to make speeches denouncing the occupation. Despite a curfew, youths manned the monument 24 hours a day and defied Russians who tried to disperse them by shooting over their heads.

POLITICAL MOVE THWARTED

On Thursday, Aug. 23, as the defiance mounted in the streets and gunfire echoed

through the city, the Soviet Union turned to the political aspects of the occupation.

Moscow had evidently expected to form a government under President Svoboda—to assure constitutional continuity—and to reorganize party leadership with trusted men.

Two steps were promptly taken by ambassador Stepan V. Chervonenko, the political chief of the invasion, and by Gen. Ivan G. Pavlovsky, a Soviet Defense Minister and commander of the invasion forces.

After reported consultations with the Russians, Jan Piller, a conservative Presidium member, called on President Svoboda at Hradcany Castle to present him with a list of a "worker and peasant" government with the request that he remain as chief of state.

President Svoboda, an army general, a convinced Communist and a Hero of the Soviet Union, refused. He said he would discuss nothing until the Czechoslovak leaders had been released. A message from Ambassador Chervonenko also failed to budge the President.

TROIKA IS SHORT-LIVED

Overnight Wednesday the Czechoslovak conservatives had met with Mr. Chervonenko and other Soviet officials at the Praha Hotel, which is used by the Central Committee. The Soviet group was disappointed by the small turnout and by the reluctance of the Czechoslovaks to join the leadership that the Russians proposed to establish.

After hours of deliberation it developed that only Mr. Bilak, Mr. Koldar and Mr. Indra were prepared to go on the new Presidium. To complicate matters, these three party officials apparently were unable to agree among themselves as to who would serve as First Secretary. The decision was made for the three to serve jointly as party leaders.

The announcement of the troika was greeted with public derision, and it vanished from sight almost as soon as it had been invented. The Soviet political maneuver had failed.

THE SECRET CONGRESS

In a countermove by the Czechoslovak liberals, hundreds of delegates began streaming secretly during the night to the huge C.K.D. plant in Prague to hold the extraordinary 14th congress of the party.

The congress had been originally scheduled for Sept. 9, and the delegates were elected during the summer. Most of them were pro-Dubcek and it was taken for granted that the new Central Committee and Presidium to be elected by the congress would be overwhelmingly liberal.

The delegates were informed by the clandestine radio that the congress would be held Thursday morning at the C.K.D. plant. The organizers assumed correctly that inasmuch as the radio was publicly announcing that the plant would be the site of the congress, the Russians would conclude it was being held elsewhere. This tactic worked.

The delegates were introduced into the plant disguised as workers. The plant's armed people's militia, traditionally supporters of the conservatives, stood guard.

The underground congress elected a liberal 160-man Central Committee, which in turn chose its 27-man Presidium. Mr. Dubcek was reelected First Secretary, but in his absence Venek Silhan, an economics professor, was chosen to act in his place.

At this stage, Mr. Dubcek and his colleagues were being moved from Sliac to Lvov, in the Soviet Ukraine, with a stop at Transcarpathian town of Mukachevo. They had not been permitted to change clothes; they were inadequately fed, and were exposed to insults and maltreatment.

SVOBODA FILIES TO MOSCOW

On Friday, Aug. 23, President Svoboda suddenly flew to Moscow following a 7 A.M. meeting in Hradcany Castle with Ambassador Chervonenko. Mr. Svoboda said in a brief statement that he was going to the Kremlin

to seek a resolution of the crisis and that he would return the same evening.

Flying on the same plane were Mr. Indra and Mr. Bilak, but Czechoslovak Government spokesmen made it clear that they were not members of the Svoboda delegation. Among those actually accompanying the President were Deputy Premier Gustav Husak, a Slovak and a friend of Mr. Dubcek, and Defense Minister Dzur.

President Svoboda was received in Moscow with honors usually accorded a chief of state, but his Soviet hosts soon realized that he was in no mood for compromise. He made it clear from the outset that he would not undertake to negotiate until Mr. Dubcek and his colleagues were freed and invited to participate in the talks.

On Saturday Mr. Dubcek and the three other imprisoned liberal leaders were flown from Lvov to Moscow and driven to the Kremlin.

INTERNED AIDES HAGGARD

They were a haggard, mentally and physically exhausted group, but it was a victory for the Czechoslovaks to have won their freedom. President Svoboda sent a message to the nation that, in view of the arrival of the four men, he was remaining at least another day for additional talks.

In Prague, this news evoked the first moment of optimism since the invasion. But the Russians countered by sending additional forces to the capital. Soviet strength there rose from 35,000 men on Wednesday to 50,000 on Friday and 90,000 on Sunday as the talks dragged on.

Mr. Smrkovsky, the President of the National Assembly, was not exaggerating when he said later that the Czechoslovaks had negotiated "in the shadow of tanks and planes."

The pressure was so immense that on Monday, Aug. 26, Mr. Svoboda, Mr. Dubcek and the others agreed to sign the agreement. A communiqué gave no real indications of the substance of the accord.

CZECH LEADERS RETURN

At 5:20 A.M. Tuesday, President Svoboda and the others landed at Ruzyně Airport. By that time many of the tanks had disappeared from large parts of the city center and were assembled in parks and side streets. Trolleys and buses were running on normal schedules.

People seemed to be breathing a little easier and everyone seemed to be returning to work. At Hradcany Castle, a Czechoslovak honor guard once again took up its post and the presidential flag flew from the castle staff.

Under the Moscow accord, the Russians agreed to a gradual troop withdrawal in return for a renewal of press censorship, the disbanding of non-Communist political groups, the gradual removal of liberals from office and increasing Soviet control over administration. In addition, two Soviet divisions are to be permanently stationed along the border with West Germany.

It was a high price to pay to get the tanks out of Prague but the Czechoslovaks had evidently little choice but to pay it. Mr. Svoboda, Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Smrkovsky and the others made this clear in radio speeches last week.

The invasion, said Mr. Smrkovsky, was "a tragedy of small nations placed in the center of our continent."

BERLINERS DEMONSTRATE DURING "DAY OF GERMANS"

BERLIN, September 1.—Rightists and leftists demonstrated today at the annual "Day of the Germans" sponsored by refugee groups in West Berlin. The police kept the opposing groups apart and there were no serious incidents.

About 30 rightist youths showed up to cheer the appearance or representatives of the right-wing National Democratic party who

attended under a general invitation to all West German state legislatures.

The presence of the controversial rightists, plus rain, kept attendance to about 5,000 in an outdoor stadium seating 25,000.

Speakers emphasized German solidarity with the beleaguered Czechoslovak people. Mayor Klaus Schütz attacked East Germany, which joined the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia, saying the East Germans had forfeited every right to talk about the rights of peoples.

PRAVDA CRITICIZES A CZECH WEEKLY—ASKS FOR CLOSING OF LIBERAL WRITERS' PUBLICATION
(By Henry Kamm)

Moscow, September 1.—Pravda, the newspaper of the Communist party, complained today that the Czechoslovak press was slow to adapt itself to renewed censorship.

Pravda centered its attack on one of the most liberal of Czechoslovak publications, Literarni Listy, the weekly of the writers' union. Literarni Listy has been published clandestinely since the occupation and has not lost the sarcastic sting that made it a favorite of the intellectuals and youth.

The Soviet party organ characterized the underground weekly as a "wasps' nest" that "continues to exist somewhere in a backyard and continues to play its abject role as one of the main ideological centers of counter-revolution."

"Every sensible person understands, however, that such a game cannot continue," Pravda declared. "The counterrevolutionary forces must be and will be bridled."

EDITOR IS CRITICIZED

Jan Prochazka, a member of the weekly's editorial board, was singled out in Pravda for having "concocted an article containing revolting and mean slander of the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement" in last Wednesday's issue.

Literarni Listy has a history of suppression. Its current editors were responsible for the former weekly of the writers' union, Literarni Noviny, which was banned last summer by the regime of Antonin Novotny. Some of its editors, including A. J. Liehm and Ludvik Vaculik, were punished by or suspended from the party and not restored until after the start of the liberalization earlier this year.

Literarni Listy rose to a circulation of 300,000 in a country of 14.5 million and became a forum of liberal ideas. It maintained its political position in ironic language and savage cartoons. Its success was so great that before the invasion there were plans for English and German-language editions.

POLES ASSAIL WRITERS

(By Jonathan Randal)

WARSAW, September 1.—The state-controlled Polish television stepped up a resurgent "anti-Zionist" campaign today, charging "Zionists" with responsibility for the "counter-revolution" in Czechoslovakia.

Branding some of the Czechoslovak liberal writers as Zionists, the Prague correspondent of Polish television linked them with Czechoslovak criticism this spring of what has been officially admitted was an anti-Semitic witch-hunt in Poland.

The television man denounced Eduard Goldstuecker, the president of the Czechoslovak writers union; Ladislav Mnacko and Pavel Kohout, novelists, and Arnold Lustig and Jan Prochazka of the weekly literary Listy. [Mr. Lustig arrived in Israel on Sunday as an immigrant, the Associated Press reported from Haifa.]

"The Zionist forces were the most active of those who attacked Poland in March and allowed themselves in an atmosphere of intolerance and anti-Communism to designate the future Communist leaders of Czechoslovakia," the Polish correspondent Czeslaw Berenda said.

He said that many of these writers "do not share these difficult days with the citizens of Prague" and had fled to the West.

Defense Minister Wojciech Jaruzelski praised Polish occupation troops, believed to number 45,000 men, for fulfilling their "patriotic and internationalist duties."

Polish correspondents accused "counter-revolutionaries" of seeking to pit one occupying army against another by praising Polish troops as "cultured and chivalrous" and depicting the Soviet troops as "brutal and hostile."

Zygmunt Broniarek, writing in the party newspaper, Trybuna Ludu, said a Czechoslovak Army officer had denied that his country was heading toward counter-revolution or was about to leave the Warsaw Pact. These were among avowed reasons for the Soviet-led intervention.

Another correspondent denied rumors that Polish troops were going hungry and that an epidemic was raging in their ranks.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 3, 1968]

PRAVDA CAUTIONS CZECHS ON TRADE—ASSERTS ONLY "IGNORAMUSES" SEEK TIES WITH WEST

(By Raymond H. Anderson)

Moscow, September 2.—Pravda declared today that only a "pitiful handful of political ignoramuses" in Prague were interested in reorienting Czechoslovakia's trade toward the West and soliciting hard-currency credits.

A long article in the Soviet Communist party paper stressed that it was advantageous for Czechoslovakia to trade primarily with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

Shortly after Prague's reform program was undertaken last winter, leading economic officials began to speak of the urgency of obtaining up to \$500-million in credits to modernize the Czechoslovak industry.

The possibility of the Soviet Government's supplying the hard-currency credit was raised during visits here by Czechoslovak leaders, but Moscow held back, apparently hoping to use the prospect of a loan to influence the Czechoslovaks to restrain their reforms.

Damage to Czechoslovakia's economy from the turmoil in the wake of invasion by troops of the Soviet Union and four Communist allies seems to have made foreign credit more urgent than ever. The Czechoslovaks have said that they expect to discuss the question of reparations with the Soviet Union.

OBLIGATION IS SEEN

Pravda emphasized that all Communist countries had an obligation to strengthen their bonds of political and economic cooperation "for the sake of the victory of our common goal."

The paper complained that some Czechoslovaks had joined a critical chorus against Comecon, the Soviet bloc's economy community, and it rejected protests that trade within the group was "one-sided, to the advantage of the Soviet Union."

Raw-material imports by Czechoslovakia from the Soviet Union, Pravda declared, have been at prices favorable to Czechoslovaks.

The Soviet Union, the paper continued, supplies 99.5 per cent of Czechoslovakia's needs in crude oil at a price of 273 crowns (about \$40) a ton delivered to refineries. It quoted Rude Pravo, the Czechoslovak party paper, as having estimated that oil imported from Iran, for example, would cost the Czechoslovaks 408 crowns (\$60) a ton.

OTHER IMPORTS LISTED

The paper said that the Soviet Union supplied the bulk of Czechoslovakia's other raw-material imports, including 83.6 per cent of the iron ore and 53.3 per cent of other metals, 53.8 per cent of the cotton imports and most of the country's wheat imports.

Many of the Soviet Union's exports to Czechoslovakia, the article declared pointedly, are scarce materials that Moscow could sell in hard-currency markets.

In the other direction, the paper continued, Czechoslovakia's industry benefits greatly from the large market afforded by the Soviet Union for industrial products.

"True patriots" in Czechoslovakia understand the importance of maintaining and expanding economic ties with the Soviet Union, Pravda emphasized. It added:

"Only a pitiful handful of political ignoramuses dream about 'broadening the scope' for flirtation with imperialist monopolies, which seduce simpletons with their big moneybags, 'fat' credits, 'advantageous deals,' and similar lavish promises that lead directly to the yoke of dependence on foreign capital."

CZECHS' FALL CONFIRMS RED DOMINO FEARS

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Freedom has died in Czechoslovakia, not drowned in brave and youthful blood as it was in Hungary, but brutally strangled with cold, inhuman power and calculation, only a few weeks after the wretched Czechs began rejoicing over their new birth of freedom.

The best evidence now is that this shocking deed began to be planned from the moment the members of the Soviet Presidium discovered, at the Cierna meeting, that they could not break the will and unity of their Czech colleagues. If that is true, the soothing Cierna communique was mere dust thrown in the eyes of the Czechs and the rest of the world, to give the Soviet leaders time to decide on their next move.

Certainly, the Soviet armies never ceased to be concentrated along the Czech frontiers, but were instead augmented and also went through exercises obviously preparatory to invasion. Perhaps the men in the Kremlin hoped, for a while, that Dubcek and the others would draw the correct inference and would move preventively to destroy their country's new-won freedom with their own hands.

At any rate, the thing has happened. A civilized and ancient country, in the very center of Europe, is now to be held down by a foreign occupying army and to be ruled by open hirelings of its foreign masters.

What, one wonders, will be the reaction of those men of the left whose indignation waxes so hot when it is a question of Western or even American "imperialism"? What difference will these people find, between the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Adolf Hitler and the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Leonid Brezhnev and his jolly crew?

One can already hear the self-deluding explanations, that the Soviets have made a "great mistake" (such a splendid silver lining for the Czechs!) because of "the effect on world opinion" of this piece of calculated ruthlessness. The same damn fools said the same things about Hungary.

But by their own grim standards, the Soviets have made no mistake at all. They do not parrot twaddle about the "discredited domino theory" (which always makes one wonder just who discredited it). They knew that sooner or later the dominoes would begin tumbling in Eastern Europe if freedom was permitted to be reborn there. And they therefore moved against the Czechs as they had moved against the Hungarians.

Such are the cruel realities. The prime question is whether the smallest notice will be taken of these cruel realities in the left-wing academic and intellectual circles in this country. The left-wing academics and intellectuals have more and more wallowed in self-deception throughout the last seven years; and by their wallowings they have managed to deceive millions of other rather more sensible people.

Seven years is the time-frame, because that

is the period that has elapsed since the Cuban missile crisis. President John Kennedy did not refer scornfully to the "discredited domino theory." He believed in it, as he once publicly testified; and for that very reason he risked a thermonuclear confrontation to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba.

This great achievement led directly to the liquidation of the second Berlin crisis—that domino theory at work again! And these events produced what can only be called a widespread Dr. Pangloss-illusion. All was now supposed to be "for the best in this best of all possible worlds," as the good doctor kept telling poor Candide.

More specifically, the remorseless fangs of history were supposed to have been drawn. The cold war was supposed to be over. The Soviet Union was supposed to be rapidly evolving into the kind of peaceable, unmilitary, genially free society in which the left-wing academics and their chums, the liberal editorial writers, could give their egos runs in the yard with perfect impunity.

Well, who can believe this now? Brezhnev has demonstrated once again what everyone should have known all along—that the Soviets never hesitate to use military force if they think they do so with impunity; that they care not a snap of their fingers for "international morality" or "world opinion"; and that they will do anything they believe it is safe to do to serve their own hard interests.

Who can doubt, then, that they may one day support Arab genocide in Israel, which will give them the riches of the Middle East, if they begin to suspect that no one will interfere? And what can more rapidly nourish such Soviet suspicions than the kind of collapse of American resolve that Senators Eugene McCarthy, Ted Kennedy and others are now seeking to promote?

SOVIET UNION'S COUP DISPELS LIBERAL MYTH (By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The "Communist myth," so often brushed aside by "liberals" as imaginary, has all of a sudden become a reality. The argument of the "doves" that the Soviet Union and most of the Communist-bloc states in Eastern Europe constitute no threat to world peace and that they should be given trade benefits and other concessions by the United States has evaporated overnight.

The world is back again to where it was more than a decade ago when the Soviet armies crushed an uprising of the people of Hungary. Then, after having connived to weaken the NATO alliance in Europe, the Soviets proceeded to build up North Vietnam and finally to provoke Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam as a means of diverting American attention from Europe.

In virtually all free nations today a unanimous condemnation is being expressed against the Soviet Union for its invasion of Czechoslovakia and its attempts to suppress the few freedoms that have been allowed the people there. The hopes of the Czechs for a degree of independence from Soviet domination were abruptly shattered as the Soviet armies, aided by military forces of East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria and Poland—puppets of Moscow—crossed the Czech border. In the capital at Prague the leaders who had dared to institute reforms in the Communist system have been imprisoned.

President Johnson stated the case clearly when he said that "a defenseless country" has been invaded in order to "stamp out a resurgence of ordinary human freedom." He added:

"The excuses offered by the Soviet Union are patently contrived. The Czechoslovakian government did not request its allies to intervene in its internal affairs. No external aggression threatened Czechoslovakia. The action of the Warsaw Pact allies is in flat violation of the United Nations Charter."

There are, of course, in the United States

a few politically minded critics who immediately cried out that Russia is merely doing what the United States did in Vietnam. No parallel, however, exists because the South Vietnamese government formally requested the help of the United States after trying in vain to repel by itself the infiltration by the Communists from North Vietnam. The Moscow government makes no secret of the fact that within the last three years it has provided billions of dollars worth of munitions and supplies to the North Vietnamese to carry on the aggression against South Vietnam.

The case for American assistance to South Vietnam now will be strengthened before world opinion. It is clear that the Soviet government does not extend military or economic aid and then let go of its control over the smaller countries, but insists instead on dominating their governments and denying them a right to rule themselves. The United States has explicitly stated that its objective in South Vietnam is to assure the people there the right of self-determination and that, once this is accomplished, our troops will be withdrawn.

Since the Soviet Union has a veto in the Security Council of the United Nations, this leaves the question to be handled by the General Assembly of the U.N., which can adopt a resolution as it did in 1956 condemning the Soviet Union for "depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence." But it is doubtful that such a resolution will make any more impression today on Moscow than it did 12 years ago.

Meanwhile, the world has been awakened to the somber fact that military power exerted by the Soviets in defiance of the provisions of the United Nations Charter can at any moment break the peace on every continent. A stronger alliance of nations than the U.N. will have to be formed in order to be able to mobilize a military force of such strength as to command the respect of would-be aggressors.

The Soviet Union has not only made a big error in Czechoslovakia, but it has assumed that the United States is powerless to draw together the other nations of the world to thwart any further extension of Soviet imperialism. World opinion, however, can quickly be mobilized. For it now is evident that the policies of the present Moscow regime are no different from those which prevailed under Khrushchev or Stalin. The Communist drive for world domination still threatens the peace of mankind and makes a "detente" with the present leaders in the Kremlin a dangerous policy of acquiescence in Communist imperialism.

2. THE THREAT TO RUMANIA AND YUGOSLAVIA [From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1968] HUNGARY ACCUSES RUMANIA OF FOLLOWING THE IMPERIALISTS' LINE ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA—TWO NEWSPAPERS SCORE CEAUDESCU—BUCHAREST CROWDS OBSERVE NATIONAL HOLIDAY WEEKEND IN A CAREFREE MOOD (By Israel Shenker)

BUDAPEST, August 24.—The Hungarian press sharply assailed President Nicolae Ceausescu of Rumania today for his stand in the Czechoslovak crisis.

Having withheld attack yesterday in deference to the Rumania National Day, the controlled press here accused Mr. Ceausescu of parroting the imperialist line on Czechoslovakia.

Magyar Memzet found it "very strange" that on the part of high-ranking leaders of Rumania, "incomprehension in the highest degree and even wilful misinterpretation can be experienced."

The newspaper added: "There is a strange similarity between the tone and the content of Ceausescu's speech and the phrases repeated a hundred times a day by Western radio stations."

On Wednesday, Mr. Ceausescu called the

Soviet-led intervention in Czechoslovakia "a big mistake and a severe danger for peace in Europe and socialism in the world." He said that there was no justification for the occupation of Czechoslovakia and warned that "intervention into the internal affairs" of other Communist parties must end.

INDEPENDENT SPIRIT SHOWN

For several years Rumania has shown an increasing desire for independence from Soviet direction, but Mr. Ceausescu's views this week were unprecedentedly plainspoken. There was considerable speculation about how the Soviet Union would react to the Rumanian leader's utterances.

By degrees, Rumania has in fact managed a partial withdrawal from the hegemony of her powerful neighbor. The clearest and latest evidence was the failure of Bucharest to participate in the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Until now, the Hungarian Communist party—along with fraternal parties elsewhere in Eastern Europe—has refrained from attacking Rumania.

With the wraps now off, the Budapest newspaper *Esti Hirlap*, organ of the Budapest Communist Party Committee, joined the fray. It, too, attacked Mr. Ceausescu by name—and said Rumania should remember that the Soviet Union liberated it from the Germans in World War II.

SOVIET DENOUNCES CEAUDESCU

MOSCOW, August 24.—The Soviet Government newspaper *Izvestia* denounced President Ceausescu today for aiding the Czechoslovak "counter-revolution" through his speeches.

As an example of Mr. Ceausescu's alleged help to counter-revolutionaries, *Izvestia* cited his statement that "no one can act as an advisor or mentor on how and in what way socialism should be built."

Izvestia, in an article by Vladimir Kudryavtsev, said that the thesis that each country chooses its own path to socialism was correct, but was being abused.

"Certain people so ignore the principles that are common to all socialist countries that they contribute to the Czechoslovak counter-revolution in its desire to break Czechoslovakia away from the socialist commonwealth, *Izvestia* said.

RUMANIANS ENJOY HOLIDAY

(By John M. Lee)

BUCHAREST, August 24.—Despite continuing anxiety over Czechoslovakia and possible repercussions for Rumania, Bucharest settled back today to enjoy a warm, sunny holiday weekend.

Seemingly carefree crowds in sports clothes swarmed through the lush Cismigiu Gardens in the downtown area, packed the sidewalk cafes and outdoor restaurants and strolled down the broad tree-lined Margheru Boulevard, the Champs-Elysées of Bucharest.

There were long lines for Italian movies and for a Tarzan picture so old that it starred Johnny Weismuller. The only uniforms in evidence were on traffic policemen and guards at Government buildings.

Yet, transistor radios brought newscasts to restaurant tables, and small crowds gathered to hear the latest bulletins. Almost every other person seemed to have a morning newspaper, turned to Czechoslovak developments.

PEOPLE TALK READILY

Rumanians talked readily to visitors and condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. "It is an impossible situation," said a young woman student. "How do the Russians think they can do this?"

How did she think Rumania had escaped a similar repression?

"Perhaps we are better diplomats," she smiled.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1968]
TITO SEES AIDES AS CONCERN OVER SOVIET GROWS—BELGRADE BELIEVED FEARFUL OF A SURGE IN NEO-STALINISM—BUT APPREHENSION OVER PERIL OF INVASION SEEMS EASED
 (By Paul Hofmann)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, August 28—President Tito reviewed the Czechoslovak situation with aides today amid apparently deepening concern within the Yugoslav regime over what it fears is a surge of Neo-Stalinism in the Soviet Union.

An official announcement said today that Marshal Tito had conferred with Trpe Javoklevski, the Yugoslav Ambassador in Prague, on the northern Adriatic Island of Brioni. The announcement conveyed to the public the information that the President was back in his summer residence after five days in and near Belgrade, and that he was still concerned about Czechoslovakia.

Many Yugoslavs saw Marshal Tito's return to Brioni as a sign that a crisis that they felt had menaced their country as well as Czechoslovakia had passed.

The President came to Belgrade from Brioni last week and warned in a speech Friday that Yugoslavia would fight against any threat to her independence. The clear implication was that Soviet political or military pressure might present such a threat.

REGIME SILENT ON ACCORD

Though many Yugoslav Army specialists who were recalled to active service over the weekend are still with their units, the feeling today was that if there ever had been a Soviet threat to attack Yugoslavia it had receded.

Government spokesmen would not comment on the agreement reached in Moscow to settle the dispute between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. "There isn't even a Czechoslovak reaction yet," one official said.

Newspapers were cautious and skeptical on whether the Moscow agreement would work.

Borba, a Belgrade newspaper close to the Communist party apparatus, said that "time and practice" alone would tell the value of the accord.

Vecernje Novosti, the afternoon edition of Borba, said that socialism had in the past paid much too high a price to agree to return into Stalin's "pen of obedient sheep."

Anxiety here over a possible resurgence of Stalinism in the Soviet Communist party is caused by concern that Moscow may again tend to regard Yugoslavia as a part of the Soviet sphere of influence. This is a concept that led to the break between Stalin and Marshal Tito in 1948.

The Yugoslav Communist party is engaged in a nationwide campaign to remind its members and the people at large that the Yugoslav system is different from that of Soviet-bloc Communism, not only in its rejection of the Czechoslovak invasion but also in its social and economic institutions at home.

In the hundreds of local meetings that the Communist party is organizing these days, expressions of sympathy for Czechoslovakia are coupled with the praise for Yugoslavia's own "road toward socialism."

Self-management—the participation of Yugoslav workers in the managerial decisions affecting their plant or enterprises—is being hailed as the cornerstone of the Yugoslav system and as an example that the Czechoslovak reformers intend to follow.

RUMANIANS HEAR OF DEMAND

(Special to the New York Times)

BUCHAREST, August 28.—Rumors circulated in Bucharest today that the Soviet Union had commanded Rumania to allow Warsaw Pact military maneuvers on Rumanian territory. But Foreign Office officials said they had no information on such a demand.

Despite Rumania's strained relations with the Soviet Union, the Government has main-

tained nominal membership in the Warsaw Pact. However, Rumania has not participated in maneuvers under the treaty since 1962, and is generally inactive in Warsaw Pact affairs.

The new line of "continuing counterrevolution" is apparently designed to justify a lengthy stay of the Warsaw Pact occupation troops to "protect socialism" in Czechoslovakia. But for the young party member it only caused confusion.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 29, 1968]

RUMANIAN LEADERS BAR CZECH-TYPE LIBERALISM BUT VOW INDEPENDENCE—CITIZENS SAY THEY WOULD FIGHT RUSSIANS; NATION IS SEEKING CLOSE ECONOMIC TIES TO WEST
 (By Ray Vicker)

BUCHAREST.—Unlike Czechoslovakia, Rumania poses few threats to the Soviet Union on purely ideological grounds.

Indeed, the leaders in this East European capital are about as eager to stray from orthodox Communist doctrine by eliminating press censorship and police powers as are the men in the Kremlin.

Yet Rumania exercises its own brand of national independence, free of Soviet domination. It was this strain of independence—with the determination to maintain it—that led President Nicolae Ceausescu to support the Czech regime so vigorously that he placed Rumania's army on alert "to defend our Socialist homeland" against a similar invasion.

Last week thousands of students, workers, soldiers and farmers marched in patriotic parades and staged political rallies in a show of unity behind President Ceausescu's government. Their fervor can't be misinterpreted. "If the Russians come," says a mechanic "we should fight them—everywhere."

That a clash of arms between Rumania and Russia will yet take place seems less likely than it did a few days ago. The uproar that greeted the Soviet-led invasion—and its limited success in de-liberalizing the Czech regime—makes this an increasingly unpopular form of political persuasion.

Moreover, in recent days, Rumanian leaders have considerably played down their criticism of the Soviets, possibly in response to Russian countercharges that any Rumanian fears of invasion are completely unwarranted.

AN END TO INTERFERENCE

But the more moderate Rumanian tone doesn't reflect any basic change in the sentiments of the government or the 19 million citizens. "An end must be put for good and all to interference in the affairs of other states and of other parties," declares Mr. Ceausescu, who is Communist Party leader as well as Rumania's president.

An architect, Theodor Sturdza, simply asks: "Who can trust the Russians after the invasion of Czechoslovakia?"

Not that Russians were winning popularity contests here even before their misadventure in Czechoslovakia. Rumania's independent position began taking shape in 1961, in fact, as a reaction to a Soviet master plan calling on her to concentrate on agricultural and raw materials production for trade with other Communist bloc countries. Instead, Rumania adopted its own economic program, emphasizing industry and closer trade relations with the West.

By 1967, Rumania had asserted itself to the point that only 47% of its trade was with Socialist countries. The first of six British-made jets have been delivered to Rumania's airline—with Yugoslavia the only other East European nation to utilize Western aircraft.

Rather than purchase oil from Russia, Rumania recently concluded a substantial contract to buy from Iran. And an American concern, Universal Oil Products Co. of Des Plaines, Ill., has built a \$22 million oil re-

finery for Rumania—which again snubbed Russia on the deal.

VISITING THE UNITED STATES

Talks with trade officials here clearly indicate that Rumania would like even closer economic relations with the U.S. Recently Deputy Premier Alexandru Briadeanu spent several weeks in the U.S. investigating ways Rumania might acquire more technical equipment for developing industries.

There is also an emotional aspect to Rumania's current dispute with the Soviet Union. "Nobody in Rumania likes the Russians," says a student at Bucharest University. He says that after Russian was dropped as a compulsory second language a few years ago, "nobody would take it—English and French are the languages we study."

To be sure, a visitor from the West is quickly reminded that this Communist country still maintains tight central controls and all the trappings of a police state.

When a foreigner began snapping photographs not long ago of a barefoot woman in a marketplace in the city of Craiova, a policeman briefly placed him under arrest. Later, when he dropped in on friends in Tirgu Jiu, a police car pulled up at the door within minutes to investigate.

The press is not free in a Western or even Czechoslovakian sense. But during the current crisis the Ceausescu government has permitted newspapers the exceptional freedom of reporting all Czech developments. Radio Bucharest similarly has transmitted all available statements by Czech leaders and all clandestine radio broadcasts.

Unlike the Czechs, the Rumanians have almost no concept of democracy and practically none of the thirst for personal liberty that has demonstrated in Czechoslovakia. Rumania has never experienced a Western-style democracy, and there are few demands for political change.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1968]

RUMANIANS FIRM; WARN RUSSIANS—AGAIN URGE TROOPS PULL OUT—TELL OF BLOC "TENSION"

(By John M. Lee)

BUCHAREST, August 29.—Rumanian Communist leaders declared today that they attached the "utmost importance" to the complete withdrawal of Warsaw Pact forces from Czechoslovakia "in the shortest time."

The officials also appeared to warn the Soviet Union against further incursions that might exacerbate relations between Communist countries. They asserted:

"It is imperative that absolutely nothing should be undertaken that might worsen these relations or deepen the divergencies and breed fresh sources of tension."

The firm declarations were contained in a statement by the Executive Committee of the party's Central Committee, published in the party newspaper, Scinteia and other papers. It was the first Rumanian comment on the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement reached in Moscow on Tuesday.

The agreement called for the gradual withdrawal of forces as soon as conditions in Czechoslovakia are "normalized." Two divisions are to remain behind to help guard the West German border.

STONE TERMED RESOLUTE

Western diplomats were impressed by the resolute tone of the Rumanian comment. In their view, Rumania is continuing to insist that each national Communist party should be able to determine its own development, as the Rumanian party has done, free from outside interference.

The statement did nothing to yield to criticism by the Soviet Union, Hungary and Poland of Rumania's breakaway stance.

"The Executive Committee expresses to the Communists of Czechoslovakia, to the Czech

and Slovak people, its feelings of warm sympathy, of support and full internationalist solidarity," the statement said.

It recalled that Rumania had expressed "anxiety and disapproval" over the invasion of Czechoslovakia Aug. 20, and it noted that the return to office of Czechoslovak leaders and the resumption of activity by party and government bodies "create conditions for undertaking the complex tasks facing them."

"At the same time," the statement went on, "the Executive Committee considers of utmost importance the carrying into effect of the complete withdrawal, in the shortest time, of the armed forces of the five socialist countries from Czechoslovakia."

POLAND ASSAILS RUMANIA

(By Jonathan Randal)

WARSAW, August 29.—Poland assailed Rumania today for having placed "sovereignty and independence" above allegiance to Soviet-led Communism. The criticism came in an article observers interpreted as a possible prelude to further pressures on the Bucharest regime by the orthodox Communist nations.

An unsigned 2,500-word article in the party newspaper, Trybuna Ludu, reflecting the views of the Polish leadership, castigated Rumania for having denounced the invasion of Czechoslovakia in disregard of the "supreme dictate of the moment."

In language that recalled the strong words employed in the state-controlled Polish press against Czechoslovakia in past months, the article, also attacked President Nicolae Ceausescu of Rumania by name for the first time since the invasion last week.

Observers said that this was a practice normally reserved for the most serious inter-party polemics.

Also for the first time since the invasion, Wladyslaw Gomulka, the Polish party leader, consulted with members of the ruling 12-man Politburo. The official Polish press agency limited its report to noting that he had discussed "present problems of the international situation."

Also present were five other Politburo members, regional party leaders, Central Committee department directors and others who were described as certain ministers.

Trybuna Ludu also criticized Rumania for having established diplomatic relations with West Germany last year and for having failed to break diplomatic ties with Israel after the war in the Middle East in June 1967.

Rumania is the only Eastern European country that has established relations with Bonn and the only one that did not follow Moscow's lead in breaking with Israel last year.

The newspaper said that Rumanian support for Czechoslovakia "indicates that the objective was not 'defense of democracy and sovereignty' but disintegration of the socialist commonwealth."

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 31, 1968]

BLOC TROOPS SAID TO MOVE ON ROMANIA—CZECH RADIO REPORTS NINE RUSSIAN DIVISIONS NEAR BORDER

(By Stuart S. Smith)

PRAGUE, August 30.—A Czechoslovak radio station transmitting from somewhere in Bohemia said today that the Warsaw powers are massing troops along their borders with Rumania.

According to the broadcast, the Soviet Union has moved nine military divisions into Bucovina alone. Bulgaria, it said, has transferred two divisions of troops to its frontier with Rumania and Hungary has deployed three divisions along its eastern boundary.

COOPERATION CALL

In London, Joseph Luns, the Dutch Foreign Minister, said the situation in the Balkans is a serious cause for concern and

called for improved Atlantic alliance cooperation.

In New York, Corneliu Manescu, the Romanian Foreign Minister and current United Nations General Assembly president, held talks with United Nations officials to sound out their attitude toward a possible invasion of his country. Mr. Manescu also spoke with George W. Ball, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Bucovina and Moldavia are former Romanian provinces which the Soviet Union took from Rumania at the close of World War II.

Two weeks ago, President Nicolae Ceausescu indicated that the Romanian military forces had been withdrawn from the Warsaw Pact command and simultaneously ordered the immediate arming of the country's Workers' Militia.

TANK PULLOUT TERMS ARE SET FOR PRAGUE

(By a Sun staff correspondent)

PRAGUE, August 30.—The Soviet military commander here warned today that Russia will keep its tanks in the Czechoslovak capital until the citizens remove the anti-Soviet slogans from the city's wall.

The Czechoslovak National Front Organization later appealed to the people to remove the offending placards.

Radio Prague quoted the commander, Gen. Ivan Velichko, as saying all posters, signs and banners would have to be taken down or painted over before he would transfer his forces.

DUBCEK POSITION

The announcement conflicts with Alexander Dubcek's speech Tuesday which said the invading military units were to be removed forthwith.

Shortly after his return from his Moscow negotiations with the Kremlin's top officials, Mr. Dubcek, the Czechoslovak Communist party leader, said "we agreed" that the occupation forces "in the towns and villages will immediately depart to designated areas. This is naturally connected with the extent to which our own Czechoslovak authorities will themselves be capable in individual towns of insuring order and normal life."

Except for the first few days immediately following the Warsaw powers' attack, there has been no public disorder in Czechoslovakia, and some major cities, Pilsen, for example, have had no sizable occupation units since the middle of last week.

TWO HUNDRED TANKS REMAIN

Prague, however, is still jammed with Soviet military equipment, including at least 200 battle tanks, more than that many armored cars, numerous howitzers, one or more heavy motor batteries, machine gun emplacements and other heavy arms.

Although the soldiers and their weapons are no longer occupying the Government and party headquarters, they still hold most of the capital's newspaper offices, radio and television stations, printing plants and other key communications points, including the Prague airport.

Many large fields within easy firing range of the city's heart are full of Soviet troops, helicopters, military communications equipment and other paraphernalia.

REBUKE ON INVASION

The Czechoslovak National Front's central committee also rebuked the Warsaw powers, declaring that their invasion violated the "basic norms of international law."

The committee also called upon the occupation authorities to release the political prisoners they have arrested during the last ten days and to refrain from interfering any longer in the nation's affairs.

Soviet officials have demanded that what they call the "illegal" newspapers here stop

publishing and that the free Czechoslovak radio stations be silenced.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA BEFORE THE OCCUPATION

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1967]

A CZECH WRITER DESCRIBES HIS INNER STRUGGLE

(By Richard Eder)

PRAGUE, September 19.—"The social revolution has triumphed in our country, but the problem of power is still with us. We have taken the bull by the horns and we are holding on, and yet something keeps butting us in the seat of the pants."

With these words Ludvik Vaculik, a 41-year-old Prague writer, began a speech, delivered two and a half months ago, whose repercussions are still agitating party and intellectual circles in Czechoslovakia. Spoken at the writers' congress at the end of June, the words of Mr. Vaculik and four or five other writers transformed what had been expected to be a stormy session into something verging on a revolution.

For the last three years or so, Czechoslovak cultural activity has been the freest and most inventive in Eastern Europe, in striking contrast to the conservative attitude of most party leaders. Films, plays, novels and literary essays have, with varying degrees of directness, voiced demands for personal freedom and the supremacy of private values.

DIRECT CHALLENGE TO REGIME

At the writers' congress those themes were distilled into a far more direct challenge to the regime. In essence Mr. Vaculik and others insisted that freedom as a concession was not enough, and that the regime must recognize freedom as a right, surrendering part of its power through such a recognition.

Mr. Vaculik's speech, as well as the other speeches at the congress, have not been published in Czechoslovakia, but word of them has spread. Reports of the speech have appeared in West German and Swiss papers.

Mr. Vaculik, who has been denounced by President Antonin Novotny and other high party officials, and who faces party disciplinary action, told the congress that the party monopoly of power made its liberalizing gestures suspect.

FIRM GUARANTEES DEMANDED

"I can see a continual attempt, with all the dangers it implies, to bring back the bad times," he said. "What use is it that we have been given the literary fund, the publishing houses, the journals. Behind all this is the threat that they will take it back if we are unruly."

"We are told that the old abuses are not being committed," he continued. "Am I supposed to feel grateful? I don't, I see no real guarantees."

"Why can't we live where we want? Why can't tallors spend three years in Vienna, and painters 30 years in Paris, and come back to live here without being regarded as criminals?"

He went on to speak of the effect that the party monopoly of power had on the country.

"Power is a specific human condition," he said. "It overwhelms the rulers and the ruled and threatens the health of both."

He suggested that the instability of a democracy was preferable to the rigidity of the present system.

CITIZEN IS RENEWED

"There the government falls, but the citizen is renewed," he said. "On the contrary, where the government remains continually in power, the citizen falls."

"He does not fall at the execution post. That happens perhaps to a few dozen or a few hundred only, but this is enough. For this is followed by the whole nation's falling into fear, into political apathy, into trivial

concerns and into a growing dependence on smaller and smaller masters."

Speaking "as a citizen of a state that I will not renounce, but in which I cannot live happily," he assailed the mediocrity to which life had been reduced.

"I believe that the citizen is extinct in our country," he said. "We are joined by the most despicable of ties: a common frustration."

He said the system elevated "the most pedestrian types" and submerged "the complex personalities, individuals with personal attractiveness, and most of all those whose character and deeds had become an unspoken standard of decency."

Mr. Vaculik, who played an active role in the party when younger, said that the party did not hesitate to use threats of torture or blackmail as well as temptation to hold its followers. It appeals to the ambitious and the greedy, as well as to "the selfless but poorly informed enthusiasts of whom I am one."

ANSWER: "I DON'T KNOW"

He told the Congress that he was criticizing not Socialism but power, even though the organs of power tried to confuse the two. As to whether they could be disentangled at this late date, in order, as he put it, to "translate the dream into reality," he said the only answer he could give was, "I don't know."

Though his views are widely echoed, Czech writers and intellectuals have disavowed as a fraud a purported protest manifesto attributed to more than 400 intellectuals and printed in the West. The document accused the party of a "witch hunt."

After the writers' Congress there was an immediate effort by the party to condemn Mr. Vaculik and three other speakers, Pavel Kohout, Ivan Kline and A. J. Liehm all were replaced as candidates for the Central Committee of the Writers Union.

The literary magazines and the newspapers came out with editorials attacking the speakers, following the lead of President Novotny and of the party's cultural overseer, Jiri Hendrych.

Nevertheless, it was noted that the editorials were not so strong as they might have been. There is, in fact, a tendency among a number of more conservative writers who have good party connections to defend the right of Mr. Vaculik and the others to speak as they did while disagreeing with what they said.

The party Central Committee is expected to announce its verdict at the end of the month, both on the individual writers and on the broader question of whether there is to be a formal curtailing of intellectual freedom. Despite the anger of the party leaders, there are widespread reports that the efforts of the more influential members of the intellectual community to prevent a crackdown will succeed, at least partly, and that the party decision will be some form of compromise.

PREPARED FOR WHAT COMES

Mr. Vaculik, a pale, casually dressed man who speaks modestly of his work—he has published two novels, the most recent of which won wide praise—says he is prepared for whatever comes. Sitting in the writers' club over a lemonade, and pausing to talk with fellow writers who came up to greet him affectionately, he spoke briefly of himself.

The son of a carpenter in a Moravian village, he worked as an apprentice in a shoe factory and, when World War II ended, came to Prague to study.

"I joined the party in 1946—back when there were a number of choices," he said. "I thought it had the most courageous program, the most logical one. As time went by and things didn't work, I thought it was because certain figures were no good.

"Later I began to suspect that the system itself was * * *

"I would start over again from the beginning," he said with a smile, "from where I was in 1946. I would try to work, to write, to see what I could do, I would be free."

Expulsion from the party would jeopardize his job on the editorial board of *Literarni Noviny*, the principal literary magazine. Other members of the board, including the editor, Dusan Hamsik, said, however, that they saw no reason why he should be removed.

Asked why, in view of his opinion of the party structure, he did not resign, Mr. Vaculik answered:

"If the people who think as I do, and there are very many, would stay in the party and work, perhaps we could make the party what it ought to be."

He said this tentatively, as if not especially convinced, and added: "But I wouldn't advise young people to join it. Three years ago, perhaps I would have. Now I think it is too difficult."

What should young people do if they do not join the party?

"I have no answer," he said. "Perhaps that is why they are so apathetic, so selfish, because they have no answer either. They do not have the illusion about the party that we did, and they don't believe in anything else."

He paused, and then said with the mixture of puzzlement and regret that Czechoslovaks of his generation use when they speak of the people in their twenties: "They are so poor. And so free."

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 11, 1968]
RED TROOPS MOVING IN, CZECHS HEAR—RADIO PRAGUE QUOTES NEWS REPORTS FROM WEST GERMANY

(By Stuart S. Smith)

BONN, July 10.—Quoting West German news reports, Radio Prague said tonight that more foreign Warsaw Pact troops are marching into Czechoslovakia.

"We can only hope there is no reason to worry," Radio Prague commented.

Earlier this evening the Czechoslovak Defense Ministry admitted the Soviet Union is balking over the withdrawal of its soldiers. Soviet, Polish and Hungarian units entered Czechoslovakia in May and June for the Warsaw Pact "staff exercises."

NEW SITUATION

"A new situation has arisen," a ministry spokesman explained during an interview with Radio Prague. "The whole matter is being negotiated anew," he said.

On July 2 Major General Josef Cepicky, the Czechoslovak spokesman for last month's Warsaw Pact maneuvers, said during a television program "all foreign armies will be out of our territory within three days."

Asked about this statement during tonight's broadcast, the Defense Ministry official commented: "Since it [the Soviet withdrawal] has not yet achieved, it means a new situation has arisen. The whole matter is being discussed anew. I cannot make a comment at this time. Perhaps tomorrow."

SOME 27,000 SOVIET TROOPS

Prague sources said that as of last night there were 27,000 Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia but added that additional troops, particularly from Hungary, are currently marching into the country.

Reliable Communist officials said Monday that Czechoslovak leaders had capitulated to Kremlin demands that foreign Warsaw Pact troops remain on Czechoslovak territory until further notice.

Soviet Marshal Ivan I. Yakubovskiy, the Warsaw Alliance military commander, has reportedly refused to recall his men from Czechoslovakia on the grounds that Antonin Novotny, the discredited former president

and party chief, agreed that the maneuvers could continue through August.

BEGAN JUNE 20

The maneuvers began June 20. On June 30 the Polish, Czechoslovak and Soviet news agencies announced that the maneuvers had ended. Soon thereafter, however, Tass, the official Soviet agency, withdrew the story, even though it had already been printed in *Pravda*, the Soviet party newspaper, and stated the maneuvers would continue. Czechoslovak officials immediately said the maneuvers were over, all reports to the contrary notwithstanding.

Yesterday Col. Gen. Martin Dzur, the Czechoslovak Defense Minister, said that 35 per cent of the foreign troops had left the country and that discussions with the Warsaw Pact command were taking place about sending the rest home.

WRITERS' UNION OBJECTS

Today, though, Prague officials close to the Czechoslovak Communist party leadership said the foreign troops will remain and will be reinforced. General Dzur, it was added, has threatened to resign.

The Czechoslovak Writers' Union has sent a letter to the Soviet Embassy in Prague warning that the continued presence of Russian soldiers in the country might cause "indignation" among the Czechoslovak citizens. This, however, may well be what the Kremlin is waiting for as an excuse to stamp out the democratization movement.

This morning Prague newspapers demanded that their Government announce a definite date for the departure of the last foreign soldiers. There have been no foreign garrisons in Czechoslovakia since the end of World War II. The limited number of Soviet officers who advised the Czechoslovak Army left the country some years ago and there is no plan to ask them to return, Czechoslovak officials say.

Several offices have been flooded with letters. Their telephone switchboards have been swamped with calls asking when the foreign soldiers are to leave.

"If everything is all right what is preventing the officials of our Army from giving precise information?" inquired *Mlad Fronta*, the Czechoslovak Youth Union Daily. "Unclear and contradictory information only increases the uncertainty and plays into the hands of those who spread alarming reports."

The East German, Polish, Hungarian, Bulgarian and Soviet Communist parties have written notes to the Czechoslovak Communist party expressing their concern about the liberalization movement. The letters differ in tone. The Ulbricht regime's is said to be the toughest, allegedly accusing the Czechoslovak leadership of being revisionists.

SUMMIT REJECTED

Late Monday the Czechoslovak party Central Committee Presidium reportedly rejected demands to attend a Communist summit conference this week.

The Prague newspaper *Zemelske Noviny* commented: "It would hardly be of any use if we were to go to the conference table in the role of . . . heretics." The newspaper said Czechoslovakia is ready to have bilateral talks with any interested party provided the country's sovereignty is respected.

In Moscow this morning *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, a political and literary newspaper, charged that counter-revolutionary forces have developed in Czechoslovakia. The term is reserved only for the Kremlin's worst enemies. It was applied once to describe the Hungarian uprising which the U.S.S.R. crushed with its tanks in 1956.

MANIFESTO ASSAILED

Literaturnaya Gazeta asserted that the recent Czechoslovak "Two Thousand Words" manifesto signed by the country's leading intellectuals and sportsmen was a "Provoc-

ative, inflammatory, anti-Communist, counter-revolutionary action program."

The manifesto has found wide support among the Czechoslovak citizens even though the party Presidium said it went too far. It called for strikes in the event the new leadership is unable to purge the Czechoslovak party of the foot-dragging conservatives.

Thus far, however, Prague has been exceptionally quiet. The citizens there are well aware of what is at stake and are not going to be provoked into anti-Soviet demonstrations. What might happen if the conservatives deliberately staged an anti-Russian incident as an excuse for bringing the Soviet troops into the city is another question.

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 15, 1968]

BLOC TROOPS REMAIN ON CZECH SOIL—SOVIET, POLISH FORCES DELAY PULLOUT; REDS MEET IN WARSAW

(By Stuart S. Smith)

BONN, July 14.—The withdrawal of Soviet and Polish troops from Czechoslovakia has been postponed because of heavy weekend traffic, CTK, the Czechoslovak news agency, announced tonight.

Prague television said the Warsaw Pact military command ordered the recall put off "until the evening and night hours." "Not a single foreign soldier left Czechoslovak state territory today," the station reported.

TUESDAY TIME SET

Yesterday *Vecerni Praha*, a Prague evening newspaper, said the last foreign units would cross the Czechoslovak frontier at 9 A.M. Tuesday.

Meanwhile, Soviet, East German, Polish, Bulgarian and Hungarian Communist party and Government leaders met in Warsaw today to discuss once again the Czechoslovak liberalization movement.

Czechoslovak officials boycotted the meeting. Romania was apparently not even invited.

LETTERS WERE SENT

Radio Prague noted that the five countries had earlier sent letters to the Czechoslovak party Presidium expressing fears about the fate of Czechoslovak socialism.

"Negotiations were to be held on the subject of these fears," a Radio Prague political commentator said, adding: "We have not accepted this invitation."

Today's meeting in Warsaw was the fourth Communist summit conference since Alexander Dubcek ousted Antonin Novotny from his position as Czechoslovak party secretary January 5.

ROSTER OF HIGH REDS

Among those attending the Warsaw talks were Leonid I. Brezhnev, Soviet party chief; Nikolai V. Podgorny, Soviet President; Alexei N. Kosygin, Soviet Premier; Walter Ulbricht, East German party boss; Willi Stoph, East German Premier; Janos Kadar, Hungarian party leader; Todor Zhivkov, Bulgarian party chief and Premier; Wladislaw Gomulka, Polish party leader, and numerous other top officials.

The presence of so many high-ranking persons indicates the seriousness with which some of Czechoslovakia's Warsaw Pact allies take Mr. Dubcek's demands that the Communist movement permit his country to develop a system of democratic socialism without outside interference.

NEVER BEEN SO UNITED

This morning *Prace*, the Czechoslovak trade union newspaper, carried a report from the Polish capital reporting, "In Warsaw they will negotiate about us without us."

An accompanying editorial asserted that "our nation has never before in its history been so united and of the same opinion as it is today."

The nation, *Prace* declared, stands firmly behind Mr. Dubcek, Premier Oldrich Cernik; Josef Smrkovsky, the National Assembly

president, "and the progressive representatives of the Communist party and Government."

These forward-looking leaders, the paper said, quite clearly showed our friends, as well as those who criticized our liberalization process, that they represent a sovereign people and a sovereign state.

Prace and other newspapers were again full of resolutions from the public declaring that Czechoslovakia will go its way come what may.

The Czechoslovak Academy of Science, for example, wrote to the Soviet Academy of Science, one of whose members recently accused Czechoslovakia of betraying the Communist cause. "The friendship with your country," the Czechoslovak scientists pointed out, "is still the basis" of the policy. However, the letter added, "we insist that you try to better understand what is going on in our country."

The Czechoslovak academicians invited their Soviet colleagues to send a delegation "to visit us" so that the Soviet scientists would "not only get the information about our country that is being greatly distorted in your press."

A letter from the Prague Hospital staff read in part: "We reject all the slander concerning our leading representatives." The letter rebuked the Soviet for accusing Czechoslovak officials of revisionism and counter-revolutionism, asserting, "we are also a cultured nation with a tradition of many centuries and with a high average intelligence."

REMOVE FOREIGN SOLDIERS

"We want to build Socialism, but on the basis of the highest freedom for man and on humanist values. We demand that everyone take our liberalization process for what it is. Leave us our Sovereignty and remove all foreign soldiers from our territory."

A *Prace* reporter talked with some Soviet Army officers yesterday, reporting that they had packed and expected to be gone within two days. "This is your affair and we wish you much luck," the *Prace* reporter said the Soviet officer told him.

ANTI-BONN POSITION

Trybuna Ludu said it was especially concerned by the efforts of certain Czechoslovak officials to revise the Warsaw Pact's common stand against the Federal Republic of West Germany.

Shortly after Romania recognized West Germany, the other Eastern European alliance states met and reached a secret agreement that none of them would exchange ambassadors with Bonn unless the Federal Republic:

1. Formally recognized the East German Government.
2. Recognized the Oder-Neisse line as Germany's permanent frontier with Poland.
3. Renounced all access to nuclear weapons.
4. Declared the 1938 Munich treaty invalid from its inception.

WARSAW ATTACK

In Warsaw this morning an unsigned but plainly official article in *Trybuna Ludu*, the Polish Communist party newspaper, sharply attacked Czechoslovakia, warning that no country can be permitted to break out of the common front.

"If in a Socialist country the forces of reaction threaten the basis of socialism it is at the same time an assault on the interests of the other Socialist countries," *Trybuna Ludu* asserted.

The paper clearly showed that the five orthodox Communist nations are deeply concerned about the very existence of the Warsaw Pact, commenting: "Its strength and ability to endure" depends upon the internal developments in each member country.

THREATENS SECURITY

"He who would break the backbone of the Socialist States threatens the basis of

our alliance, our unity and the security of our fraternal countries," the newspaper declared, adding:

"It is NOT so much the fact that the anti-Communist reaction is rising against socialism, for this it does all the time everywhere, but above all that its activity and its appeals are tolerated "in Czechoslovakia" within the framework of 'democratization' and are not met with determined resistance."

Trybuna Ludu complained that the anti-Communist reaction is finding a "favorable tribune" in the "columns of the Czechoslovak press, on the radio and on television" as well as "in the ranks of the party itself."

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 18, 1968]

CZECHS AGAIN DEFY SOVIET BLOC, STICK TO LIBERAL POLICY

PRAGUE.—Bolstered by the support of President Tito and Western Europe's two biggest Communist parties, Czechoslovakia's liberal Communist leadership defied the Kremlin and its orthodox allies in Eastern Europe again today.

The Czechoslovak party's presidium replied to the tough demands from the Soviet Union and four other Red governments for reversal of Prague's liberal course by declaring there is nothing "counter-revolutionary" about it.

"We don't see any realistic reasons permitting our present situation to be called counter-revolutionary," the party presidium said in a statement published by the Czechoslovak news agency CTK.

FEAR SPREAD OF DRIVE

The statement replied to a letter from the Warsaw conference Sunday and Monday of Communist leaders from the Soviet Union, East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria. The Russians, Germans and Poles particularly fear the liberal ferment in Czechoslovakia will spread to their own potentially restive people.

The Czechoslovak reformist regime of Alexander Dubcek already had pledged to continue liberalization, saying it had full support of the people.

The Warsaw letter and a further declaration by the Soviet Communist party's central committee were published in the Soviet press today. They amounted to the strongest and most extraordinary public demands made on a Soviet ally in recent years.

CLAIMS REJECTED

The Czechoslovak presidium called the party central committee to meet tomorrow to approve the reply to the Warsaw letter.

The reply rejected claims by the fearful orthodox that the Communist system in Czechoslovakia was in danger, that the country was preparing to change its foreign policy and "that there is concrete danger of separating our country from the Socialist society."

It expressed surprise at the criticism and said the Czechoslovak Communists consistently base their actions on the principles of Socialist internationalism, the Warsaw Pact alliance and the development of friendly relations with the Soviet Union and other Socialist states.

PURGE DEMANDED

The demands by the Soviet Union and hard-line allies called for Dubcek to restore dictatorial party control, reimpose press censorship and purge liberals from the party. The Warsaw letter accused the Czechoslovak leaders of failing to correct an "absolutely unacceptable" situation.

It also vowed support for the remaining conservatives whom the liberals hoped to oust from the party central committee at a party congress in September.

Neither the letter nor the resolution of the Soviet party, urging "a decisive struggle," said what action would be taken if the

Dubcek regime did not give in to the demands.

Meanwhile, the Italian Communist party reaffirmed its solidarity with the Czechoslovak liberalization drive today and called for independence for every Communist party in the world.

BACK CZECH COURSE

The Italian Communist leadership said it "is convinced that the understanding and fraternal and faithful support by the other Communist parties can make a valid contribution to the Czechoslovak Communist party to fight the dangers present in this process of renewal."

An Italian delegation and French Communist party chief Waldeck Rochet were in Moscow earlier this week to urge that the Czechoslovaks be left alone to develop their own policies.

The Prague government announced that Rochet will arrive tomorrow.

Sources in Belgrade disclosed plans to visit Prague by both Tito, who has taken his country along an independent course since he broke with Stalin in 1948, and Romanian Communist leader Nicolae Ceausescu, who has been increasingly defiant of Kremlin control.

A public opinion poll published in Prague yesterday showed the people are overwhelmingly behind Dubcek, and 91 percent of those queried asked that Russian troops withdraw as soon as possible.

The Czechoslovak army said Soviet troops who stayed after the end of Warsaw Pact maneuvers last month were moving out "according to schedule." It said "all Soviet troops" would leave the country but gave no date.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
July 30, 1968]

THREAT TO CZECHS MUTES LIBERALS (By David Lawrence)

Paradoxes are numerous these days, but none is more conspicuous than the absolute silence about Czechoslovakia which is being maintained by virtually all the groups, organizations, college professors, liberals and others in America who zealously expound the doctrine that people have a right to determine their own form of government.

No such silence prevailed when Rhodesia, for example, tried to solve its internal problems with respect to racial relations. In fact, the United States has joined with other members of the United Nations in imposing almost total sanctions on trade with Rhodesia.

But here is Czechoslovakia threatened by military intervention by the Soviet government if something in line with Moscow-style communism is not adopted. Yet no voices are raised anywhere in Europe or in this country even to express sympathy with the democratic elements in Czechoslovakia which are trying to modify their form of government. Meanwhile, the Soviets are making military threats and have actually mobilized troops on the border of Czechoslovakia to coerce the latter into acceptance of Moscow's dictatorial policies.

The Czech leaders are not trying to abolish communism, but seeking to modify it so that it will be more democratic. They already are permitting considerable freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press. The Soviet government, however, apparently feels it has the right to dictate to the leaders in Prague what they may or may not do in domestic policies.

Members of the 11-man Communist body ruling Czechoslovakia are conferring with top Soviet leaders who have come from Moscow to a meeting on Czech territory near the Soviet border. Upon the outcome of this conference depends whether the Soviet Union will intervene militarily to force the present government to come to terms or will establish

a new regime that will adhere to the kind of communism which the Soviets apply throughout the areas they control. Moscow is being supported by Poland, East Germany and Bulgaria—over which it maintains an iron hand—and to a lesser extent by Hungary, which is still occupied by Soviet troops.

The Kremlin leaders are demanding of Czech officials that they turn back toward the Soviet kind of communism—including a resumption of press censorship and the suppression of all non-Communist political activities. Even more, the Czechs are being coerced into maintaining their alliance with the Communist-bloc nations and are being warned about getting too friendly with West Germany or other non-Communist countries. The threat of Soviet military intervention is constant.

The crisis is bound to affect the future of the satellite states in Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia under Tito long ago broke away from Soviet domination, but does have friendly relations with Moscow. Rumania, too, has in recent years asserted more and more independence.

It is understandable that the American government would, for diplomatic reasons, choose to be silent. Washington has kept a hands-off policy in the Czechoslovak controversy because of a belief that nothing should be done that would give Moscow a chance to blame Western governments for what is happening in Czechoslovakia.

When the United States goes to the assistance of a country which is trying to determine its own form of government—such as South Vietnam—"liberals" denounce this as "aggression." Yet they remain silent as the Soviets seek to deny even to "liberal" Communists the right to set up their own system of government within Czechoslovakia. The mobilization of Soviet military forces is plainly a threat of aggression against Czechoslovakia, but none of the Communist parties—in France, Italy or this country—is willing to recognize it.

Certainly there is nothing to prevent private organizations and some of the articulate professors and scholars in America and Western Europe from condemning publicly in most vehement terms the Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. But silence seems to be the rule.

[From the New Leader, Aug. 26, 1968]

WHY MOSCOW FEARS THE CZECHS (By Victor A. Velen)

The New Course in Czechoslovakia is one of the most important political and social phenomena of the postwar period. Should it be repressed by Soviet intimidation or armed intervention, the repercussions could cause a serious regression in international relations. Should it succeed, this union of democracy and socialism could become a political model for other countries to follow, in the West as well as in the East.

In the effort to explain their position to the Russians, the present Czech leaders have portrayed the New Course as a revival rather than a betrayal of socialism—a revolution aimed at transforming an authoritarian, pseudo-socialist society into a humanitarian "socialist democracy." That the Russians have been incapable of grasping its real nature is understandable, since recent events in Czechoslovakia represent the antithesis of the evolution of Soviet society. Their fear is also understandable, since these events call into question the very viability of the Soviet political system. For they offer proof once again that freedom is a basic motive in history, that the more a society advances, the more imperative the need for freedom becomes.

Throughout their 20-year history, a chronic ailment of the so-called "peoples' democracies" has been a steadily diminishing national consensus. Immediately after World War II, power in these countries was held by a rel-

atively large number of disciplined, idealistic Communists backed by the mass of the working class and the intellectuals. The period of Stalinist terror, and the years of uninspiring collective rule, narrowed down this base of power to an ossified governmental bureaucracy and a sterile Party apparatus. The average citizen became alienated from public life, concerned only with his personal economic and political survival.

In the past decade, however, a new political consciousness has been awakening among the younger generations, who have begun to reject the system that raised and indoctrinated them. They have come to recognize that "man does not live by bread alone": A comparatively secure job and an advanced social security system has not been able to replace their yearning for certain fundamental political ideals.

The revolutionary rumbling in Hungary and Poland following Stalin's death were efforts to broaden the bases of these regimes by eliminating Stalinist methods and practices. But in both cases the primary motivating factor was nationalist sentiment in defiance of Russian domination. The common denominator of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters and the Polish reformists was that they were anti-Russian, and to the extent that they identified the Russians with socialism, also anti-socialist.

The historical and social premises of the Czech revolution are entirely different, as have been its results. Except for East Germany, Czechoslovakia is the only country in Eastern Europe with an old artisan and industrial—as opposed to a rural—tradition. It shared in the general Western European Enlightenment, and has had experience in the formation of democratic ideas and institutions. That is why, incidentally, Czechoslovakia was one of the few countries in Eastern Europe to have a prewar Communist party—the third strongest in the country—represented in Parliament. Thus the search for a new social pattern has not sprung from national aspirations or hatred of the Russians, but from a desire to combine socialism with the older Czechoslovak humanitarian, democratic heritage.

This combination is basically nothing more than a return to pre-Marxian socialism, usually regarded by Communists as petit bourgeois and utopian. It is predicated on the belief that modern socialism can move forward only on the basis of the freedoms (the bourgeois freedoms, as Marx called them) wrung from the ruling classes in the course of centuries of struggle—out of which emerged the great principles of modern democracy that invest sovereignty in the people.

These principles have surfaced spontaneously in Czechoslovakia since last January, but naturally they will not suffice in themselves. They must be anchored in institutions so that no change in line can sweep them away administratively, as has happened in Poland, for example. The road traveled from the "Polish October" of 1956, with its affirmation of free speech, to the anti-Semitic, fascist campaign waged by the Polish regime in repressing the students during the Warsaw riots of 1968, is ample proof that to survive principles must be transformed into legislation.

The Czechs fully recognize this. That is why their first concern, after they eliminated the most powerful Stalinist elements in the highest echelons, was to establish the freedoms of speech and assembly as law. In place of Lenin's simplistic equation, "socialism plus electrification equals communism," the Czechs have devised a more advanced and at the same time more ancient equation, which could be rendered: "Human rights guaranteed in a democratic state, plus scientific progress, plus socialism might at some future date become communism."

The Czechs are probably the first modern society to transform a totalitarian state into one where the citizens actively and effectively

participate in the *res publica*. Translated into terms of East European politics, totalitarianism has meant the uncontested rule of an oligarchy—neither elected nor revocable—which claims not only to rule in the name of the proletariat but also to be its supreme expression. In fact, this oligarchy has no connection with the proletariat and maintains its power monopoly for the sake of power alone. The elevation of Marxist theory into a state religion—an empty conglomerate of hollow phrases and formulae—has precluded the objective analysis of real problems and consequently any attempt to solve them.

Czech philosophers have worked for the past eight years to break through this totalitarian vise, and the Prague spring owes much to their conclusions. Writing in the Italian Communist weekly *Rinascita* last June, Karel Kosik went to the heart of the matter: "The Czechoslovak events do not constitute one of the usual political crises, one of the usual economic crises, but rather a crisis in the underlying premises of contemporary ideas on reality as a system of general manipulation, Humanistic socialism, for whose existence or non-existence the struggle is taking place now in Czechoslovakia, is a revolutionary and liberating alternative. . . . If the Czechoslovak experiment should succeed—and its success depends on whether it will be realized without compromise and half-solutions—we shall be confronted with practical proof that the system of general manipulation may be overcome in its own main contemporary forms: bureaucratic Stalinism and capitalist democracy. . . ."

From January 1968 on, the Czechoslovak public has become aware of the beginnings of "participatory democracy": Political and special interest groups have mushroomed, the organizational and ideological activities of the Communist party have included a greater percentage of its membership. At no time since the Russian Revolution (with the exception of the resistance movements in World War II), has a European Communist party known such an abrupt increase in popular support. According to a public opinion survey published in *Rude Pravo* on July 13, in January only 17 percent of the population had confidence in the ability of the Party to lead the state; by July this figure had increased to 51 percent, with 89 percent supporting the policies of the government.

If widespread participation and support continues, the Czechoslovak experiment may provide a solution to crises that have plagued the social systems of both East and West. Since World War I, for example, it has become increasingly evident that Western parliamentary rule is an inadequate instrument of modern government. Indeed, the more a society relies on scientific solutions, the more "partitocracy" (to use the Italian expression for party rule) comes to resemble authoritarian rule, though still retaining its democratic image in the minds of the people.

Conceivably, the replacement of parties by autonomous political and economic interest groups, intellectual clubs, youth circles, trade unions, agricultural cooperatives, etc., would constitute a permanent forum for national policy and planning much more responsive to the will of the people than the congresses and parliaments of the west. The kind of political stagnation that took place in France under the party rule of the Fourth Republic might no longer be possible. This remodeling of the political organs of state, based on the direct participation of all strata of the population, is a modernized version of the principles set forth by the early humanitarian socialists and anarchists: Saint-Simon, Fourier, Proudhon and Kropotkin.

All speculation is idle, of course, so long as Czechoslovakia remains in an almost impossible political situation. It is virtually surrounded by hostile governments which, in the name of socialism, fear any form of

revitalization based on popular expression and assent. The Soviet Union is far less concerned about the independent course taken by Rumania, for instance, because the authoritarian, bureaucratic structure of the state has so far not been challenged there.

The possibility of direct Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia now appears to depend largely on Russia's judgment of its feasibility. Every likely protest for intervention—including clumsy and obvious attempts at provocation—has certainly been sought. As the war of nerves continues, the world is witnessing new and unequivocal proof of the fundamental differences between libertarian socialism and the authoritarianism of the Soviet stamp.

Although Lenin can in no sense be considered a democrat (when Spanish Socialist leader Urrutia de los Rios asked him about freedom in the Soviet state, he answered, "*La liberte? Pour quoi faire?*"), he conceived of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a temporary institution, lasting only until socialism had been established. He also envisaged restrictions on freedom of the press as temporary. Both of Lenin's views are now major heresies in Soviet thinking. The distance that separates the first government *équipe* of the Soviet Union, composed of such brilliant intellectuals as Bukharin, Zinoviev and Lunacharski from the Brezhnev-Kosygin team is a measure of the extent to which the Soviet ruling class has been transformed into a mediocre and self-perpetuating bureaucracy, imprisoned in its own rigid ideological armor.

Despite the short period of reform and thaw under Khrushchev, the present Russian leadership not only identifies increasingly with the Stalinist past but is also reverting to Stalinist practices. The repression of dissent, started with the sentencing of writers, Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel, has continued in a succession of other trials and condemnations designed to bring recalcitrant intellectuals into line. In contrast to Czechoslovakia, the protests of a few intellectuals and students have been lost among the believing mass. The sociological conditions needed to foster a widespread demand for democratization of the Soviet system are not as yet present.

Formalized, primitive Marxism continues to be accepted unquestioningly, as well as credited with the great technological advances made by the Russians. Lenins' mummy is still the most revered ikon of the Russian cathedral. And the fumes of self adulation have not begun to clear the altars. Polemicizing against the Czech philosopher Vaclav Hencel, who affirmed that socialism can be divided into authoritarian and democratic models, *Pravda* stated flatly: "There can be only one kind of socialism and that is Soviet socialism, which is the supreme form of democracy."

So long as the present Soviet leadership is in power, Russian opposition to the New Course in Czechoslovakia is not likely to soften. Nor is there much chance of a similar evolution taking place in the Soviet Union in the near future, for it would be contrary to the almost exclusively autocratic Russian historical tradition. Nevertheless, while the Czechoslovak experiment may not guarantee the jobs of the party bosses, if allowed to survive, it may well guarantee the future of socialism.

EXCERPTS FROM A SPECIAL EDITION OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK NEWSPAPER, TRIBUNA OTEVRENOSTI

"What is happening here is not a movement whose aim is the restoration of the old order, but a movement which is meant to carry the socialist revolution to a higher, more perfect stage of development, closer to its aims. . . ."

EDUARD GOLDSTUCKER,
President of the Writers Union.

"One of the basic interests, and hence one of the necessities of a country having the cultural and industrial level of Czechoslovakia should be to open its borders to the entire world. I believe that to enclose oneself within a Chinese wall is an expression of weakness. . . ."

JIRI HANZELKA,
Engineer.

"Today the matter of democratization is no longer only an affair of the [mythical] seven courageous men. I would say that it is a concern of all of us, of the hundreds of thousands, I would even say, millions of people in our country. . . . I would like to express my conviction that either we will live in this country in freedom, or we will not live at all. . . . In a revolution of the type which we are now experiencing—a revolution of the word, a revolution of ideas and not of barbaric, violent acts—the solution cannot be simply that the old caste system give way to new privileges, in order solely that new groups take over the power positions and others again appropriate the monopoly of ideas, the implementation of justice, and the education of our children. The solution is that today and tomorrow the entire nation should partake in these duties and responsibilities. . . ."

"Socialism, if it wants to succeed, if it wants to be an attraction center for the world, cannot be built on hatred, suspicion, lies and violence, but, on the contrary, should offer man more freedom than any other system, because otherwise its creation would have been useless. . . ."

"They are asking us whom we side with in this world. We are with those who, as we, have not renounced the struggle, have not given up the hope that our life could be better. We are on the side of the enslaved, of the suffering, of the unhappy. We are with those who reject the curse of racism, the humiliation of anti-Semitism, persecution and chauvinism, and the conceit of narrow nationalism. We are with those who, gathered around the declaration of human rights, want our time to be friendlier than Hell."

JAN PROCHAZKA,
Author.

4. INTELLECTUAL FERMENT IN THE SOVIET UNION

[From the New York Times Magazine]

THE NEW TRIALS IN RUSSIA Stir Memories of Stalin's Days: This Is the Winter of Moscow's Dissent

(By Patricia Blake)

Moscow has just experienced an unusually fierce winter, many smaller towns were snow-bound, and grave concern is being expressed in the press about air pollution—all of which is very convenient for Russian intellectuals, who commonly characterize their conditions in meteorological images.

For example, Vladimir Bukovsky, who was sentenced last September to three years in prison for having organized a demonstration protesting the arrest of writers, has offered a comment on the miasma of intellectual life. In a sketch called "A Stupid Question," which appeared before his arrest in the underground magazine Phoenix, Bukovsky complained to a physician: "I just can't stand it any longer. I tried at first to ignore it but I couldn't. . . . I can't, you see, take a really deep breath. . . . The doctors can't help me. . . . But I do so want to take a deep breath sometimes, you know, with all my lungs—especially in the spring. . . . There seems to be some obstruction to breathing. Or isn't there enough air?"

Recently, Yevgeni Yevtushenko complained of the same trouble. In "Smog," a poem datelined Moscow-New York, published in the Soviet magazine *Znamya* in January of this year, he writes that he is gasping for air. The locale is purportedly New York, but the weather conditions are Russian and clearly

recognizable as such by the Soviet reader. Notices have been posted in bars, the poet says, which read: "You can breathe easily only through vodka."

Yevtushenko uses the device of putting words in the mouths of American writers. Allen Ginsberg is made to say: "Darkness is descending, / darkness! / This is the smell of outer hell. / There is no excuse for those / who can breathe in this stench! In a world of moral vacuum, / in a world of fog and chaos / the only halfway decent person / is he who suffocates." In the same poem, Arthur Miller (who has publicly spoken out against the trials of writers in Russia) is described as "stern in his terrible prophecy." Miller supposedly says: "There will be still more burnings at the stake / by Inquisitions. / Smog / is the smoke of these stakes to come."

The atmosphere is indeed heavy with menace. Not since 1963, when Khrushchev carried on a ferocious campaign against the liberal intelligentsia, has creative life in Russia seemed in such jeopardy. The two recent trials of writers in Moscow represent only the most visible surface of what is actually taking place. The arrests of hundreds of intellectuals, for offenses ranging from the distribution of anti-Soviet propaganda to armed conspiracy, and other sinister signals suggest that a policy decision has been made, at the highest level, to reintroduce terroristic methods to stifle dissent.

These attempts at coercion have produced, not submission, but defiance more open and more widespread than at any time in the Soviet Union's entire history of persecution of intellectuals. The Communist leadership in Russia, and in parts of Eastern Europe as well, is being confronted with such spectacles as street demonstrations in Moscow, student riots in Warsaw and, in Prague, a resistance among intellectuals so massive that, in Czechoslovakia's newly favorable political climate, it appears to have succeeded in obtaining a reversal of cultural policy.

The pattern of repression, as it has evolved under Brezhnev and Kosygin, is not so easily charted as it was under Khrushchev. For one thing, the style of new leadership in dealing with the unruly intelligentsia is more subdued. No longer is the chief of state heard denouncing abstract painters as homosexuals who (in Khrushchev's words) use human excrement instead of paint. There are no more mass meetings with writers and artists in the Kremlin, no more vast campaigns in the press against internationally known literary figures like Voznesensky and Yevtushenko.

Aims and methods have changed as well. Khrushchev believed for a time that he could turn the aspirations of the liberal intellectuals to his own political purposes; he attempted to gain their support by offering them a measure of freedom, but when they responded, not with gratitude but with ever greater demands, he turned on them with the full range of his celebrated invective. These repeated attempts to woo, then subdue, the intelligentsia produced the seasonal "thaws" and "freezes" that characterized cultural life under Khrushchev.

In contrast, the new leaders have always shown a determination not to allow the intelligentsia to play any sort of political role. Plagued with other problems inherited from Khrushchev, they at first seemed merely to be trying (with little success) to contain the most vociferous libertarians among the intellectuals. Now, however, they have been compelled to take notice of three problems that have strikingly intensified in the post-Khrushchev era: (1) the spread of dissent; (2) the breakdown of controls over the intelligentsia; (3) the publication abroad of suppressed works by Russian writers, much of which is damaging to the prestige of the Soviet leadership, the system and the ideology.

Thus, while Khrushchev relied largely on bombast and threats against dissidents (which he was unwilling or unable to carry out) the present leaders have introduced the technique of staging political trials of intellectuals, while at the same time giving the K.G.B. (Committee for State Security—the secret police) far greater powers in dealing with the intelligentsia than at any time since Stalin's death.

The fact that this policy of selective terror was applied with increasing intensity in 1967, the year of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, is a measure of the leadership's alarm over large-scale and unrestrained expressions of dissent. The crack-down has, in fact, come as a surprise to Western observers, and to many people in Russian literary circles who believed that the Soviet leadership would make no move to repress the intellectuals until after the anniversary celebrations last November. The existence of dissent would be played down, they said; an appearance of national unity had to be maintained, as well as a semblance of solidarity among the foreign Communist parties still more or less loyal to Moscow. The trial of the writers Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel in 1966 had provoked such vehement opposition among foreign Communist leaders that it seemed unlikely the Soviet authorities would invite further embarrassment along these lines.

A number of officially inspired attempts were made before the anniversary to still the continued reverberations of that trial. Many newsmen in Moscow, and visitors from abroad, were systematically informed that Sinyavsky and Daniel would be released on the occasion of the general amnesty in November, provided the Western press would stop reporting the plight of the two writers and left-wing intellectuals would stop agitating about the case. "Dr. Zhivago." The recent writings of Alexander Solzhenitsyn and other suppressed works would soon be published, they were told. It was even suggested that censorship was about to be abolished, the only impediment to complete cultural freedom in the Soviet Union being the meddlesomeness of foreigners.

Nothing of the sort, of course, took place. Instead, the dawn of the anniversary year 1967 was marked by the arrest of a large group of intellectuals in Leningrad whose number has been estimated at from 150 to 300 persons. Precautions were taken by the authorities to prevent this action from causing an international sensation. The arrests were made among obscure persons, in a city where foreign journalists are not stationed. No mention of the arrests was made in the Soviet press. It is only recently, therefore, that some details of the Leningrad case have become known.

The roundup took place in late February or early March, 1967. Among those arrested were a number of Leningrad University professors, law and philosophy students at the university, poets, literary critics and magazine editors. At least one closed trial of four persons is known to have been held, and another is said to be in preparation now. Among those already tried, one is a Professor Ogurtsov, a specialist on Tibet at the university, who was condemned to 15 years at hard labor—the maximum sentence, short of death. A second, Yevgeni Vagin, an editor of a multivolume edition of Dostoyevsky, was sentenced to 13 years.

Those arrested were charged with conspiracy to armed rebellion. It was alleged that they were members of a terrorist network, with contacts abroad, which operated under the guise of various philosophical societies, including a "Berdyaev Circle," named after Nikolai Berdyaev, the Christian philosopher who was an opponent of the Soviet regime because of its suppression of freedom. Members of similar groups, said to be linked with the Leningrad organizations, have reportedly

been arrested in Sverdlovsk and in several towns in the Ukraine.

The Leningrad arrests are clearly the most menacing of the coercive actions against intellectuals that have been undertaken in the post-Khrushchev period. This is the first time in Soviet history that intellectuals are known to have been arrested and tried for possession of arms for the purpose of rebellion against the state. The charge is indeed so grave that it irresistibly raises the question of whether the arms case was not fabricated by the K.G.B. The purpose of such a provocation would be to smear the whole liberal intelligentsia, which, it might now be alleged, is so disaffected as to be capable of armed rebellion—thus opening the way to arrests on a much larger scale. The attempt by the K.G.B. to connect the Leningrad organizations with groups in other parts of the country suggests that something along these lines is in progress. Moreover, the possession of small arms, of which the Leningrad intellectuals are accused (in Sverdlovsk, they allegedly acquired machine guns), appears preposterous. Under peacetime conditions it would be extremely difficult to smuggle arms into the Soviet Union, and the rigid system of arms control in the police and armed forces requires the strictest accountability for every weapon and every bullet.

Although the arms case in Leningrad carries with it the most fearful implications, the area where selective terror has been applied most intensively under Brezhnev and Kosygin has been the Ukraine. Here, aspirations for intellectual freedom are mixed with demands for cultural autonomy, sometimes shading into Ukrainian nationalism. The wave of arrests began in January, 1966, when more than 200 university professors, students, journalists, writers and scientists were secretly tried for having distributed pamphlets in defense of Ukrainian culture and of the use of the Ukrainian language in the Ukrainian Republic. Public protest demonstrations took place in various cities in the wake of these trials. In Lvov, a crowd outside the courtroom showered the van carrying the prisoners with flowers.

The main point made in one letter of protest by a Ukrainian intellectual, Vyacheslav Chernovil, was to be echoed later by defendants at the Moscow trials—i.e., that the freedoms guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution are precisely those that are held to be criminal offenses in court: freedom of press and assembly, and freedom to hold demonstrations. Of judicial procedure, Chernovil wrote: "The secret trial reminds one of a boa constrictor to which a rabbit is thrown for the boa's breakfast, the rabbit having first been granted permission to present the hungry beast with arguments to prove his innocence."

The K.G.B.'s far greater freedom of action in dealing with intellectuals, as evidenced by these cases, appears all the more remarkable in view of the sharp limitation of police power that was established after Stalin's death. No longer does the secret police penetrate all governing institutions and wield extraordinary political power. Mass police terror exists no more. At the same time, however, the Second Chief Directorate of the K.G.B. has a continuity of function that goes back to the old Cheka, the first Soviet secret police, of which it is the direct descendant. It gathers information and prepares dossiers on individuals, regardless of the political climate and of reforms in the society.

Built into the K.G.B., then, is a potential of extreme, oppressive action. It is a ready tool, when a political decision is made to use it, as has apparently happened now, to a still limited but highly suggestive degree. It is significant that the K.G.B. has been unleashed on two groups alone, where dissent runs high: the liberal intelligentsia and Russia's Protestants (particularly the Evan-

gical Christians and the Reform Baptists), who have been suffering from greatly intensified repression since 1966.

The year 1967 saw a major attempt to rehabilitate the secret service, which, for the Soviet people, is quite properly associated with revolutionary violence, the bloody horror of the great purges, and the 20-year Stalinist terror. All the vast propaganda resources of the Soviet state were mobilized for this purpose. Countless books and articles glorifying the exploits of secret-service agents were cranked out by the state publishing houses during the past year. If this campaign was intended to popularize the K.G.B., it was naive, to say the least. Its main purpose appeared, rather, to rebuild the morale of the secret service and thus increase its efficiency.

The climax of this operation came in December, on the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Cheka, when Yuri Andropov, the head of the K.G.B., addressed Government and K.G.B. leaders in the Kremlin. Andropov assured his listeners that "in recent years our party has done an enormous amount of work to strengthen Socialist legality. . . . Thus our party has shown that there is and can be no reversion in any violation of Socialist legality whatsoever."

How this new Socialist legality actually works has perhaps never been better exemplified in the post-Khrushchev period than by the trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel for having circulated "anti-Soviet" works that were published abroad. A patently prejudicial press campaign took place before and during the trial. The presiding judge, Lev Smirnov, continuously interrupted the proceedings with grossly insulting or ironic interjections about the accused. As scores of Soviet intellectuals have pointed out, the verdict of guilty was clearly prearranged.

Having manufactured the case against Sinyavsky and Daniel, and persuaded the political leadership to make it a show trial, the K.G.B. proceeded to attempt to deal with the consequences. Sergei Bannikov, the general of state security in charge of the intelligentsia, called meetings at which he warned writers in the strongest terms against protesting about the trial. Then, on the eve of the anniversary of the revolution, it was officially announced that two K.G.B. generals had been named to the U.S.S.R. Supreme Court. One was a Maj. Gen. Nikolai Chestyakov. The other was Bannikov, who was designated vice president—one of the three top positions on the court.

Such K.G.B. appointments were unprecedented since Stalin's time; until now the court has maintained a semblance, at least, of judicial objectivity. Certainly the meaning of Bannikov's appointment was not lost on the public: more trials on the Sinyavsky-Daniel model could be expected. In case anyone missed the point, it was made abundantly clear when the Order of Lenin was bestowed on Smirnov, the judge at the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial, "for his services in strengthening Socialist legality."

The most striking aspect of these coercive tactics is that they are not producing the desired results. The simple fact is that the Russian intellectual has, by and large, ceased to be afraid. The old, fearful sense of isolation from which writers and readers, teachers and students, scholars, scientists and artists suffered under Stalin has gradually been replaced by a sense of community that now gives them the courage to risk prison for the sake of commonly shared principle. This change seems very nearly miraculous when one considers how intellectually, artistically and morally stupefying was Stalin's terror. "They only ask you," said Boris Pasternak of the Soviet authorities, "to praise what you hate most and grovel before what makes you most unhappy."

Today intellectuals of all ages are openly calling, not only for greater intellectual and artistic freedom, but, increasingly, for fun-

damental changes in Soviet society. They are fighting for their beliefs from the prisoner's dock, on the streets, in underground books and magazines and, indeed, on any tribune they can find—including the foreign press. They throw flowers on paddy wagons, demonstrate outside courtrooms, and assemble in public squares carrying placards calling for adherence to the Constitution. They hold illegal press conferences for Western newsmen where they accuse Soviet newspapers of slander, and threaten to sue. They draft letters, signed by a who's who of Soviet literature, science and scholarship, demanding an end to violations of the law, and address them to Brezhnev and Kosygin, the Politburo, the Supreme Court, Pravda and Izvestia, and circulate them all over Moscow. In short, the liberal intelligentsia is confronting the Soviet leadership with its own myths.

The evolution of courage and conscience that has made these events possible in the present period of severe repression began much earlier in the post-Stalin era. The most obvious, and crucial, precondition was, of course, the elimination of mass police terror after Stalin's death. This, however, did not immediately lift the pall on the Soviet people; terror had been internalized far too long. For those intellectuals who had survived the purges, the reflex of distrust and deception was not easy to master. Soon, however, there were some stirrings of dissatisfaction—but these were limited to the cultural sphere, to censorship and other forms of artistic control. Skepticism about the basic values of the system began to become apparent only after Khrushchev's revelations of Stalin's crimes in 1956.

The scope of the reaction among intellectuals—and, indeed, among the public at large—may be appreciated when one considers that the whole ideological schema of Communism and the entire political and economic system had been for 30 years inextricably linked with the person of Stalin. The destruction of the Stalin myth put into question the legitimacy of the new leadership and, in fact, nothing less than the *raison d'être* of the Soviet system.

At this juncture, writers and poets began to command considerable influence over public opinion. A policy of relative permissiveness from 1956 to the end of 1962 (with some seasonal setbacks) resulted in the appearance of a mass of books and articles which criticized, in scarcely veiled terms, virtually every aspect of Soviet society, and which attracted a mass readership running into the millions. The publication in November, 1962, of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's harrowing novel of a Stalinist concentration camp, "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," led writers and readers to believe that the whole bloody history of the Stalin era could at last be publicly ventilated, and the most wicked of Stalin's accomplices purged from the governing bureaucracies.

Khrushchev, alarmed by the scope of expectations of the intellectuals, reversed himself in 1963. There followed a seven-month press campaign which excoriated intellectuals, and which was accompanied by censure meetings held all over the country. Liberals who had captured positions of influence in the cultural organizations (like the Writers Unions) were replaced by die-hard Stalinists, and all references to Stalin's crimes were banned from literature. It was then, in response to Khrushchev's offensive, that intellectuals began to develop the sense of common cause they are so dramatically demonstrating today. The writers and other intellectuals under fire in 1963 steadfastly refused to recant, despite fearful pressures. Some remained silent; others counter-attacked and defended one another.

During the first year after Khrushchev's fall in 1964, it became clear that administrative controls were inadequate to contain public expressions of dissent. Literary works

of a highly unorthodox and critical nature were slipping past the censorship, and selling out at once, often in editions of 100,000 copies.

The distribution of mimeographed underground magazines and books had reached such proportions that the great Russian poet Anna Akhmatova, before her death in 1966, could airily say on a visit to Europe that "our literature has no need of Gutenberg's invention." Perhaps most galling of all, works unpublished in Russia, like those of Abram Tertz and Nikolai Arzhak, were reaching Western publishers almost as fast as they were being written.

The turning point of cultural policy under Brezhnev and Kosygin came in February, 1966, when the leadership gave the K.G.B. license to step in where nonterroristic controls had failed. The show trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel was the immediate consequence. All the subsequent arrests and trials of writers and intellectuals in Moscow in 1967 and 1968 proceed directly from this case.

The trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel was an event equivalent in its divisive impact on Soviet society to that of the Dreyfus case on France in the eighteen-nineties. The reaction to it both reflected and intensified the struggle between the liberal intellectuals and other people of conscience and vested authority. It served to mobilize the intelligentsia already united by the onslaughts of 1963, into expressing its indignation almost with a single voice. It made many older intellectuals, silent until then with their fearful memories of Stalinism, openly commit themselves to the liberal camp. And it raised the issue, in the most compelling public fashion, of the contradiction between "Socialist justice" and brutal reality.

The significant fact about the trial is that the two writers, charged with circulating "anti-Soviet" writings, readily admitted that they were the pseudonymous authors of the works in question, but denied that they were guilty of a crime. Their testimony and final pleas constitute a defense less of themselves than of literature itself, and a condemnation, in overwhelmingly eloquent terms, of the grossly simplistic and Philistine criteria applied to literature by the Soviet authorities for the past 30 years. Had they pleaded guilty, as the court evidently expected, they would have got off with lighter sentences. (Sinyavsky was condemned to seven years of hard labor and Daniel to five.)

It was clear that they wished to make examples of themselves, so that others might carry on after them. This hope was completely realized. The trial utterly failed in its purpose of terrorizing intellectuals. On the contrary, the behavior of the defendants infused the liberal intellectuals community with a new sense of pride and honor. Sinyavsky and Daniel had established a standard of conduct which henceforth others would strive to meet. In sum, the moral quality of intellectual life in Russia was immeasurably raised by their action.

Not one prominent writer in Russia, except Mikhail Sholokhov, could be found to endorse the trial, while protests signed by hundreds of famous writers, scholars and scientists poured into Government agencies and newspapers. Opposition to the trial by European Communists became so strident that foreign Communist newspapers were banned for a time from Soviet newsstands. But, substituting for a free press, the foreign short-wave radio stations, the Voice of America, Radio Liberty, the B.B.C. and Deutsche Welle repeatedly beamed the trial transcript (which had been smuggled abroad) and the text of all the protests to their millions of listeners in Russia.

Thus the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial boomeranged by causing a national and international scandal, as well as by stiffening the intelligentsia's resistance. In May, the Congress of the Stalinist-dominated Soviet Writers Union was boycotted by leading liberals, and

Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Russia's finest living prose writer, addressed his now-famous letter to the congress demanding the abolition of censorship. He charged that the K.G.B. had confiscated his manuscripts and that the leadership of the Writers Union, far from defending authors from such outrages, had a long history of being "always first among the persecutors" of writers who were slandered, exiled, imprisoned and executed. The reaction of the authorities was simply to hit harder—in Moscow, at the heart of resistance.

The first of the Moscow trials, in September, 1967, involved three young men charged with organizing a demonstration on Pushkin Square against the arrest of some literary figures a few days earlier. In the second trial, at the beginning of January, 1968, four young people, including two underground writers, Alexander Ginzburg and Yuri Galanskov, were accused of circulating an underground magazine, Phoenix '66.

Galanskov was said to have privately drafted a new constitution for the Soviet Union and distributed it among his friends. Ginzburg was also charged with editing and circulating a "White Book" on the Sinyavsky-Daniel case, consisting of the trial transcript, protests by Soviet intellectuals and a letter of his own to Kosygin in which he said: "I love my country and I do not wish to see its reputation damaged by the latest uncontrolled activities of the K.G.B. I love Russian literature and I do not wish to see two more of its representatives sent off to fell trees under police guard."

Ginzburg was sentenced to five years and Galanskov to seven. The third defendant, who turned state's evidence, was let off with two years, while the fourth, who was accused merely of typing manuscripts for the others, received a one-year suspended sentence.

In these trials, the authorities made determined efforts to seal off the proceedings so that any resistance on the part of the defendants would not become public. Except for a handful of relatives of the accused, the courtrooms were packed with pre-selected persons, who, according to one witness, read magazines or dozed during the trials, rousing themselves from time to time to utter "animal-like hoots and cries for severe penalties." The September trial received a brief mention in a Moscow newspaper, which stated that the accused had confessed their crime.

Thereupon, a 30-year-old physicist, Pavel Litvinov, the grandson of the late Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov, saw to it that the actual testimony of one defendant was communicated to the foreign press.

It showed that the defendant, the 25-year-old writer Vladimlr Bukovsky, not only had pleaded not guilty but had defended his right to demonstrate publicly under the Soviet Constitution. He protested that the investigation of his case had been conducted, not by the prosecutor's office, but by the K.G.B., in violation of the law. Bukovsky, who was sentenced to three years, ended his plea as follows: "I absolutely do not repent for organizing the demonstration. I find that it accomplished what it had to accomplish, and when I am free again, I shall again organize demonstrations—of course, in complete observance of the law, as before."

Litvinov further made public the record of his interrogation by a K.G.B. officer in which he defied a threat to arrest him if he circulated the Bukovsky transcript. After it was sent abroad, Litvinov told an American newsman that he had not been bothered since by the K.G.B. "When the K.G.B. sees that a man is not afraid of them, they do not call him in any more for more conversation. When they call him again, it's for good." Litvinov was immediately fired from his teaching job.

Ginzburg and Galanskov pleaded not guilty at the five-day trial in January. Said Ginzburg of the contents of his White Book. "Any

patriot is obliged to give up his life for his country—but not to lie for it."

News of the defendants' resistance quickly leaked out to the crowd of some 200 sympathizers who gathered on the street, in freezing weather, outside the courtroom. What took place was tantamount to a five-day press conference by friends of the accused with foreign journalists. K.G.B. men continuously mingled in the crowd, taking pictures of the protesters. Shouted a former major general, Pyotr Grigorenko: "You can't intimidate me. I bled for this country!" As the defense lawyers filed out of the courtroom, they were given red carnations by persons in the crowd.

Among those who kept a vigil outside the courtroom were Alexander Yesenin-Volpin, the son of the famous poet Sergei Yesenin, who committed suicide in 1925 and Pyotr Yakir, the son of Maj. Gen. Iona Yakir, who was executed during the purges of the Red Army in 1937, then "posthumously rehabilitated" after Stalin's death. Yakir distributed an appeal saying that the trial "has gone beyond all bounds in suppressing human rights. Even Andrei Vyshinsky would have envied the organization of this trial."

Shortly before the court sentenced the defendants, Pavel Litvinov and Mrs. Yuli Daniel issued a statement to foreign journalists, asking that it be published and broadcast as soon as possible. "We are not sending this request to Soviet newspapers because that is hopeless," they said. They called the trial "a wild mockery of justice . . . no better than the celebrated trials of the nineteen-thirties, which involved us in so much blood that we still have not recovered from them." The judge, they said, allowed only evidence "which fits in the program already prepared by the K.G.B."

Following this, 12 intellectuals, including Litvinov, Yesenin-Volpin, Yakir and Grigorenko addressed a similar statement about the trial to the Presidium of the conference of 66 Communist parties that opened at the end of February in Budapest for the purpose of strengthening their unity. One can imagine the reaction of the Soviet authorities on learning that the first news to reach the world of this parley consisted in front-page stories in *The New York Times* and other Western papers of an appeal by 12 Russian intellectuals to the conference's participants "to consider fully the perils caused by the trampling of man in our country."

One consequence of the Moscow trials was that the convicted writers gathered support from persons completely outside Moscow literary and intellectual circles, and for entirely extra-literary reasons. For example, among the signers of the appeal to the Budapest Conference were a former major general, the son of a general and the son of a Foreign Minister, a leader of the Crimean Tartar minority and a Russian Orthodox priest.

From as far away as Latvia came a letter to Mikhail Suslov, the Politburo member and party ideologist, from the chairman of a model collective farm who, in 1964, had been highly praised in the Soviet press. This letter, which was published, not in Russia but in *The New York Times*, called on the party to reach an understanding with the young rebels, rather than put them on trial. "Such dissenters will," the writer predicted, "inevitably create a new party. Ideas cannot be murdered with bullets, prison or exile." After describing the remoteness of the countryside where he lives, he said, addressing the Central Committee of the party, "If information has reached us on the broadest scale, you can well imagine what kind of seeds you have sown throughout the country. Have the courage to correct the mistakes that you have made, before the workers and peasants take a hand in this affair."

Protest against the trial also brought together two formerly distinct and antithetical groups within the intelligentsia itself. Until now, only one group, the "loyal opposition"—

well-known published writers and respected scholars and scientists—had publicly expressed resistance, in relatively moderate terms, against attempts at coercion by the authorities. Now another group, "the underground"—dissidents who despair of effecting change through established channels—was making itself heard with unprecedented boldness in response to the persecution of Ginzburg and others among their members.

These two groups were first seen to join forces when 31 leading writers, scholars and scientists (including three members of the Academy of Sciences) addressed a protest against the Ginzburg trial to the Moscow City Court. Later appeals by loyal oppositionists included one signed by 80 more prominent intellectuals, and another signed by 220 top scientists and artists, from Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov, Magadan and Dubna, the Soviet atomic center. In mid-March, 99 mathematicians, including seven Lenin Prize winners, rallied around Yesenin-Volpin (who is both an underground poet and a mathematician) in a protest against his forcible confinement in a lunatic asylum after he had participated in the demonstration outside the courtroom at the Ginzburg trial.

The central issue raised by all these protests (none of which was even mentioned in the Soviet press) was perhaps most eloquently defined by Pyotr Yakir in an appeal which is now being widely circulated in Moscow. "The inhuman punishment of members of the intelligentsia is a logical extension of the atmosphere of public life in recent years," he wrote. "The process of the restoration of Stalinism is going on—slowly but remorselessly." "The naive hopes" encouraged by de-Stalinization in 1956 and 1961 have not been realized. On the contrary, "the name of Stalin is being pronounced from the highest platforms in an entirely positive context."

Yakir, who spent 17 years in a Stalinist camp, deplors the fact that 10th-rate books praising Stalin are being published, while those that describe his crimes are being suppressed. His statement ends with an appeal to creative people in Russia to "raise your voices against the impending danger of new Stalins and Yezhovs. . . . We remind you that people who dared to think are now languishing in harsh forced-labor camps. Every time you are silent, another stepping-stone is added, leading to new trial of a Daniel or a Ginzburg. Little by little, with your acquiescence, a new 1937 may come upon us."

Does the future hold a return to terror on the scale of the great purges of 1937-38? Clearly, the Soviet leadership finds itself in an impossible dilemma. On the one hand, it must now be clear that much larger doses of terror must be administered if the intelligentsia is to be silenced, and its influence on public opinion curbed. One sinister omen was contained in an article in *Pravda* last March 3, in which the recent Moscow trials were said to be as justified as the purge trials of the thirties—trials that have scarcely been mentioned favorably in the Soviet press since Khrushchev's de-Stalinization speech in 1956. On the other hand, the cost of a return to mass police terror would be incalculably high. It would reverse the effect of all Soviet policies designed to bring Russia into competition with the modern world, including those that offer individual incentives for industrial production and technological and scientific creativity. Moreover, the internal dynamic of the Stalinist police state, once provided by the myth of Stalin and by ideology, could not be restored in a society now rent by skepticism and dissent. Finally, a powerful secret police apparatus on the Stalinist model might well devour the political leaders who had revived it.

How Brezhnev and Kosygin will deal with this critical situation is still unclear. On the surface it would seem that a brutal showdown

is at hand. Yet the Soviet leaders may be borne by the force of inertia and indecision that has determined their handling of other crises, both domestic and foreign. If so, we may be certain that the aspirations of the liberal intelligentsia, rising now for more than a decade, will continue to confront the leadership in irreversible and irremediable conflict.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1968]
TEXT OF ESSAY BY RUSSIAN NUCLEAR PHYSICIST
URGING SOVIET-AMERICAN COOPERATION

(NOTE.—Following is the text of an essay, titled "Thoughts on Progress, Peaceful Co-existence and Intellectual Freedom," by Academician Andrei D. Sakharov, Soviet physicist, as translated by The New York Times from the Russian manuscript.)

The views of the author were formed in the milieu of the scientific and scientific-technological intelligentsia, which manifests much anxiety over the principles and specific aspects of foreign and domestic policy and over the future of mankind. This anxiety is nourished, in particular, by a realization that the scientific method of directing policy, the economy, arts, education and military affairs still has not become a reality.

We regard as "scientific" a method based on deep analysis of facts, theories and views, presupposing unprejudiced, unfeared open discussion and conclusions. The complexity and diversity of all the phenomena of modern life, the great possibilities and dangers linked with the scientific-technical revolution and with a number of social tendencies demand precisely such an approach, as has been acknowledged in a number of official statements.

In this pamphlet, advanced for discussion by its readers, the author has set himself the goal to present, with the greatest conviction and frankness, two theses that are supported by many people in the world. The theses are:

[1]

The division of mankind threatens it with destruction. Civilization is imperiled by: a universal thermonuclear war, catastrophic hunger for most of mankind, stupefaction from the narcotic of "mass culture" and bureaucratized dogmatism, a spreading of mass myths that put entire peoples and continents under the power of cruel and treacherous demagogues, and destruction or degeneration from the unforeseeable consequences of swift changes in the conditions of life on our planet.

In the face of these perils, any action increasing the division of mankind, any preaching of the incompatibility of world ideologies and nations is madness and a crime. Only universal cooperation under conditions of intellectual freedom and the lofty moral ideals of socialism and labor, accompanied by the elimination of dogmatism and pressures of the concealed interests of ruling classes, will preserve civilization.

The reader will understand that ideological collaboration cannot apply to those fanatical, sectarian and extremist ideologies that reject all possibility of rapprochement, discussion and compromise, for example, the ideologies of Fascist, racist, militaristic and Maoist demagogy.

Millions of people throughout the world are striving to put an end to poverty. They despise oppression, dogmatism and demagogy (and their more extreme manifestations—racism, Fascism, Stalinism and Maoism). They believe in progress based on the use, under conditions of social justice and intellectual freedom, of all the positive experience accumulated by mankind.

The second basic thesis is that intellectual freedom is essential to human society—freedom to obtain and distribute information, freedom for open-minded and unfeared debate and freedom from pressure by officialdom and prejudices. Such a trinity of freedom of thought is the only guarantee

against an infection of people by mass myths, which, in the hands of treacherous hypocrites and demagogues, can be transformed into bloody dictatorship. Freedom of thought is the only guarantee of the feasibility of a scientific democratic approach to politics, economy and culture.

But freedom of thought is under a triple threat in modern society—from the opium of mass culture, from cowardly, egotistic and narrow-minded ideologies and from the ossified dogmatism of a bureaucratic oligarchy and its favorite weapon, ideological censorship. Therefore, freedom of thought requires the defense of all thinking and honest people. This is a mission not only for the intelligentsia but for all strata of society, particularly its most active and organized stratum, the working class. The worldwide dangers of war, famine, cults of personality and bureaucracy—these are perils for all of mankind.

Recognition by the working class and the intelligentsia of their common interests has been a striking phenomenon of the present day. The most progressive, internationalist and dedicated element of the intelligentsia is, in essence, part of the working class, and the most advanced, educated, internationalist, and broad-minded part of the working class is part of the intelligentsia.

This position of the intelligentsia in society renders senseless any loud demands that the intelligentsia subordinate its strivings to the will and interests of the working class (in the Soviet Union, Poland and other socialist countries). What these demands really mean is subordination to the will of the party or, even more specifically, to the party's central apparatus and its officials. Who will guarantee that these officials always express the genuine interests of the working class as a whole and the genuine interests of progress rather than their own caste interests?

We will divide this pamphlet into two parts. The first we will title "Dangers," and the second, "The Basis of Hope."

DANGERS

The threat of nuclear war

Three technical aspects of thermonuclear weapons have made thermonuclear war a peril to the very existence of humanity. These aspects are: the enormous destructive power of a thermonuclear explosion, the relative cheapness of rocket-thermonuclear weapons and the practical impossibility of an effective defense against a massive rocket-nuclear attack.

[1]

Today one can consider a three-megaton nuclear warhead as "typical" (this is somewhere between the warhead of a Minuteman and of a Titan II). The area of fires from the explosion of such a warhead is 150 times greater than from the Hiroshima bomb and the area of destruction is 30 times greater. The detonation of such a warhead over a city would create a 100-square-kilometer [40 square-mile] area of total destruction and fire.

Tens of millions of square meters of living space would be destroyed. No fewer than a million people would perish under the ruins of buildings, from fire and radiation, suffocate in the dust and smoke or die in shelters buried under debris. In the event of a ground-level explosion, the fallout of radioactive dust would create a danger of fatal exposure in an area of tens of thousands of square kilometers.

[2]

A few words about the cost and the possible number of explosions.

After the stage of research and development has been passed, mass production of thermonuclear weapons and carrier rockets is no more complex and expensive than, for example, the production of military aircraft, which were produced by the tens of thousands during the war.

The annual production of plutonium in the world now is in the tens of thousands of tons. If one assumes that half this output goes for military purposes and that an average of several kilograms of plutonium goes into one warhead, then enough warheads have already been accumulated to destroy mankind many times over.

[3]

The third aspect of thermonuclear peril (along with the power and cheapness of warheads) is what we term the practical impossibility of preventing a massive rocket attack. This situation is well known to specialists. In the popular scientific literature, for example, one can read this in an article by Richard L. Garwin and Hans A. Bethe in the *Scientific American* of March, 1968.

The technology and tactics of attack have now far surpassed the technology of defense despite the development of highly maneuverable and powerful antimissiles with nuclear warheads and despite other technical ideas, such as the use of laser rays and so forth.

Improvements in the resistance of warheads to shock waves and to the radiation effects of neutron and x-ray exposure, the possibility of mass use of relatively light and inexpensive decoys that are virtually indistinguishable from warheads and exhaust the capabilities of an antimissile defense system, a perfection of tactics of massed and concentrated attacks, in time and space, that overstrain the defense detection centers, the use of orbital and fractional-orbital attacks, the use of active and passive jamming and other methods not disclosed in the press—all this has created technical and economic obstacles to an effective missile defense that, at the present time, are virtually insurmountable.

The experience of past wars shows that the first use of a new technical or tactical method of attack is usually highly effective even if a simple antidote can soon be developed. But in a thermonuclear war the first blow may be the decisive one and render null and void years of work and billions spent on creation of an antimissile system.

An exception to this would be the case of a great technical and economic difference in the potentials of two enemies. In such a case, the stronger side, creating an antimissile defense system with a multiple reserve, would face the temptation of ending the dangerous and unstable balance once and for all by embarking on a pre-emptive adventure, expending part of its attack potential on destruction of most of the enemy's launching bases and counting on impunity for the last stage of escalation, i.e., the destruction of the cities and industry of the enemy.

Fortunately for the stability of the world, the difference between the technical-economic potentials of the Soviet Union and the United States is not so great that one of the sides could undertake a "preventive aggression" without an almost inevitable risk of a destructive retaliatory blow. This situation would not be changed by a broadening of the arms race through the development of antimissile defenses.

In the opinion of many people, an opinion shared by the author, a diplomatic formulation of this mutually comprehended situation for example, in the form of a moratorium on the construction of antimissile systems, would be a useful demonstration of a desire of the Soviet Union and the United States to preserve the status quo and not to widen the arms race for senselessly expensive antimissile systems. It would be a demonstration of a desire to cooperate not to fight.

Two Doctrines Declined

A thermonuclear war cannot be considered a continuation of politics by other means (according to the formula of Clausewitz). It would be a means of universal suicide.

Two kinds of attempts are being made to portray thermonuclear war as an "ordinary" political act in the eyes of public opinion. One is the concept of the "paper tiger," the concept of the irresponsible Maoist adventurists. The other is the strategic doctrine of escalation, worked out by scientific and militarist circles in the United States. Without minimizing the seriousness of the challenge inherent in that doctrine, we will just note that the political strategy of peaceful coexistence is an effective counterweight to the doctrine.

A complete destruction of cities, industry, transport and systems of education, a poisoning of fields, water and air by radioactivity, a physical destruction of the large part of mankind, poverty, barbarism, a return to savagery and a genetic degeneracy of the survivors under the impact of radiation, a destruction of the material and information basis of civilization—this is a measure of the peril that threatens the world as a result of the estrangement of the world's two superpowers.

Every rational creature, finding itself on the brink of a disaster, first tries to get away from the brink and only then does it think about the satisfaction of its other needs. If mankind is to get away from the brink, it must overcome its divisions.

A vital step would be a review of the traditional method of international affairs, which may be termed "empirical-competitive." In the simplest definition, this is a method aiming at maximum improvement of one's position everywhere possible and, simultaneously, a method of causing maximum unpleasantness to opposing forces without consideration of common welfare and common interests.

If politics were a game of two gamblers, then this would be the only possible method. But where does such a method lead in the present unprecedented situation?

The War in Vietnam

In Vietnam, the forces of reaction lacking hope for an expression of national will in their favor, are using the force of military pressure. They are violating all legal and moral norms and are carrying out flagrant crimes against humanity. An entire people is being sacrificed to the proclaimed goal of stopping the "communist tide."

They strive to conceal from the American people considerations of personal and party prestige, the cynicism and cruelty, the hopelessness and ineffectiveness of the anti-Communist tasks of American policy in Vietnam, as well as the harm this war is doing to the true goals of the American people, which coincide with the universal tasks of bolstering peaceful coexistence.

To end the war in Vietnam would first of all save the people perishing there. But it also is a matter of saving peace in all the world. Nothing undermines the possibilities of peaceful coexistence more than a continuation of the war in Vietnam.

The Middle East

Another tragic example is the Middle East. If direct responsibility on Vietnam rests with the United States, in the Middle East direct responsibility rests not with the United States but with the Soviet Union (and with Britain in 1948 and 1956).

On one hand, there was an irresponsible encouragement of so-called Arab unity (which in no way had a socialist character—look at Jordan—but was purely nationalist and anti-Israel). It was said that the struggle of the Arabs had an essentially anti-imperialist character. On the other hand, there was an equally irresponsible encouragement of Israeli extremists.

We cannot here analyze the entire contradictory and tragic history of the events of the last 20 years, in the course of which the Arabs and Israel, along with historically justified actions, carried out reprehensible

deeds, often brought about by the actions of external forces.

Thus in 1948, Israel waged a defensive war. But in 1956, the actions of Israel appeared reprehensible. The preventive six-day war in the face of threats of destruction by merciless, numerically vastly superior forces of the Arab coalition could have been justifiable. But the cruelty to refugees and prisoners of war and the striving to settle territorial questions by military means must be condemned. Despite this condemnation, the breaking of relations with Israel appears a mistake, complicating a peaceful settlement in this region and complicating a necessary diplomatic recognition of Israel by the Arab governments.

In our opinion, certain changes must be made in the conduct of international affairs, systematically subordinating all concrete aims and local tasks to the basic task of actively preventing an aggravation of the international situation, of actively pursuing and expanding peaceful coexistence to the level of cooperation, of making policy in such a way that its immediate and long-range effects will in no way sharpen international tensions and will not create difficulties for either side that would strengthen the forces of reaction, militarism, nationalism, Fascism and revanchism.

International affairs must be completely permeated with scientific methodology and a democratic spirit, with a fearless weighing of all facts, views and theories, with maximum publicity of ultimate and intermediate goals and with a consistency of principles.

New Principles Proposed

The international policies of the world's two leading superpowers (the United States and the Soviet Union) must be based on a universal acceptance of unified and general principles, which we initially would formulate as follows:

[1]

All peoples have the right to decide their own fate with a free expression of will. This right is guaranteed by international control over observance by all governments of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man." International control presupposes the use of economic sanctions as well as the use of military forces of the United Nations in defense of "the rights of man."

[2]

All military and military-economic forms of export of revolution and counterrevolution are illegal and are tantamount to aggression.

[3]

All countries strive toward mutual help in economic, cultural and general organizational problems with the aim of eliminating painlessly all domestic and international difficulties and preventing a sharpening of international tensions and a strengthening of the forces of reaction.

[4]

International policy does not aim at exploiting local, specific conditions to widen zones of influence and create difficulties for another country. The goal of international policy is to insure universal fulfillment of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" and to prevent a sharpening of international tensions and a strengthening of militarist and nationalist tendencies.

Such a set of principles would in no way be a betrayal of the revolutionary and national liberation struggle, the struggle against reaction and counterrevolution. On the contrary, with the elimination of all doubtful cases, it would be easier to take decisive action in those extreme cases of reaction, racism and militarism that allow no course other than armed struggle. A strengthening of peaceful coexistence would create an opportunity to avert such tragic events as those in Greece and Indonesia.

Such a set of principles would present the

Soviet armed forces with a precisely defined defensive mission, a mission of defending our country and our allies from aggression. As history has shown, our people and their armed forces are unconquerable when they are defending their homeland and its great social and cultural achievements.

Hunger and overpopulation

Specialists are paying attention to a growing threat of hunger in the poorer half of the world. Although the 50 per cent increase of the world's population in the last 30 years has been accompanied by a 70 per cent increase in food production, the balance in the poorer half of the world has been unfavorable. The situation in India, Indonesia, in a number of countries of Latin America and in a large number of other underdeveloped countries—the absence of technical-economic reserves, competent officials and cultural skills, social backwardness, a high birth rate—all this systematically worsens the food balance and without doubt will continue to worsen it in the coming years.

The answer would be a wide application of fertilizers, an improvement of irrigation systems, better farm technology, wider use of the resources of the oceans and a gradual perfection of the production, already technically feasible, of synthetic foods, primarily amino acids. However, this is all fine for the rich nations. In the more backward countries, it is apparent from an analysis of the situation and existing trends that an improvement cannot be achieved in the near future, before the expected date of tragedy, 1975-80.

What is involved is a prognosticated deterioration of the average food balance in which localized food crises merge into a sea of hunger, intolerable suffering and desperation, the grief and fury of millions of people. This is a tragic threat to all mankind. A catastrophe of such dimensions cannot but have profound consequences for the entire world and for every human being. It will provoke a wave of wars and hatred, a decline of standards of living throughout the world and will leave a tragic, cynical and anti-Communist mark on the life of future generations.

The first reaction of a Philistine in hearing about the problem is that "they" are responsible for their plight because "they" reproduce so rapidly. Unquestionably, control of the birth rate is important and the people, in India for example, are taking steps in this direction. But these steps remain largely ineffective under social and economic backwardness, surviving traditions of large families, an absence of old-age benefits, a high infant mortality rate until, quite recently, and a continuing threat of death from starvation.

It is apparently futile only to insist that the more backward countries restrict their birth rates. What is needed most of all is economic and technical assistance to these countries. This assistance must be of such scale and generosity that it is absolutely impossible before the estrangement in the world and the egotistical, narrow-minded approach to relations between nations and races is eliminated. It is impossible as long as the United States and the Soviet Union, the world's two great superpowers, look upon each other as rivals and opponents.

Social factors play an important role in the tragic present situation and the still more tragic future of the poor regions. It must be clearly understood that if a threat of hunger is, along with a striving toward national independence, the main cause of "agrarian" revolution, the "agrarian" revolution in itself will not eliminate the threat of hunger, at least not in the immediate future. The threat of hunger cannot be eliminated without the assistance of the developed countries, and this requires significant changes in their foreign and domestic policies.

Inequality of American Negroes

At this time, the white citizens of the United States are unwilling to accept even minimum sacrifices to eliminate the unequal economic and cultural position of the country's black citizens, who make up 10 per cent of the population.

It is necessary to change the psychology of the American citizens so that they will voluntarily and generously support their government and worldwide efforts to change the economy, technology and level of living of billions of people. This, of course, would entail a serious decline in the United States rate of economic growth. The Americans should be willing to do this solely for the sake of lofty and distant goals, for the sake of preserving civilization and mankind on our planet.

Similar changes in the psychology of people and practical activities of governments must be achieved in the Soviet Union and other developed countries.

In the opinion of the author, a 15-year tax equal to 20 per cent of national incomes must be imposed on developed nations. The imposition of such a tax would automatically lead to a significant reduction in expenditures for weapons. Such common assistance would have an important effect of stabilizing and improving the situation in the most under-developed countries, restricting the influence of extremists of all types.

Changes in the economic situation of underdeveloped countries would solve the problem of high birth rates with relative ease, as has been shown by the experience of developed countries, without the barbaric method of sterilization.

Certain changes in the policies, viewpoints and traditions on this delicate question are inescapable in the advanced countries as well. Mankind can develop smoothly only if it looks upon itself in a demographic sense as a unit, a single family without divisions into nations other than in matters of history and traditions.

Therefore, government policy, legislation on the family and marriage and propaganda should not encourage an increase in the birth rates of advanced countries while demanding that it be curtailed in underdeveloped countries that are receiving assistance. Such a two-faced game would produce nothing but bitterness and nationalism.

In conclusion on that point, I want to emphasize that the question of regulating birth rates is highly complex and that any standardized, dogmatic solution "for all time and all peoples" would be wrong. All the foregoing, incidentally, should be accepted with the reservation that it is somewhat of a simplification.

Pollution of Environment

We live in a swiftly changing world. Industrial and water-engineering projects, cutting of forests, plowing up of virgin lands, the use of poisonous chemicals—all this is changing the face of the earth, our "habitat."

Scientific study of all the interrelationships in nature and the consequences of our interference clearly lag behind the changes. Large amounts of harmful wastes of industry and transport are being dumped into the air and water, including cancer-inducing substances. Will the safe limit be passed everywhere, as has already happened in a number of places?

Carbon dioxide from the burning of coal is altering the heat-reflecting qualities of the atmosphere. Sooner or later, this will reach a dangerous level. But we do not know when. Poisonous chemicals used in agriculture are penetrating into the body of man and animals directly and in more dangerous modified compounds, causing serious damage to the brain, the nervous system, blood-forming organs, the liver and other organs.

Here, too, the safe limit can be easily crossed, but the question has not been fully studied and it is difficult to control all these processes.

The use of antibiotics in poultry raising has led to the development of new disease-causing microbes that are resistant to antibiotics.

I could also mention the problems of dumping detergents and radioactive wastes, erosion and salinization of soils, the flooding of meadows, the cutting of forests on mountain slopes and in watersheds, the destruction of birds and other useful wildlife like toads and frogs and many other examples of senseless despoliation caused by local, temporary, bureaucratic and egotistical interest and sometimes simply by questions of bureaucratic prestige, as in the sad fate of Lake Balkal.

The problem of geohygiene (earth hygiene) is highly complex and closely tied to economic and social problems. This problem can therefore not be solved on a national and especially not on a local basis. The salvation of our environment requires that we overcome our divisions and the pressure of temporary, local interests. Otherwise, the Soviet Union will poison the United States with its wastes and vice versa. At present, this is a hyperbole. But with a 10 per cent annual increase of wastes, the increase over 100 years will be 20,000 times.

Police dictatorships

An extreme reflection of the dangers confronting modern social development is the growth of racism, nationalism and militarism and, in particular, the rise of demagogic, hypocritical and monstrously cruel dictatorial police regimes. Foremost are the regimes of Stalin, Hitler and Mao Tse-tung, and a number of extremely reactionary regimes in smaller countries, Spain, Portugal, South Africa, Greece, Albania, Haiti and other Latin American countries.

These tragic developments have always derived from the struggle of egotistical and group interests, the struggle for unlimited power, suppression of intellectual freedom, a spread of intellectually simplified, narrow-minded mass myths (the myth of race, of land and blood, the myth about the Jewish danger, anti-intellectualism, the concept of lebensraum in Germany, the myth about the sharpening of the class struggle and proletarian infallibility bolstered by the cult of Stalin and by exaggeration of the contradictions with capitalism in the Soviet Union, the myth about Mao Tse-tung, extreme Chinese nationalism and the resurrection of the lebensraum concept, of anti-intellectualism, extreme antihumanism and certain prejudices of peasant socialism in China).

The usual practice is the use of demagoguery, storm troopers and Red Guards in the first stage and terrorist bureaucracy with reliable cadres of the type of Eichmann, Himmler, Yezhov and Beria at the summit of the defilement of unlimited power.

The Rule of Hitler

The world will never forget the burning of books in the squares of German cities, the hysterical cannibalistic speeches of the Fascist "fuehrers" and their even more cannibalistic plans for the destruction of entire peoples, including the Russians. Fascism began a partial realization of these plans during the war it unleashed, annihilating prisoners of war and hostages, burning villages, carrying out a criminal policy of genocide (during the war, the main blow of genocide was aimed at the Jews, a policy that apparently was also meant to be provocative, especially in the Ukraine and Poland).

We shall never forget the kilometer-long trenches filled with bodies, the gas chambers, the SS dogs, the fanatical doctors, the piles of women's hair, suitcases with gold teeth and fertilizer from the factories of death.

Analyzing the causes of Hitler's coming to power, we will never forget the role of German and international monopolist capital. We also will not forget the criminally sectarian and dogmatically narrow policies of Stalin and his associates, setting Socialists and Communists against one another (this has been well related in the famous letter to Ilya Ehrenburg by Ernst Henri).

The Stalinist Period

Fascism lasted 12 years in Germany. Stalinism lasted twice as long in the Soviet Union. There are many common features but also certain differences. Stalinism exhibited a much more subtle kind of hypocrisy and demagoguery, with reliance not on an openly cannibalistic program like Hitler's but on a progressive, scientific and popular socialist ideology.

This served as a convenient screen for deceiving the working class, for weakening the vigilance of the intellectuals and other rivals in the struggle for power, with the treacherous and sudden use of the machinery of torture, execution and informants, intimidating and making fools of millions of people, the majority of whom were neither cowards nor fools. As a consequence of this "specific feature" of Stalinism, it was the Soviet people, its most active, talented and honest representatives, who suffered the most terrible blow.

At least 10 to 15 million people perished in the torture chambers of the N.K.V.D. [secret police] from torture and execution, in camps for exiled kulaks [rich peasants] and so-called semi-kulaks and members of their families and in camps "without the right of correspondence" (which were in fact the prototypes of the Fascist death camps where, for example, thousands of prisoners were machine-gunned because of "overcrowding" or as a result of "special orders").

People perished in the mines of Norilsk and Vorkuta from freezing, starvation and exhausting labor, at countless construction projects, in timber cutting, building of canals or simply during transportation in prison trains, in the overcrowded holds of "death ships" in the Sea of Okhotsk and during the resettlement of entire peoples, the Crimean Tatars, the Volga Germans, the Kalmyks and other Caucasus peoples. Readers of the literary journal *Novy Mir* recently could read for themselves a description of the "road of death" between Norilsk and Igarka [in northern Siberia].

Temporary masters were replaced (Yagoda, Molotov, Yezhov, Zhdanov, Malenkov, Beria), but the antipeople's regime of Stalin remain equally cruel and at the same time dogmatically narrow and blind in its cruelty. The killing of military and engineering officials before the war, the blind faith in the "reasonableness" of the colleague in crime, Hitler, and the other reasons for the national tragedy of 1941 have been well described in the book by Nekrich, in the notes of Maj. Gen. Grigorenko and other publications—these are far from the only examples of the combination of crime, narrow-mindedness and short-sightedness.

Stalinist dogmatism and isolation from real life was demonstrated particularly in the countryside, in the policy of unlimited exploitation and the predatory forced deliveries at "symbolic" prices, in the almost serf-like enslavement of the peasantry, the depriving of peasants of the most simple means of mechanization and the appointment of collective-farm chairmen on the basis of their cunning and obsequiousness. The results are evident—a profound and hard-to-correct destruction of the economy and way of life in the countryside, which, by the law of interconnected vessels, damaged industry as well.

The inhuman character of Stalinism was demonstrated by the repressions of prisoners of war who survived Fascist camps and then

were thrown into Stalinist camps, the anti-worker "decrees," the criminal exile of entire peoples condemned to slow death, the unenlightened zoological kind of anti-Semitism that was characteristic of Stalinist bureaucracy and the N.K.V.D. (and Stalin personally), the Ukrainophobia characteristic of Stalin and the draconian laws for the protection of socialist property (five years' imprisonment for stealing some grain from the fields and so forth) that served mainly as a means of fulfilling the demands of the "slave market."

An Unpublished History

A profound analysis of the origin and development of Stalinism is contained in the 1,000-page monograph of R. Medvedev. This was written from a socialist, Marxist point of view and is a successful work, but unfortunately it has not yet been published. The present author is not likely to receive such a compliment from Comrade Medvedev, who finds elements of "Westernism" in his views. Well, there is nothing like controversy! Actually the views of the present author are profoundly socialist and he hopes that the attentive reader will understand this.

The author is quite aware of the monstrous relations in human and international affairs brought forth by the egotistical principle of capital when it is not under pressure from socialist and progressive forces. He also thinks however, that progressives in the West understand this better than he does and are waging a struggle against these manifestations. The author is concentrating his attention on what is before his eyes and on what is obstructing, from his point of view, a worldwide overcoming of estrangement, obstructing the struggle for democracy, social progress and intellectual freedom.

Our country has started on the path of cleansing away the foulness of Stalinism. "We are squeezing the slave out of ourselves drop by drop" (an expression of Anton Chekhov). We are learning to express our opinions, without taking the lead from the bosses and without fearing for our lives.

Khrushchev Is Credited

The beginning of this arduous and far from straight path evidently dates from the report of Nikita S. Khrushchev to the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist party. This bold speech, which came as a surprise to Stalin's accomplices in crime, and a number of associated measures—the release of hundreds of thousands of political prisoners and their rehabilitation, steps toward a revival of the principles of peaceful coexistence and toward a revival of democracy—oblige us to value highly the historic role of Khrushchev despite his regrettable mistakes of a voluntarist character in subsequent years and despite the fact that Khrushchev, while Stalin was alive, was one of his collaborators in crime, occupying a number of influential posts.

The exposure of Stalinism in our country still has a long way to go. It is imperative, of course, that we publish all authentic documents, including the archives of the N.K.V.D., and conduct nationwide investigations. It would be highly useful for the international authority of the Soviet Communist party and the ideals of socialism if, as was planned in 1964 but never carried out, the party were to announce the "symbolic" expulsion of Stalin, murderer of millions of party members, and at the same time the political rehabilitation of the victims of Stalinism.

In 1936-39 alone more than 1.2 million party members, half of the total membership, were arrested. Only 50,000 regained freedom; the others were tortured during interrogation or were shot (600,000) or died in camps. Only in isolated cases were the rehabilitated allowed to assume responsible posts; even fewer were permitted to take part

in the investigation of crimes of which they had been witnesses or victims.

We are often told lately not to "rub salt into wounds." This is usually being said by people who suffered no wounds. Actually only the most meticulous analysis of the past and of its consequences will now enable us to wash off the blood and dirt that befouled our banner.

It is sometimes suggested in the literature that the political manifestations of Stalinism represented a sort of superstructure over the economic basis of an anti-Leninist pseudosocialism that led to the formation in the Soviet Union of a distinct class—a bureaucratic elite from which all key positions are filled and which is rewarded for its work through open and concealed privileges. I cannot deny that there is some (but not the whole) truth in such an interpretation, which would help explain the vitality of neo-Stalinism, but a full analysis of this issue would go beyond the scope of this article, which focuses on another aspect of the problem.

It is imperative that we restrict in every possible way the influence of neo-Stalinists in our political life. Here we are compelled to mention a specific person. One of the most influential representatives of neo-Stalinism at the present time is the director of the Science Department of the Communist party's Central Committee, Sergei P. Trapeznikov. The leadership of our country and our people should know that the views of this unquestionably intelligent, shrewd and highly consistent man are basically Stalinist (from our point of view, they reflect the interests of the bureaucratic elite).

His views differ fundamentally from the dreams and aspirations of the majority and most active section of the intelligentsia, which, in our opinion, reflect the true interests of all our people and progressive mankind. The leadership of our country should understand that as long as such a man (if I correctly understand the nature of his views) exercises influence, it is impossible to hope for a strengthening of the party's position among scientific and artistic intellectuals. An indication of this was given at the last elections in the Academy of Sciences when S.P. Trapeznikov was rejected by a substantial majority of votes, but this hint was not "understood" by the leadership.

The issue does not involve the professional or personal qualities of Trapeznikov, about which I know little. The issue involves his political views. I have based the foregoing on word-of-mouth evidence. Therefore, I cannot in principle exclude the possibility (although it is unlikely) that in reality everything is quite the opposite. In that pleasant event, I would beg forgiveness and retract what I have written.

THE CULT OF MAOISM

In recent years, demagogy, violence, cruelty and vileness have seized a great country that had embarked on the path of socialist development. I refer, of course, to China. It is impossible without horror and pain to read about the mass contagion of antihumanism being spread by "the great helmsman" and his accomplices, about the Red Guards who, according to the Chinese radio, "jumped with joy" during public executions of "ideological enemies" of Chairman Mao.

The idiocy of the cult of personality has assumed in China monstrous, grotesquely tragicomic forms, carrying to the point of absurdity many of the traits of Stalinism and Hitlerism. But this absurdity has proved effective in making fools of tens of millions of people and in destroying and humiliating millions of more honest and more intelligent people.

The full picture of the tragedy in China is unclear. But in any case, it is impossible to look at it in isolation from the internal economic difficulties of China after the col-

lapse of the adventure of "the great leap forward," in isolation from the struggle by various groups for power, or in isolation from the foreign political situation—the war in Vietnam, the estrangement in the world and the inadequate and lagging struggle against Stalinism in the Soviet Union.

The greatest damage from Maoism is often seen in the split of the world Communist movement. That is, of course, not so. The split is the result of a disease and to some extent represents the way to treat that disease. In the presence of the disease a formal unity would have been a dangerous, unprincipled compromise that would have led the world Communist movement into a blind alley once and for all.

Actually the crimes of the Maoists against human rights have gone much too far, and the Chinese people are now in much greater need of help from the world's democratic forces to defend their rights than in need of the unity of the world's Communist forces, in the Maoist sense, for the purpose of combatting the so-called imperialist peril somewhere in Africa or in Latin America, or in the Middle East.

The threat to intellectual freedom

This is a threat to the independence and worth of the human personality, a threat to the meaning of human life.

Nothing threatens freedom of the personality and the meaning of life like war, poverty, terror. But there are also indirect and only slightly more remote dangers.

One of these is the stupefaction of man (the "gray mass"), to use the cynical term of bourgeois prognosticators) by mass culture with its intentional or commercially motivated lowering of intellectual level and content, with its stress on entertainment or utilitarianism, and with its carefully protective censorship.

Another example is related to the question of education. A system of education under government control, separation of school and church, universal free education—all these are great achievements of social progress. But everything has a reverse side. In this case it is excessive standardization, extending to the teaching process itself, to the curriculum, especially in literature, history, civics, geography, and to the system of examinations.

One cannot but see a danger in excessive reference to authority and in the limitation of discussion and intellectual boldness at an age when personal convictions are beginning to be formed. In the old China, the system of examinations for official positions led to mental stagnation and to the canonizing of the reactionary aspects of Confucianism. It is highly undesirable to have anything like that in a modern society.

Modern technology and mass psychology constantly suggest new possibilities of managing the norms of behavior, the strivings and convictions of masses of people. This involves not only management through information based on the theory of advertising and mass psychology, but also more technical methods that are widely discussed in the press abroad. Examples are biochemical control of the birth rate, biochemical control of psychic processes and electronic control of such processes.

Warns on Experiments

It seems to me that we cannot completely ignore these new methods or prohibit the progress of science and technology, but we must be clearly aware of the awesome dangers to basic human values and to the meaning of life that may be concealed in the misuse of technical and biochemical methods and the methods of mass psychology.

Man must not be turned into a chicken or a rat as in the well known experiments in which elation is induced electrically through electrodes inserted into the brain. Related to this is the question of the ever increasing

use of tranquilizers and antidepressants, legal and illegal narcotics, and so forth.

We also must not forget the very real danger mentioned by Norbert Wiener in his book "Cybernetics," namely the absence in cybernetic machines of stable human norms of behavior. The tempting, unprecedented power that mankind, or, even worse, a particular group in a divided mankind, may derive from the wise counsels of its future intellectual aides, the artificial "thinking" automata, may be, as Wiener warned, become a fatal trap; the counsels may turn out to be incredibly insidious and, instead of pursuing human objectives, may pursue completely abstract problems that had been transformed in an unforeseen manner in the artificial brain.

Such a danger will become quite real in a few decades if human values, particularly freedom of thought, will not be strengthened, if alienation will not be eliminated.

Let us now return to the dangers of today, to the need for intellectual freedom, which will enable the public at large and the intelligentsia to control and assess all acts, designs and decisions of the ruling group.

Marx and Lenin Quoted

Marx once wrote that the illusion that the "bosses know everything best" and "only the higher circles familiar with the official nature of things can pass judgment" was held by officials who equate the public weal with governmental authority.

Both Marx and Lenin always stressed the viciousness of a bureaucratic system as the opposite of a democratic system. Lenin used to say that every cook should learn how to govern. Now the diversity and complexity of social phenomena and the dangers facing mankind have become immeasurably greater; and it is therefore all the more important that mankind be protected against the danger of dogmatic and voluntaristic errors, which are inevitable when decisions are reached in a closed circle of secret advisers or shadow cabinets.

It is no wonder that the problem of censorship (in the broadest sense of the word) has been one of the central issues in the ideological struggle of the last few years. Here is what a progressive American sociologist, Lewis A. Coser, has to say on this point:

"It would be absurd to attribute the alienation of many avant-garde authors solely to the battle with the censors, yet one may well maintain that those battles contributed in no mean measure to such alienation. To these authors, the censor came to be the very symbol of the Phillistinism, hypocrisy and meanness of bourgeois society.

"Many an author who was initially apolitical was drawn to the political left in the United States because the left was in the forefront of the battle against censorship. The close alliance of avant-garde art with avant-garde political and social radicalism can be accounted for, at least in part, by the fact that they came to be merged in the mind of many as a single battle for freedom against all repression" (I quote from an article by Igor Kon, published in *Novy Mir* in January, 1968).

We are all familiar with the passionate and closely argued appeal against censorship by the outstanding Soviet writer A. Solzhenitsyn. He as well as G. Vladimov, G. Svirsky and other writers who have spoken out on the subject have clearly shown how incompetent censorship destroys the living soul of Soviet literature; but the same applies, of course, to all other manifestations of social thought, causing stagnation and dullness and preventing fresh and deep ideas.

Such ideas, after all, can arise only in discussion, in the face of objections, only if there is a potential possibility of expressing not only true, but also dubious ideas. This was clear to the philosophers of ancient

Greece and hardly anyone nowadays would have any doubts on that score. But after 50 years of complete domination over the minds of an entire nation, our leaders seem to fear even allusions to such a discussion.

At this point we must touch on some disgraceful tendencies that have become evident in the last few years. We will cite only a few isolated examples without trying to create a whole picture. The crippling censorship of Soviet artistic and political literature has again been intensified. Dozens of brilliant writings cannot see the light of day. They include some of the best of Solzhenitsyn's works, executed with great artistic and moral force and containing profound artistic and philosophical generalizations. Is this not a disgrace?

Wide indignation has been aroused by the recent decree adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Republic, amending the Criminal Code in direct contravention of the civil rights proclaimed by our Constitution. [The decree included literary protests among acts punishable under Article 190, which deals with failure to report crimes.]

Literary Trials Assailed

The Daniel-Sinyavsky trial, which has been condemned by the progressive public in the Soviet Union and abroad (from Louis Aragon to Graham Greene) and has compromised the Communist system, has still not been reviewed. The two writers languish in a camp with a strict regime and are being subjected (especially Daniel) to harsh humiliations and ordeals.

Most political prisoners are now kept in a group of camps in the Mordvinian Republic, where the total number of prisoners, including criminals, is about 50,000. According to available information, the regime has become increasingly severe in these camps, with personnel left over from Stalinist times playing an increasing role. It should be said, in all fairness, that a certain improvement has been noted very recently; it is to be hoped that this turn of events will continue.

The restoration of Leninist principles of public control over places of imprisonment would undoubtedly be a healthy development. Equally important would be a complete amnesty of political prisoners, and not just the recent limited amnesty, which was proclaimed on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution as a result of a temporary victory of rightist tendencies in our leadership. There should also be a review of all political trials that are still raising doubts among the progressive public.

Was it not disgraceful to allow the arrest, 12-month detention without trial and then the conviction and sentencing to terms of five to seven years of Ginzburg, Galanskov and others for activities that actually amounted to a defense of civil liberties and (partly, as an example) of Daniel and Sinyavsky personally. The author of these lines sent an appeal to the party's Central Committee on Feb. 11, 1967, asking that the Ginzburg-Galanskov case be closed. He received no reply and no explanations on the substance of the case. It was only later that he heard that there had been an attempt (apparently inspired by Semichastny, the former chairman of the K.G.B.) to slander the present writer and several other persons on the basis of inspired false testimony by one of the accused in the Galanskov-Ginzburg case. Subsequently the testimony of that person—Dobrovolsky—was used at the trial as evidence to show that Ginzburg and Galanskov had ties with a foreign anti-Soviet organization, which one cannot help but doubt.

[The reference here is to evidence given by Dobrovolsky in the pretrial investigation of the case of Vladimir Bukovsky, Vadim Delone and Yevgeny Kushev in early 1967. Dobrovolsky said there allegedly existed "a single anti-Communist front ranging from Academicians Sakharov and Leontovich to SMOG," an illegal group of young writers and artists.]

Persecution Is Charged

Was it not disgraceful to permit the conviction and sentencing (to three years in camps) of Khaustov and Bukovsky for participation in a meeting in defense of their comrades? Was it not disgraceful to allow persecution, in the best withhunt tradition, of dozens of members of the Soviet intelligentsia who spoke out against the arbitrariness of judicial and psychiatric agencies, to attempt to force honorable people to sign false, hypocritical "retractions," to dismiss and blacklist people, to deprive young writers, editors and other members of the intelligentsia of all means of existence?

Here is a typical example of this kind of activity.

Comrade B., a woman editor of books on motion pictures, was summoned to the party's district committee. The first question was, Who gave you the letter in defense of Ginzburg to sign? Allow me not to reply to that question, she answered. All right, you can go, we want to talk this over, she was told. The decision was to expel the woman from the party and to recommend that she be dismissed from her job and barred from working anywhere else in the field of culture.

With such methods of persuasion and indoctrination the party can hardly expect to claim the role of spiritual leaders of mankind.

Was it not disgraceful to have the speech at the Moscow party conference by the president of the Academy of Sciences (Mstislav V. Keldysh), who is evidently either too intimidated or too dogmatic in his views? Is it not disgraceful to allow another backsliding into anti-Semitism in our appointments policy (incidentally, in the highest bureaucratic elite of our government, the spirit of anti-Semitism was never fully dispelled after the nineteen thirties).

Was it not disgraceful to continue to restrict the civil rights of the Crimean Tatars, who lost about 46 per cent of their numbers (mainly children and old people) in the Stalinist repressions? Nationality problems will continue to be a reason for unrest and dissatisfaction unless all departures from Leninist principles are acknowledged and analyzed and firm steps are taken to correct mistakes.

Is it not highly disgraceful and dangerous to make increasingly frequent attempts, either directly or indirectly (through silence), to publicly rehabilitate Stalin, his associates and his policy, his pseudosocialism of terroristic bureaucracy, a socialism of hypocrisy and ostentatious growth that was at best a quantitative and one-sided growth involving the loss of many qualitative features? (This is a reference to the basic tendencies and consequences of Stalin's policy, or Stalinism, rather than a comprehensive assessment of the entire diversified situation in a huge country with 200 million people.)

Although all these disgraceful phenomena are still far from the monstrous scale of the crimes of Stalinism and rather resemble in scope the sadly famous McCarthyism of the cold war era, the Soviet public cannot but be highly disturbed and indignant and display vigilance even in the face of insignificant manifestations of neo-Stalinism in our country.

EFFECT ON OTHER PARTIES

We are convinced that the world's Communists will also view negatively any attempts to revive Stalinism in our country, which would, after all, be an awful blow to the attractive force of Communist ideas throughout the world.

Today the key to a progressive restructuring of the system of government in the interests of mankind lies in intellectual freedom. This has been understood, in particular, by the Czechoslovaks and there can be no doubt that we should support their bold initiative, which is so valuable for the future of socialism and all mankind. That support

should be political and, in the early stages, include increased economic aid.

The situation involving censorship (Glavlit) in our country is such that it can hardly be corrected for any length of time simply by "liberalized" directives. Major organizational and legislative measures are required, for example, adoption of a special law on press and information that would clearly and convincingly define what can and what cannot be printed and would place the responsibility on competent people who would be under public control. It is essential that the exchange of information on an international scale (press, tourism and so forth) be expanded in every way, that we get to know ourselves better, that we not try to save on sociological, political and economic research and surveys, which should be conducted not only according to government-controlled programs (otherwise we might be tempted to avoid "unpleasant" subjects and questions).

The basis for hope

The prospects of socialism now depend on whether socialism can be made attractive, whether the moral attractiveness of the ideas of socialism and the glorification of labor, compared with the egotistical ideas of private ownership and the glorification of capital, will be the decisive factors that people will bear in mind when comparing socialism and capitalism, or whether people will remember mainly the limitations of intellectual freedom under socialism or, even worse, the fascist regime of the cult [of personality].

I am placing the accent on the moral aspect because, when it comes to achieving a high productivity of social labor or developing all productive forces or insuring a high standard of living for most of the population, capitalism and socialism seem to have "played to a tie." Let us examine this question in detail.

The United States-Soviet Ski Race

Imagine two skiers racing through deep snow. At the start of the race, one of them, in striped jacket, was many kilometers ahead, but now the skier in the red jacket is catching up to the leader. What can we say about their relative strength? Not very much, since each skier is racing under different conditions. The striped one broke the snow, and the red one did not have to. (The reader will understand that this ski race symbolizes the burden of research and development costs that the country leading in technology has to bear.) All one can say about the race is that there is not much difference in strength between the two skiers.

The parable does not, of course, reflect the whole complexity of comparing economic and technological progress in the United States and the Soviet Union, the relative vitality of RRS and AME (Russian Revolutionary Sweep and American Efficiency.)

We cannot forget that during much of the period in question the Soviet Union waged a hard war and then healed its wounds; we cannot forget that some absurdities in our development were not an inherent aspect of the socialist course of development, but a tragic accident, a serious, though not inevitable, disease.

On the other hand, any comparison must take account of the fact that we are now catching up with the United States only in some of the old, traditional industries, which are no longer as important as they used to be for the United States (for example, coal and steel). In some of the newer fields, for example, automation, computers, petrochemicals and especially in industrial research and development, we are not only lagging behind but are also growing more slowly, so that a complete victory of our economy in the next few decades is unlikely.

It must also be borne in mind that our nation is endowed with vast natural resources, from fertile black earth to coal and

forest, from oil to manganese and diamonds. It must be borne in mind that during the period under review our people worked to the limit of its capacity, which resulted in a certain depletion of resources.

We must also bear in mind the ski-track effect, in which the Soviet Union adopted principles of industrial organization and technological and development previously tested in the United States. Examples are the method of calculating the national fuel budget, assembly-line techniques, antibiotics, nuclear power, oxygen converters in steelmaking, hybrid corn, self-propelled harvester combines, strip mining of coal, rotary excavators, semiconductors in electronics, the shift from steam to diesel locomotives, and much more.

There is only one justifiable conclusion and it can be formulated cautiously as follows:

1. We have demonstrated the vitality of the socialist course, which has done a great deal for the people materially, culturally and socially and, like no other system, has glorified the moral significance of labor.

2. There are no grounds for asserting, as is often done in the dogmatic vein, that the capitalist mode of production leads the economy into a blind alley or that it is obviously inferior to the socialist mode in labor productivity, and there are certainly no grounds for asserting that capitalism always leads to absolute impoverishment of the working class.

Progress by Capitalism

The continuing economic progress being achieved under capitalism should be a fact of great theoretical significance for any non-dogmatic Marxist. It is precisely this fact that lies at the basis of peaceful coexistence and it suggests, in principle, that if capitalism ever runs into an economic blind alley it will not necessarily have to leap into a desperate military adventure. Both capitalism and socialism are capable of long-term development, borrowing positive elements from each other and actually coming closer to each other in a number of essential aspects.

I can just hear the outcries about revisionism and blunting of the class approach to this issue; I can just see the smirks about political naiveté and immaturity. But the facts suggest that there is real economic progress in the United States and other capitalist countries, that the capitalists are actually using the social principles of socialism, and that there has been real improvement of the position of the working people. More important, the facts suggest that on any other course except ever-increasing coexistence and collaboration between the two systems and the two superpowers, with a smoothing of contradictions and with mutual assistance, on any other course annihilation awaits mankind. There is no other way out.

Two Systems Compared

We will now compare the distribution of personal income and consumption for various social groups in the United States and the Soviet Union. Our propaganda materials usually assert that there is crying inequality in the United States, while the Soviet Union has something entirely just, entirely in the interests of the working people. Actually both statements contain half-truths and a fair amount of hypocritical evasion.

I have no intention of minimizing the tragic aspects of the poverty, lack of rights and humiliation of the 22 million American Negroes. But we must clearly understand that this problem is not primarily a class problem, but a racial problem, involving the racism and egotism of white workers, and that the ruling group in the United States is interested in solving this problem. To be sure the government has not been as active as it should be; this may be related to fears of an electoral character and to fears of

upsetting the unstable equilibrium in the country and thus activate extreme leftist and especially extreme rightist parties. It seems to me that we in the socialist camp should be interested in letting the ruling group in the United States settle the Negro problem without aggravating the situation in the country.

At the other extreme, the presence of millionaires in the United States is not a serious economic burden in view of their small number. The total consumption of the rich is less than 20 percent, that is, less than the total rise of national consumption over a five-year period. From this point of view, a revolution, which would be likely to halt economic progress for more than five years, does not appear to be an economically advantageous move for the working people. And I am not even talking of the blood-letting that is inevitable in a revolution. And I am not talking of the danger of the "Irony of history," about which Friedrich Engels wrote so well in his famous letter to V. Zasulich, the "Irony" that took the form of Stalinism in our country.

There are, of course, situations where revolution is the only way out. This applies especially to national uprisings. But that is not the case in the United States and other developed capitalist countries, as suggested, incidentally, in the programs of the Communist parties of these countries.

As far as our country is concerned, here, too, we should avoid painting an idyllic picture. There is still great inequality in property between the city and the countryside, especially in rural areas that lack a transport outlet to the private market or do not produce any goods in demand in private trade. There are great differences between cities with some of the new, privileged industries and those with older, antiquated industries. As a result 40 percent of the Soviet population is in difficult economic circumstances. In the United States about 25 percent of the population is on the verge of poverty. On the other hand the 5 percent of the Soviet population that belong to the managerial group is as privileged as its counterpart in the United States.

The Managerial Group

The development of modern society in both the Soviet Union and the United States is now following the same course of increasing complexity of structure and of industrial management, giving rise in both countries to managerial groups that are similar in social character.

We must therefore acknowledge that there is no qualitative difference in the structure of society of the two countries in terms of distribution of consumption. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of the managerial group in the Soviet Union (and, to a lesser extent, in the United States) is measured not only in purely economic or productive terms. This group also performs a concealed protective function that is rewarded in the sphere of consumption by concealed privileges.

Few people are aware of the practice under Stalin of paying salaries in sealed envelopes, of the constantly recurring concealed distribution of scarce foods and goods for various services, privileges in vacation resorts, and so forth.

I want to emphasize that I am not opposed to the socialist principle of payment based on the amount and quality of labor. Relatively higher wages for better administrators, for highly skilled workers, teachers and physicians, for workers in dangerous or harmful occupations, for workers in science, culture and the arts, all of whom account for a relatively small part of the total wage bill, do not threaten society if they are not accompanied by concealed privileges; moreover, higher wages benefit society if they are deserved.

The point is that every wasted minute of a leading administrator represents a major material loss for the economy and every

wasted minute of a leading figure in the arts means a loss in the emotional, philosophical and artistic wealth of society. But when something is done in secret, the suspicion inevitably arises that things are not clean, that loyal servants of the existing system are being bribed.

It seems to me that the rational way of solving this touchy problem would be not the setting of income ceilings for party members or some such measure, but simply the prohibition of all privileges and the establishment of unified wage rates based on the social value of labor and an economic market approach to the wage problem.

I consider that further advances in our economic reform and a greater role for economic and market factors accompanied by increased public control over the managerial group (which, incidentally, is also essential in capitalist countries) will help eliminate all the roughness in our present distribution pattern.

An even more important aspect of the economic reform for the regulation and stimulation of production is the establishment of a correct system of market prices, proper allocation and rapid utilization of investment funds and proper use of natural and human resources based on appropriate rents in the interest of our society.

A number of socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia are now experimenting with basic economic problems of the role of planning and of the market, government and cooperative ownership, and so forth. These experiments are of great significance.

Rapprochement Advocated

Summing up we now come to our basic conclusion about the moral and ethical character of the advantages of the socialist course of development of human society. In our view, this does not in any way minimize the significance of socialism. Without socialism bourgeois practicalism and the egotistical principle of private ownership gave rise to the "people of the abyss" described by Jack London and earlier by Engels.

Only the competition with socialism and the pressure of the working class made possible the social progress of the 20th century and, all the more, will insure the now inevitable process of rapprochement of the two systems. It took socialism to raise the meaning of labor to the heights of a moral feat. Before the advent of socialism, national egotism gave rise to colonial oppression, nationalism and racism. By now it has become clear that victory is on the side of the humanistic, international approach.

The capitalist world could not help giving birth to the socialist, but now the socialist world should not seek to destroy by force the ground from which it grew. Under the present conditions this would be tantamount to suicide of mankind. Socialism should ennoble that ground by its example and other indirect forms of pressure and then merge with it.

The rapprochement with the capitalist world should not be an unprincipled anti-popular plot between ruling groups, as happened in the extreme case [of the Soviet-Nazi rapprochement] of 1939-40. Such a rapprochement must rest not only on a socialist, but on a popular democratic foundation, under the control of public opinion, as expressed through publicity, elections and so forth.

Such a rapprochement implies not only wide social reforms in the capitalist countries, but also substantial changes in the structure of ownership, with a greater role played by government and cooperative ownership, and the preservation of the basic present features of ownership of the means of production in the socialist countries.

Our allies along this road are not only the working class and the progressive intelligentsia, which are interested in peaceful coexistence and social progress and in a democratic

peaceful transition to socialism (as reflected in the programs of the Communist parties of the developed countries), but also the reformist part of the bourgeoisie, which supports such a program of "convergence." Although I am using this term, taken from the Western literature, it is clear from the foregoing that I have given it a socialist and democratic meaning.

Typical representatives of the reformist bourgeoisie are Cyrus Eaton, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and, especially, President John F. Kennedy. Without wishing to cast a stone in the direction of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev (our high esteem of his services was expressed earlier), I cannot help recalling one of his statements, which may have been more typical of his entourage than of him personally.

On July 10, 1961, in speaking at a reception of specialists about his meeting with Kennedy in Vienna, Comrade Khrushchev recalled Kennedy's request that the Soviet Union, in conducting policy and making demands, consider the actual possibilities and the difficulties of the new Kennedy Administration and refrain from demanding more than it could grant without courting the danger of being defeated in elections and being replaced by rightist forces. At that time, Khrushchev did not give Kennedy's unprecedented request the proper attention, to put it mildly, and began to rail. And now, after the shots in Dallas, who can say what auspicious opportunities in world history have been, if not destroyed, but, at any rate, set back because of a lack of understanding.

Bertrand Russell once told a peace congress in Moscow that "the world will be saved from thermonuclear annihilation if the leaders of each of the two systems prefer complete victory of the other system to a thermonuclear war I am quoting from memory." It seems to me that such a solution would be acceptable to the majority of people in any country, whether capitalist or socialist. I consider that the leaders of the capitalist and socialist systems by the very nature of things will gradually be forced to adopt the point of view of the majority of mankind.

Intellectual freedom of society will facilitate and smooth the way for this trend toward patience, flexibility and a security from dogmatism, fear and adventurism. All mankind, including its best organized and active forces, the working class and the intelligentsia, is interested in freedom and security.

Four-stage plan for cooperation

Having examined in the first part of this essay the development of mankind according to the worse alternative, leading to annihilation, we must now attempt, even schematically, to suggest the better alternative. (The author concedes the primitiveness of his attempts at prognostication, which requires the joint efforts of many specialists, and here, even more than elsewhere, invites positive criticism.)

[1]

In the first stage, a growing ideological struggle in the socialist countries between Stalinist and Maoist forces, on the one hand, and the realistic forces of leftist Leninist Communists (and leftist Westerners), on the other, will lead to a deep ideological split on an international, national and intraparty scale.

In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, this process will lead first to a multiparty system (here and there) and to acute ideological struggle and discussions, and then to the ideological victory of the realists, affirming the policy of increasing peaceful coexistence, strengthening democracy and expanding economic reforms (1960-80). The dates reflect the most optimistic unrolling of events.

The author, incidentally, is not one of those who consider the multiparty system to be an essential stage in the development of

the socialist system or, even less, a panacea for all ills, but he assumes that in some cases a multiparty system may be an inevitable consequence of the course of events when a ruling Communist party refuses for one reason or another to rule by the scientific democratic method required by history.

In the second stage, persistent demands for social progress and peaceful coexistence in the United States and other capitalist countries, and pressure exerted by the example of the socialist countries and by internal progressive forces (the working class and the intelligentsia) will lead to the victory of the leftist reformist wing of the bourgeoisie, which will begin to implement a program of rapprochement (convergence) with socialism, i.e., social progress, peaceful coexistence and collaboration with socialism on a world scale and changes in the structure of ownership. This phase includes an expanded role for the intelligentsia and an attack on the forces of racism and militarism (1972-85). (The various stages overlaps.)

In the third stage, the Soviet Union and the United States, having overcome their alienation, solve the problem of saving the poorer half of the world. The above-mentioned 20 per cent tax on the national income of developed countries is applied. Gigantic fertilizer factories and irrigations systems using atomic power will be built [in the developing countries], the resources of the sea will be used to a vastly greater extent, indigenous personnel will be trained, and industrialization will be carried out. Gigantic factories will produce synthetic amino acids, and synthesize proteins, fats and carbohydrates. At the same time disarmament will proceed (1972-90).

In the fourth stage, the socialist convergence will reduce differences in social structure, promote intellectual freedom, science and economic progress and lead to creation of a world government and the smoothing of national contradictions (1980-2000). During this period decisive progress can be expected in the field of nuclear power, both on the basis of uranium and thorium and, probably, deuterium and lithium.

Some authors consider it likely that explosive breeding (the reproduction of active materials such as plutonium, uranium 233 and tritium) may be used in subterranean or other enclosed explosions.

During this period the expansion of space exploration will require thousands of people to work and live continuously on other planets and on the moon, on artificial satellites and on asteroids whose orbits will have been changed by nuclear explosions.

The synthesis of materials that are superconductors at room temperature may completely revolutionize electrical technology, cybernetics, transportation and communications. Progress in biology (in this and subsequent periods) will make possible effective control and direction of all life processes at the levels of the cell, organism, ecology and society, from fertility and aging to psychic processes and heredity.

If such an all-encompassing scientific and technological revolution, promising uncounted benefits for mankind, is to be possible and safe, it will require the greatest possible scientific foresight and care and concern for human values of a moral, ethical and personal character. (I touched briefly on the danger of a thoughtless bureaucratic use of the scientific and technological revolution in a divided world in the section on "Dangers," but could add a great deal more.) Such a revolution will be possible and safe only under highly intelligent worldwide guidance.

The foregoing program presumes:

(a) worldwide interest in overcoming the present divisions;

(b) the expectation that modifications in both the socialist and capitalist countries will tend to reduce contradictions and differences;

(c) worldwide interest of the intelligentsia, the working class and other progressive forces in a scientific democratic approach to politics, economics and culture;

(d) the absence of unsurmountable obstacles to economic development in both world economic systems that might otherwise lead inevitably into a blind alley, despair and adventurism.

Every honorable and thinking person who has not been poisoned by narrow-minded indifference will seek to insure that future development will be along the lines of the better alternative. However only broad, open discussion, without the pressure of fear and prejudice, will help the majority to adopt the correct and best course of action.

Proposals summarized

In conclusion, I will sum up some of the concrete proposals of varying degrees of importance that have been discussed in the text. These proposals, addressed to the leadership of the country, do not exhaust the content of the article.

[1]

The strategy of peaceful coexistence and collaboration must be deepened in every way. Scientific methods and principles of international policy will have to be worked out, based on scientific prediction of the immediate and more distant consequences.

[2]

The initiative must be seized in working out a broad program of struggle against hunger.

[3]

A law on press and information must be drafted, widely discussed and adopted, with the aim not only of ending irresponsible and irrational censorship, but of encouraging self-study in our society, fearless discussion and the search for truth. The law must provide for the material resources of freedom of thought.

[4]

All anticonstitutional laws and decrees violating human rights must be abrogated.

[5]

Political prisoners must be amnestied and some of the recent political trials must be reviewed (for example, the Daniel-Sinyavsky and Galanskov-Ginzburg cases). The camp regime of political prisoners must be promptly relaxed.

[6]

The exposure of Stalin must be carried through to the end, to the complete truth, and not just to the carefully weighted half-truth dictated by case considerations. The influence of neo-Stalinists in our political life must be restricted in every way (the text mentioned, as an example, the case of S. Trapeznikow, who enjoys too much influence).

[7]

The economic reform must be deepened in every way and the area of experimentation expanded, with conclusions based on the results.

[8]

A law on geohygiene must be adopted after broad discussion, and ultimately become part of world efforts in this area.

With this article the author addresses the leadership of our country and all its citizens as well as all people of goodwill throughout the world. The author is aware of the controversial character of many of his statements. His purpose is open, frank discussion under conditions of publicity.

In conclusion a textological comment. In the process of discussion of previous drafts of this article, some incomplete and in some respects one-sided texts have been circulated. Some of them contained certain passages that were inept in form and tact and were included through oversight. The author asks readers to bear this in mind. The author is deeply grateful to readers of preliminary

drafts who communicated their friendly comments and thus helped improve the article and refine a number of basic statements.—A. Sakharov

PEOPLE MENTIONED IN SAKHAROV MANUSCRIPT

Aragon, Louis (born 1895): French Communist writer, who protested Soviet literary trials.

Beria, Lavrenti P. (1899–1953): Stalin's chief of secret police; executed by Stalin's successors.

Bukovsky, Vladimir: young Soviet writer; sentenced in September, 1967 to three years' imprisonment for participation in an unauthorized demonstration.

Clausewitz, Karl Von (1780–1831): Prussian general and military writer.

Crimean Tatars: Soviet ethnic minority, exiled in World War II for alleged collaboration with the Germans; fully cleared of accusation in July, 1967.

Daniel, Yuli M.: Soviet writer, sentenced in February, 1966, to five years' imprisonment on charges of having slandered the Soviet Union in books published abroad under the pen name Nikolai Arzhak.

Delone, Vadim: young Soviet poet; sentenced with Bukovsky to one year's imprisonment.

Dobrovolsky, Aleksei: contributor to Soviet underground magazine Phoenix 1966; arrested January, 1967 with Ginzburg and Galanskov; turned state's evidence; sentenced in January, 1968, to two years.

Ehrenburg, Ilya: the Soviet novelist who died last August at the age of 76.

Eichmann, Adolf: SS colonel who headed Gestapo's Jewish section; arrested by Israel in May, 1960; tried and executed in May, 1962.

Galanskov, Yuri: editor of Soviet underground magazine Phoenix 1966; sentenced in January, 1968 to seven years' imprisonment for anti-Soviet activity.

Ginzburg, Aleksandr: author of a book on the Sinyavsky-Daniel case that was published abroad; sentenced in January, 1968, to five years' imprisonment for anti-Soviet activity.

Glavlit: the Soviet censorship agency.

Greene, Graham: the British novelist, who protested Soviet literary trials.

Grigorenko, Pyotr G.: former major general in World War II; cashiered in 1964 on charges of anti-Soviet activity.

Henri, Ernst: pseudonym for a Soviet commentator; Semyon Rostovsky, who contributes frequently to the weekly Literaturnaya Gazeta.

Himmler, Heinrich: Hitler's secret police chief; suicide in 1945.

Khaustov, Viktor: sentenced in February, 1967, to three years' imprisonment for organizing demonstration on behalf of arrested writers.

Kushev, Yevgeny: young Soviet poet; sentenced in September, 1967, to one year's imprisonment for participation of protest demonstration.

Leontovich, Mikhail A. (born 1903): Soviet nuclear physicist; an associate of Andrei D. Sakharov.

Malenkov, Georgi M. (born 1902): a close associate of Stalin; expelled from the Soviet leadership by Nikita S. Khrushchev in 1957.

Molotov, Vyacheslav M. (born 1890): a close associate of Stalin; expelled from the Soviet leadership by Nikita S. Khrushchev in 1957.

Nekrich, Aleksandr M.: Soviet historian, author of book on the German attack on the Soviet Union in 1941; reported criticized and ousted from Communist party in 1967.

Semichastny, Vladimir Y.: chairman of the K.G.B., Soviet secret police from 1961 until relieved of his post in May, 1967.

Sinyavsky, Andrei D.: Soviet writer, sentenced in February, 1968, to seven years' imprisonment on charges of having slandered the Soviet Union in books published abroad under the pen name of Abram Tertza.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I.: Soviet writer;

author of "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich"; in official disfavor and unpublished in recent years.

Wiener, Norbert (1894–1964): American mathematician; founder of the science of cybernetics, which laid the basis for computer technology.

Yagoda, Genrikh G.: Stalin's chief of secret police from 1934 to 1936; supervised early phase of great purges; was himself purged and executed in 1938.

Yezhov, Nikolai I.: Stalin's chief of secret police from 1936 to 1938; supervised the main phase of great purges; disappeared in 1939.

Zasluch, Vera I. (1851–1919): early Russian Marxist who had correspondence with Marx and Engels; she opposed terrorism as a revolutionary tactic and joined Menshevik faction against Lenin.

Zhdanov, Andrei A. (1896–1948): a close associate of Stalin, in charge of artistic and scientific policies at height of his career from 1945 to 1948.

OUTSPOKEN SOVIET SCIENTIST: ANDREI DMITRIYEVICH SAKHAROV

In the fall of 1958, the Soviet Communist party newspaper, Pravda, opened its authoritative pages to the views of two prominent nuclear physicists in a nationwide debate on educational reform.

Academician Andrei D. Sakharov, then 37 years old, and a fellow academician, Yakov B. Zeldovich, urged separate schools for specially gifted children to train the future generation of scientists at an early age.

The authors contended that it was indisputable that mathematicians and physicists, at least, were most productive in the early stages of their careers and that many of the great discoveries in those fields had been made by scientists aged 22 to 26.

Dr. Sakharov, for one, was reasoning from personal experience. He earned his doctorate in physics at the age of 26, joined in making a major physical discovery at the age of 29 and, at 32, was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences, the most prestigious position for a Soviet scientist, having skipped the usual intermediate stage of corresponding member.

In recent years Dr. Sakharov (pronounced SAH-khah-roff) has continued to voice his views on public affairs. But instead of being officially sanctioned by publication in Pravda, his opinions, often critical of domestic and foreign policy, were circulating in manuscript among friends and associates.

His latest essay, written last month and now available here, outlines a plan for Soviet-American cooperation and ultimate rapprochement that he views as the only way to save mankind from thermonuclear war, overpopulation and famine, and pollution of the environment.

MEMBER OF THE ELITE

As a member of the scientific and technological elite of Soviet society, and as a man with broad intellectual horizons and range of interests, Dr. Sakharov has not been afraid to speak out, even if his views are in conflict with official policy.

In the spring of 1966, as the new Soviet leadership was preparing to convoke the 23d congress of the Communist party, the country was abuzz with rumors that Mr. Khrushchev's successors were planning to rectify his unqualified 1956 condemnation of Stalin's rule.

Academician Sakharov then joined fellow nuclear physicists and other intellectuals in a petition sent to Leonid I. Brezhnev, the new party chief, opposing any planned restoration of Stalin's status. The petitioners said the Soviet people "will never understand or accept" a rehabilitation of Stalin and they warned of a new split in Communist ranks, between the Soviet party and the Communist parties of the West, if such a step were taken.

It is unclear whether the high prestige of the signers and their argument proved per-

suasive, but no dramatic steps to change Stalin's status were taken at the congress in 1966.

Later that year, Dr. Sakharov again joined a group of petitioners, this time to object to a newly adopted decree that made unauthorized protest demonstrations a crime.

Entirely the product of the Soviet period, Andrei Dmitriyevich Sakharov was born May 21, 1921, and was graduated from Moscow University during the war year of 1942. Scarce published biographical data contain no information about his personal life or family background.

He joined the Lebedev Institute of Physics in Moscow, where he earned his doctorate in 1947 while working with Dr. Igor Y. Tamm, a specialist in quantum mechanics who, in 1958, became one of three Russians to share the Nobel Prize in Physics.

Research by Dr. Tamm and his students led in 1950 to a proposal that provided the theoretical basis for controlled thermonuclear fusion—the harnessing of the power of the hydrogen bomb for the generation of electricity for peaceful purposes.

The principle, involving the use of an electrical discharge in plasma (ionized gas) and heat containment by a magnetic field, furnished the basis for much subsequent controlled-fusion research, in which a breakthrough to commercial application is yet to be achieved.

For their work, both Dr. Sakharov and his teacher were elected full members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in 1953. While Dr. Tamm had held the probationary corresponding membership for 20 years, his young associate moved directly into the highest level of the Soviet scientific elite.

Since 1959, Dr. Sakharov has been associated with Academician Mikhail A. Leontovich in research on the theoretical aspects of controlled fusion.

Dr. Sakharov's work has been publicized in the popular literature. A book for the general reader by V. P. Kartsev, entitled "Stories About Physics," scheduled for publication in Moscow later this year, describes his design for an "explosive-magnetic generator," a device that would produce electricity from an explosion contained by a magnetic field.

Dr. Sakharov was probably influenced in his outlook by Dr. Tamm, himself a candidate and courageous scholar who has attended some of the Pugwash conferences on science and international affairs. The meetings, which brought together scientists of East and West, were named for Pugwash, N.S., a Canadian village where the first conference was sponsored by Cyrus S. Eaton, the Cleveland industrialist.

SENATE RESOLUTION 388—RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ELMER J. HOLLAND OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 388) relative to the death of Representative Elmer J. Holland of Pennsylvania, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 939

Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to

the bill (H.R. 18037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. PASTORE, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 941

Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) proposed an amendment to House bill 18037, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO CERTAIN DEDUCTION BY FARMERS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 940

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 2767, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts, a bill which is pending on the Senate calendar.

My amendment is designed to remove a present inequity in our Federal income tax law with respect to the tax treatment of insurance proceeds received by farmers resulting from the destruction and damage of crops by hail.

Mr. President, the technical problem arises when a farmer produces crops and, quite often, does not sell those crops until the following year. When those crops are destroyed in the same year in which he sells the previous year's crop, under the present tax law, he is required to report and pay tax on the insurance proceeds, which are a substitute for the income from the crops, and the income from the present year's crops in the same year.

If the farmer had not been subject to the vicissitudes of hail, his crops would have been raised and he would have sold them in the following year. There would then have been no doubling up of income.

All my amendment does is to give the farmer the opportunity, where he has consistently followed the practice of selling crops produced in one year in the following year, of avoiding this doubling up hardship.

I trust that the Members of the Senate will recognize this inequity and see fit to agree to my amendment. I propose to call it up at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Thursday, September 12, 1968, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building on the following nominations:

William J. Holloway, Jr., of Oklahoma,

to be U.S. circuit judge, 10th circuit, vice a new position created under Public Law 90-347 approved June 18, 1968.

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Michigan, vice Wade H. McCree, Jr., elevated.

David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge, District of Columbia, vice Joseph C. McGarraghy.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the majority leader.

THE TEST OF COURAGE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the first 8 months of 1968 produced one of the greatest tests of courage in this century. January saw the first halting step of a small country toward the goal of freedom. As the months passed, Czechoslovakia moved a little closer to its goal, and each month the Soviet Union became more threatening. The test of courage for the Czechs and Slovaks was whether, in the name of human dignity, they could stand face to face with an overpowering foe. The test of courage for totalitarian Russia was whether it dared allow one small country even a taste of freedom. Czechoslovakia won that test of courage.

The Russians used military force ruthlessly, not to suppress an armed rebellion as in Hungary, but to halt the mellowing of Communist Party rule of a satellite.

Freedom of expression for the Czechoslovak people, in the view of the Kremlin, was the most dangerous threat to the Soviet system. So the armed forces were ordered to crush the modest reform movement of Alexander Dubcek's Communist government.

The world watched the rape of Czechoslovakia. The courage of these people was magnificent. The cowardice of Russia was blatant. The President of the United States announced that the actions of the Soviet Union shocked the conscience of the world. Other countries, including Communist countries and Communist organizations, joined in the condemnation of this brazen act of oppression.

Western Europe, the United States, and the NATO organization were powerless to do little more than offer sympathy, express admiration for the heroic resistance by the Czechoslovak people, and issue statements criticizing the Kremlin.

The Kremlin may have underestimated the fierceness of the resistance of the people of Czechoslovakia, but I do not

believe for a moment that these leaders miscalculated the reaction of the rest of the world.

For our own Nation that has thrived in freedom, it is especially painful to see the small spark of freedom's light crushed by the tread of Soviet tanks.

The proclaimed threat to Socialist order that was being put down by military might was the hint of freedom. Newspapers, intellectuals, students, men in the street wanted to be able to talk and think. At its best, the January movement was not freedom as we know it—for example, over 900 specific categories of news were still to be censored in the press. However, it was an important first step in the relaxation of Soviet control.

Here in the United States, in our schools, in our Labor Day speeches, we talk of the spirit of freedom and the drive within men to be free. Perhaps, in this modern cradle of freedom, we have forgotten how powerful a force freedom can be.

There is a lesson we can learn: Freedom, decency, and dignity are incompatible with the Communist system. Russia has not forgotten that freedom—national and individual—is its natural enemy. In the Soviet view, their system was threatened, and they struck fast and hard to preserve it.

The harshness with which the suppression was carried out suggests that there has been little erosion in the historic ruthlessness of Soviet Communist leadership.

DÉTENTE

The brutal suppression of Czechoslovakia not only shocked the conscience of the world; it shocked the policymakers in the White House. A military invasion was, in their reasoning, the one step the Soviet Union could not take because it would threaten all the recent peaceful developments and destroy efforts or pretensions at détente.

For several years, the United States has followed what has been called a policy of convergence. It assumes that as Russia develops and prospers, its interests will converge with those of the western democracies and the United States, and détente will result.

To further this convergence, the United States has gone more than half way in seeking accommodation in many ways including working for East-West trade. No treaty or agreement was too miniscule, because the steps were supposed to lead to peaceful coexistence, as we understand the term, and ultimately even to close friendship.

Sensible men cannot fault such attempts to negotiate peacefully with the Communists. But the degree of reliance placed on the assumptions of convergence in attaining our foreign policy objectives has long been in question.

The subjugation of the Czechoslovak people should force second thoughts on even the most ardent disciples of the theory of Soviet melioration.

Let me review briefly six major assumptions underlying the United States recent attempts at détente, and let us consider them in the aftermath of Czechoslovakia:

First. The growing independence of Eastern European Communist countries,

"polycentricism" as this loosening process is known, has convinced the Soviet Union that it cannot maintain an empire in which its own power is the final determinant.

This tenet of détente has been proven wrong.

Second. The growing demands of Soviet citizens for consumer goods has brought about an economic rationalism in the Soviet economy and forced the country to adopt certain capitalist techniques. It has become increasingly apparent that external aggression and revolution are incompatible with the wants and needs of the Soviet people.

The need of international Communist power dictated external aggression against Czechoslovakia without regard to economic rationalism.

Third. After the years of Stalinist terror, liberalization is the only path which the Soviet Union can follow.

Terror is still an effective weapon in the hands of those ruthless enough to use it.

Fourth. After disappointments in attempting to use Communist ideology, the Soviets have turned to realpolitik in world affairs. They will conduct international relations in terms of enlightened self-interest and settle back into conventional patterns of international politics observed by traditional nation states.

"Enlightened self-interest" this time meant a violent reaction wrought by fear of freedom.

Fifth. Faced with a "China" problem, the Soviet Union has realized the necessity of seeking aid from the West.

Russia deliberately alienated the West in order to control Eastern Europe.

Sixth. The Soviets admitted during the Cuban missile crisis they could not match the strategic power of the United States. Logically, then, Russia must come to terms with the United States.

Strategic power was irrelevant in this crisis, and the Soviet Union continues to ignore the United States and NATO as it threatens Rumania.

Mr. President, the deliberate, indefensible attack on Czechoslovakia has shown each of the premises to be wrong or misinterpreted. The conclusion drawn from them was a miscalculation. Russia has not been forced to follow peaceful ways.

It is these premises, nonetheless, that have guided the détente mentality of our relations with the Soviet Union in recent years. Always fearing to offend, we pursued foreign relations and national security from a position of self-effacing courtesy rather than a position of strength and firmness.

It is under the protective umbrella of détente that we have allowed NATO to deteriorate, that we have redeployed military forces in Europe, and that we have considered substantial troop reductions.

It is under the protective umbrella of détente that our Nation has announced and pursued a program and policy of building bridges from West to East.

On August 20, 1968, it became fatefully obvious that the umbrella was illusory. The premises on which our détente policy was based were swept away when Warsaw Pact troops crossed the borders of Czechoslovakia.

OUR RESPONSE

Mr. President, our policymakers have had a rude shock, and it is time to re-evaluate and reexamine their decisions. I urge, therefore, thoughtful and serious review of U.S. policy in two critical areas:

First. A full-scale conference of North Atlantic Treaty Organization foreign ministers and defense ministers should be convened to review mutual defense arrangements in Europe.

Second. Concurrently, the United States must review, in depth, its current policy of bridgebuilding to the Soviets.

The announcement this past weekend that NATO is reviewing defense arrangements is a welcome one. But there was no sense of urgency in that action. The response belies the seriousness of the situation.

I am not suggesting a provocative over-reaction by NATO to events in Eastern Europe. I am suggesting that the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the rumored threats to Rumania, and the admitted shift in the balance of power in Eastern Europe requires a response equal to the gravity of the situation.

The policy of silence followed by the administration in the Czechoslovak crisis was obviously ineffective as a deterrent to the Soviet power play. The President's warning not to loose the dogs of war in Europe indicates concern over the continuing crisis. But we must go further and take those nonaggressive steps which will demonstrate the serious view which the United States and its NATO allies take of the actions by the "new" Russia.

NATO's effectiveness must be scrutinized in the light of this most recent Soviet action as a testimonial to Soviet intentions. It ranks alongside the smashing of Hungary, the installation of missiles in Cuba, the underwriting of North Vietnam's war effort, the recent increase in the Soviet military budget, and the building and deployment in new locations of formidable naval power.

The strength or, more accurately, the weakness of NATO military forces apparently gave the Soviets little cause for concern. The Communist armies moved with impunity on Czechoslovakia. They will have similar freedom of action if they decide to punish Rumania.

Cognizance should be taken of the recent buildup of Soviet naval power in the Mediterranean because it has further upset the balance of power in Europe and the Middle East. The Mediterranean is no longer a Western lake. Russia also has made striking gains in the Middle East, where her influence is substantial for the first time in U.S. history.

The nuclear superiority enjoyed by the United States immediately after World War II, and well into the 1950's, is gone. Our nuclear deterrent, although vital, is deterred. The balance of power in Europe now rests with nonnuclear forces. And the Soviets have an abundance of superiority on the ground. Our belief in the theory of Soviet mellowing has debilitated our entire military strategy. Now it appears that NATO must be revitalized.

Strengthening NATO does not mean larger U.S. forces and support. We are contributing our share or more than

our share now. It does mean greater cooperation by our European partners.

A reappraisal of NATO should look carefully into the reasons for the lack of enthusiasm in Western Europe for support of this organization for common defense. Has, for example, U.S. strategy made NATO uncreditable in Europe? Did General de Gaulle order NATO forces from France from mere petulance, or did he distrust the strategy that we dictated in NATO? If so, does the credibility gap extend to our other partners? These are questions the answers to which have been made urgent by Soviet actions.

Mr. President, I will not attempt to examine all facets of the need for reevaluation of our foreign policy in the light of our horror over Czechoslovakia. I do not have enough information or resources to carry out an exhaustive examination. But I do feel that the repressive steps taken by the Warsaw Pact nations are a clear and obvious rebuke to those who contend that communism is mellowing. It is in this light that we must review our policy of "building bridges" to the East.

The implication of Czechoslovakia, as well as other Soviet actions, suggest to me that U.S. policy toward Russia in recent years has been based on erroneous assumptions, and has been dangerous to our own best interests.

Seventeen months ago, I argued in this Chamber that the Communist threat to the free world had become greater and not less; that the increased threat was not just military, or political, or economic, but all of these—a strategic threat.

I raise this subject not as a partisan issue. Indeed, both party platforms recognize the real dangers offered by Russia today. The occupation of Czechoslovakia was called by the Democrats "a shocking reminder that we live in a dangerous and unpredictable world. The reimposition of Soviet tyranny raises the specter of the darkest days of the Stalin era and increases the risk of war in central Europe, a war that could become a nuclear holocaust."

The Republican platform, written before the invasion of Czechoslovakia, pledges that:

Only when Communist nations prove by actual deeds that they genuinely seek world peace and will live in harmony with the rest of the world, will we support expansion of East-West trade.

Candor is necessary to unravel the issues of détente, and without recrimination, I refer to my remarks on the floor of this Senate on March 14, 1967, during the debate on the Consular Treaty. Today, I repeat in part what I said then:

Basically, the entire matter boils down to how one views the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement today. If the Soviet Union is truly undergoing a period of deep and profound change, and if it is now charting a course of cooperation with emphasis on peace rather than conflict, then those who argue in the spirit of the "détente mentality" for "restraint" on the part of the United States and for expanded East-West trade are entirely correct. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Union has not undergone a meaningful change in terms of its long-range goals vis-a-vis the world, and if it persists in declaring that its ultimate

goal is victory over the United States and other non-Communist countries, then the decisions made in the spirit of the détente and in such important matters as expanded East-West trade are wrong and, therefore, endanger in a most meaningful way our national security.

If we were in fact prepared to pursue, in the most consistent and dynamic fashion certain political objectives vis-a-vis Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in return for expanded East-West trade, then a very strong case could be made for a cautious and systematic expansion of the trade pattern with those nations. Thus, if we are prepared to make certain precise demands upon those countries which want and need our trade and credits necessary to support that trade, then our objectives should be clearly spelled out to the Congress of the United States and to the American people. Mere expansion of trade without accompanying concrete political goals will come to naught. Only the interests of the Communists will be served if we are not in fact able to achieve the political objectives which the Administration currently promises.

Far from manifesting good will, the Communists repeatedly underscore their own desire to "win" over us, to defeat us thoroughly, and to see us "buried." The latter statement has been rationalized by those who share the détente mentality as a misunderstanding on our part, or a slip of the tongue by its author, Khrushchev. That such is not the case is clearly indicated by the mountains of evidence which have accumulated in Communist documents and other Communist sources over the past years.

Mr. President, in Vietnam American troops are being killed by Soviet-produced and Soviet-financed equipment.

From Cuba subversion is being exported throughout South America.

In Guatemala City, the U.S. Ambassador John Mein was machinegunned to death by Castroite guerrillas.

In the Middle East, Egypt rearms and Soviet ships ply the Mediterranean.

These are facts about the Soviet Union that must be weighed today.

Czech and Slovak patriots did not achieve freedom for themselves. They did, however, reach up to the Russian giant and strip away the mask of decency and reason. In this nuclear age, we must be willing to negotiate, but let us recognize the ruthless nature of our adversary.

OUR TEST OF COURAGE

In the light of this most recent shock of reality, I call upon the President to request a meeting of foreign ministers and defense ministers of the NATO countries; I call upon the Congress and the administration to reexamine the goals, the premises, and the interpretation underlying our policy toward the Soviet Union.

Just as for a man, it is difficult for a government to admit it was wrong. It is hard to search for realistic peace against a ruthless adversary. Regrettably, the optimists have nearly always been wrong concerning Soviet intentions. The threat has not diminished but has been successively intensified—politically, economically, and now militarily.

This Nation cannot allow wishful thinking to color the facts and obliterate obstacles. We must accept reality. This, Mr. President, is the test of courage for the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to compliment the Senator and commend him for this very hard-hitting and forceful statement with respect to the crisis that has been engendered in Czechoslovakia.

I think it is patent now in every part of the world that, little by little, a ferment has developed in the Soviet Union as the people there reach out, not merely for more consumer goods, but also for the chance to express themselves; and the very fact that they have carried on these programs against the authors and the writers of the Soviet Union who speak out freely is the best evidence I can think of as to whether or not the old Stalinist viewpoint is coming back.

The only sin that was charged against Czechoslovakia, certainly, was that Dubcek, their leader, refused to discipline at least 60 editors who were bold and courageous enough to present, all over again, the story of Jan Masaryk, the great Czech hero, on the front pages of their newspapers. When the Soviet demand was made that Dubcek discipline those editors, he very forthrightly refused to do so.

I noticed that of the five items that seemed to be at the base of this matter and its motivation, three of them, certainly, deal with freedom of expression, whether by individuals or by groups, or whether through the publications that are published in Czechoslovakia.

On the heels of this matter comes Rumania and the threat to her freedom. Freedom is an indivisible fabric, Mr. President, and we do have to take account of it. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has suggested that the President now convene our leaders and take a new look at our policy so far as it appertains to the Soviet Union, because if this destruction of freedom can go on, then, of course, freedom is in jeopardy in every part of the world, including the United States of America.

We have those who think that communism is not a threat in this country, and who shrug off and laugh off the suggestions that it is. Mr. President, I went to a lot of trouble and took an awful scolding to carry on and keep alive the Subversive Activities Control Board. I do not know how much I was pilloried in the press and in the letters of people; but I was determined to keep it alive, because it is the only board in the executive branch of the Government that deals with the matter of subversion and our internal security; and if it had done even less than was alleged, I still would have made that struggle to keep it alive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I, too, wish to express commendation to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for the very forceful statement which he has made about the grave injustice perpetrated by imperialistic Russia upon the Czechoslovak people. I treasure what the Senator has said because I know of his Czech background. Probably more than any other Member of the Senate, Senator HRUSKA is sensitive to the heartbeat of the Czech people. He knows the ordeals through which they have gone in their history, in the effort to achieve freedom for themselves and other people around the world.

I am especially impressed by certain aspects of what the Senator has just said. He stated, if I may quote from his speech:

We must go further and take those non-aggressive steps which will demonstrate the serious view which the United States and its NATO allies take of the actions by the "new" Russia.

The Senator further stated:

But I do feel that the repressive steps taken by the Warsaw Pact nations are a clear and obvious rebuke to those who contend that Communism is mellowing.

I concur with what the Senator from Illinois said a moment ago, that too many in high public office in this country have taken the attitude that we have no cause for fear of Russia.

The Senator from Nebraska further stated:

It is in this light that we must review our policy of "building bridges" to the East.

Can we, Mr. President, continue telling our people throughout this Nation, "Russia has mellowed, and the communistic world is not a monolithic aggregation of nations"? Should we not rather tell them to dismiss the idea that communism is content to remain where it is, and that we have no reason to be fearful of it?

The Senator has sounded a call to awaken Americans to understand that the maw of communism will never be satisfied until it has attained domination of free people, their souls, and their purposes everywhere, and it does not contemplate sparing the United States.

I now go to the conclusion of the Senator's statement:

It is hard to search for realistic peace against a ruthless adversary.

We have yielded time and again. We have gone forward under the assumption that there has been a relaxation of Russian hostility to free people. Then the Senator makes the significant statement that "regrettably, the optimists have nearly always been wrong concerning Soviet intentions."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May we have 3 more minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have been the object of abuse in the Foreign

Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate because I do not believe that Russia has relented.

The argument was made in a discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee that there is no communism in this world, that there is only socialism. It was stated that those governments in the Warsaw Pact with Russia are contemplating only to improve the economic and social conditions of their people.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated that the crisis was created in Czechoslovakia a brief time ago. I do not agree with him on that statement. The crisis has been with us. It was with us in 1962 when we thought we had triumphed in Cuba by having them pull out their missiles. However, the fact is that Cuban military power was greatly strengthened at that time.

The crisis has been with us. This is merely another incident that demonstrates that the purpose of Russia is to conquer the world.

I commend the Senator for his statement. My own view is that Russia's veto of the action taken by the Security Council revealed the weakness of its position.

I deeply hope that our Government will go to the General Assembly and cause its members to go on record as to whether in the spirit of the United Nations they tolerate the action of one world power descending upon a little nation and telling that little nation: "You shall not think. You shall not speak. You shall not pray except in conformity with the dictates that come from on high, out of Russia."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 5 minutes, during which time I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not take a great deal of the time of the Senate. I commend the Senator most highly for presenting not only a well organized but also a most perceptive analysis of the situation in which we find ourselves.

Many people have been saying for years that Russian imperialism has not changed in the slightest, that only the raiments, the approach, and the propaganda have changed from time to time. However, this travesty recently committed in Czechoslovakia indicates that when a country or an area over which the Russians have taken control deviates in the slightest from the basic principles of Socialist imperialism laid down by Russia, Russia then moves, if it possibly can, to squelch the freedom that is being developed in that country.

I think the six points developed by the Senator from Nebraska should be taken to heart by every American. I certainly urge the reading of his remarks not only by every Member of Congress, but also by every citizen of our country that has access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are those in this country who keep preaching that there is a detente of sorts in existence now between our coun-

try and Russia. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no more intention on the part of the Russians to accommodate themselves to an association with civilized freedom than there ever has been. Their purpose has been world dominion, and it continues to be world dominion. Every so often their fangs show, as they did in this travesty involving Czechoslovakia.

I know the world grieves about this matter. But public opinion has very little effect on Russian imperialism. The truth of that statement has been shown from time to time. It is only the opinion within the Russian orbit itself that, I think, may eventually have some effect on Russian attitude. The opinion of democracy means nothing. The attitude and public opinion of the free nations of the world have no real effect on them. They could not care less, and they have proven that so many times.

I only hope that a great many of the people who are saying that we should soften our association with NATO and build bridges with Russia will realize their mistake.

Successful building of bridges depends upon the solid foundation of each abutment. If we have a solid foundation at our end of the bridge but the foundation on the other side, in the Socialist country, is based upon quicksand, we have no bridge and no comity of action or approach.

I again congratulate the Senator from Nebraska on his very able presentation and on his perception.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senator speaks from a long background in the field of international affairs. I am very grateful to him for his fine remarks.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I concur in many of the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished Senator from Iowa. The world was shocked at the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union.

I was in Czechoslovakia several years ago, and I have a warm feeling for the people of that land.

It was 30 years ago, in 1938, that Czechoslovakia was sold down the river by the leaders of four great nations. Then, 20 years ago, in 1948, as a result of a coalition government, the Communists were permitted to take over that fine little country. Now again, in 1968, the heavy, malled might of the Soviet Union is running roughshod over the people of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union is doing great damage in Europe. However, it is also doing great damage in the furnishing of supplies to the North Vietnamese who, in turn, are causing great casualties to the American troops.

Mr. President, for more than 3 years now I have been, almost every week, inviting attention to the casualty figures.

This past week, the U.S. troops in Vietnam suffered 2,921 casualties. Mr. President (Mr. GORE in the chair), during the first 8 months of 1968, January 1 through August 31, the United States suffered 83,533 casualties.

The significant part of this, to me, is that of all the casualties we have suf-

ferred in Vietnam, 41 percent have occurred during the first 8 months of 1968—namely, January 1 through August 31. We have been engaged in Vietnam, in one form or another, approximately 7 years, but we have been heavily engaged there for more than 3 years. Yet, during the first 8 months of 1968, we suffered 83,533 casualties, which represents 41.6 percent of all the casualties we have suffered during this war.

In that connection, Mr. President, during the same 8 months, January through August, the number of free-world ships going into the ports and harbors of North Vietnam totaled 98.

The figure of 98 free-world ships going into the North Vietnamese ports during the first 8 months of this year compares with a total of 50 ships which went into those ports during the first 8 months of 1967. So we can see that the amount of free-world shipping going into the North Vietnamese ports has practically doubled during 1968.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator state the nations whose ships are going in there? Which are the principal participants?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I shall be glad to supply those figures.

During this 8-month period, January through August, a total of 98 ships carried cargo into those ports. Of those 98 ships, 77 flew the flag of Great Britain. These 77 ships, 77 ships flying the flag of Great Britain, which carried cargo to and from the North Vietnamese ports during the first 8 months of 1968, compare with 41 ships flying the British flag which carried cargo to those ports during the first 8 months of 1967.

Here, again, we see that the number of ships going into the enemy port of Haiphong has almost doubled during the first 8 months of this year compared with the same time last year.

Is there any wonder that our casualties are increasing?

Is there any wonder that more and more Americans are being killed and wounded? Forty-one percent of all the casualties we have suffered during the Vietnamese war have occurred during the first 8 months of 1968.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that while the peace talks are going on in Paris—and certainly we want to do everything possible in the way of negotiations and in the way of discussions in an effort to bring the Vietnam war to a conclusion—we must not let the troops in Vietnam become the forgotten men.

I submit that these casualty figures—2,921 killed and wounded last week—suggest that we are permitting our troops to become the forgotten men. We are being lulled into a false sense of security and as a result we are suffering heavier casualties.

VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, with many of my Democratic colleagues, I spent most of last week in Chicago at our national convention. A celebrated former Senator and a distinguished Member of this body were nominated to head our ticket. But these nominations seem to have been overshadowed by the public outcry over the television reporting of the proceedings and of the confrontation outside between the police and the collection of just plain observers, the protesters, and the troublemakers.

Some reporters from my hometown press have strong opinions on this matter, and I have in my hand three columns which I submit for the information of the Senate. I call attention particularly to the column by Dan Valentine. I do so because the title "Nothing Serious" implies that this is a humorous column. Dan ordinarily writes in a humorous vein. I do not believe he has written more than three columns of straight serious comment in a decade. But this time his report is straight and serious, and it comes from personal observation at the convention. The column by Gordon White also comes from personal exposure in Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent that these two columns and a column by Harold Schindler be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

NOTHING SERIOUS

(By Dan Valentine)

I return from five days at the 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago disenchanted, disappointed . . . and with a deep feeling of despair.

I have seen the sleaziest element of our unthinking youth, manipulated by professional rabble rousers, defy all standards of decency—while adults cheered them on.

The real heroes of the Democratic convention in Chicago are the thousands of Chicago police officers—who laid their lives on the line for unholy stretches of time to maintain law and order.

And let's praise the soldiers of the National Guard units who stood strong against the barrages of vile language and tasteless actions of the "Hippies" and the "Yippies."

Yet, thanks to biased, emotional, undisciplined electronic reporting, the police officers and National Guardsmen have been pegged as the villains of this unsavory chapter in American history.

Television, by its very nature, has only one eye. Because it is essentially show business, and not a news media, it can show only the dramatic end-results of what is taking place.

TV viewers were treated to segments of young "Yippies" demonstrating in Chicago being dragged and kicked while being arrested.

But the other side of the story is not shown—the provocation!

IT WORKED LIKE THIS:

For stretches of three and four hours at a time police officers and National Guardsmen stood silent and stolid facing the "Yippies." The police were stoned and mauled. Their authority was flouted. Obscene taunts were yelled at them by thousands of young malcontents.

Finally, after hours of this, a youth races up to a police officer and slashes at him with his foot—on the edge of the shoe is a sharp razor blade. To protect himself, the police

officer subdues the youth. This is the part filmed by the TV reporters and flashed on the air—just the incident of the youth being arrested—not the provocation!

In another isolated incident, a "Yippie" throws a brick at the head of a young police officer. The police officer is taken to the hospital. In retaliation, other officers drag the youth to a police van.

The TV cameras shoot the segment of the youth being dragged to jail. But no picture of the police officer hit on the head by a brick.

The TV newsmen interview the poor lad in jail . . . and he relates how the police were brutal to him. But the TV cameras do not interview the injured police officer in the hospital.

To make things worse, these sequences of so-called brutality, are shown over and over again to the TV viewers across the nation—creating an unfair sympathy for the "Yippies."

When I left Chicago Friday afternoon, more than 50 Chicago policemen were hospitalized with wounds from bouts with the "innocent young people" protesting for a better world. Two Chicago policemen reportedly had lye thrown in their faces by "Yippies."

An innocent woman was hit on the head by a glass thrown from a top story of the Hilton Hotel . . . Most of the lobbies in major Chicago hotels were made unbearable by the throwing of "stink" bombs by the young hoodlums.

One of the "cute" devices used by the protesting youths who keep shouting for a better America was to fling a large potato into a group of policemen or National Guardsmen. Sticking out of the potato are several razor blades, the sharp sides pointing out . . .

Chicago's Mayor Daley has been labeled "a Hitler" for his tough police enforcement during the convention. But without it, the city would have been riot-torn. And perhaps the rest of the nation, too.

The long-haired hoodlums had vowed publicly to "tear-up Chicago" . . . The police kept them from doing it. That's their job.

The 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago is an ugly chapter in the saga of the United States. It will be a long time before the bad taste is out of America's mouth.

ANOTHER SIDE TO VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

(By Gordon Elliot White)

CHICAGO.—The Democratic Party and Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago took a partly bum rap here on charges of racism and Gestapo tactics during the nominating session Wednesday night.

National television coverage of the riot areas was so restricted that only the final stages of the protest could be shown, when some Chicago police had lost their self-control and were using their nightsticks freely in a confused melee.

Earlier, thousands of Yippies had charged into police lines with rocks, sticks, and bottles flying. In a rapidly shifting pattern, the protesters had outflanked the police and National Guardsmen to get into the downtown Loop area across an unguarded Chicago River bridge.

What was shown on television in the International Amphitheatre consisted of scenes of helmeted Chicago police beating the demonstrators as they attempted to load them into paddy wagons, plus shots of the police using chemical Mace and tear gas on crowds, some of which were only bystanders. Some film footage showed the police working over reporters and cameramen.

There was, clearly, some brutality by the police, who finally attacked almost anyone in the riot area.

At the same time, bitterly disappointed backers of Sen. Kennedy, Sen. McCarthy, Sen. McGovern and Rev. Channing Phillips turn-

ed the rioters downtown into a symbol of their own defeat.

Even though the police lost control at the climax of the riot, when the demonstrators had moved within range of cameras at the Hilton Hotel, the television film could not show the hail of bottles, rocks and caustic solutions being tossed by the rioters, nor the water glasses being dropped on police from windows in the Hilton itself.

The police clearly made serious mistakes in beating newsmen and bystanders, and their strategy was faulty: If the bridges into the Loop area had all been blocked, only a few score of the rioters would have been able to confront the police at the Hilton.

Also, the police several times hemmed in groups of relatively passive demonstrators who appeared to panic and try to break through the police lines. Crowd dispersal tactics generally call for leaving open an avenue of escape through which demonstrators may be channeled harmlessly away.

But the Hippies were not innocent. They tossed stinkbombs into the Hilton and the Palmer House and other Loop hotels, broke scores of windows, smashed police car windshields, and themselves manhandled many bystanders.

The militants—nearly all of them white—appeared to oppose the war in Vietnam, but did not back any of the Democratic candidates. At one point earlier in the week they had threatened to mob Sen. McCarthy in the Hilton, and jeered him as a Fascist, finally chanting Ho Chi Minh, Ho Chi Minh, Ho Chi Minh, at the Minnesota senator.

Yippie publications bitterly wrote of McCarthy, McGovern, and even Sen. Kennedy as members of the "establishment" who had voted for military spending bills in the Senate.

At two points the police called in National Guardsmen, who stood shoulder to shoulder with fixed bayonets on their weapons. The appearance of the guard in late afternoon quieted the demonstrations, which later resumed when the guard was withdrawn. The troops returned after midnight and quickly restored order at the Hilton.

The Yippies had threatened violence in Chicago for weeks, and had trained their cadres in guerrilla tactics in Chicago parks. Led by Tom Mayden, of the Students for the Democratic Society, David Dellinger, a self-described Communist who headed the 1967 march on the Pentagon, and Jerry Rubin, of the Youth International Party, the protesters were carrying out what Staughton Lynd has called the "politics of confrontation."

The liberal wing of the party threw the disturbances at Mr. Humphrey's supporters all night Wednesday, attempting to hang "police state," "Gestapo," and "mindless brutality" tags on their party's nominee. Humphrey opponents spoke of "racism," and an "aura of suspicion" as though the Vice President were responsible for the demonstrations, the police tactics, and all else that the liberals objected to.

Some of the beaten newsmen may have been mistaken by police for rioters. Large numbers of cameramen, from both national media and the Hippie press, plus some reporters, have been covering the convention in tattered old cloths, sandals, and long hair that could easily be mistaken for Hippie attire. Some, at least appear to have actually taken part in the rock-throwing, though at least 35 legitimate accredited reporters were beaten in Tuesday's and Wednesday's rioting.

CONVENTION COVERAGE: WHAT REALLY HAPPENED?

(By Harold Schindler)

The International Amphitheatre is empty, the last gavel has sounded, and while Hippies and Chicago police lick their wounds perhaps this is the time—here in the Demill-

tarized Zone—to pause for a more penetrating look at television's coverage of the Democratic National Convention.

Millions of stunned Americans watched last week as the convention and its accompanying scenes of violence unfolded before their eyes. But now, after sober reflection, many of those viewers are wondering just exactly what it was they did see, for reports filed out of Chicago during the weekend are beginning to paint a substantially different picture than the one which dominated living rooms screens five days ago.

More disturbing than the incidents themselves is the nagging notion that much of the convention confusion and police confrontation with demonstrators—both on the floor and beyond the Amphitheatre's doors—may have in a large part been brought about by the presence of television.

(Sunday night the networks denied an allegation by Chicago police that militant demonstrators had been able to learn beforehand the location of television cameras outside convention hall.)

Since its appearance 20 years ago, commercial television has been considered an entertainment medium; an industry which accepts or discards programs solely on the basis of rating, with an almost fierce disregard for quality.

For weeks the political conventions have been a source of heated competition between the Big Three, each network scrambling for viewers. NBC alone budgeted seven million dollars for the Miami Beach and Chicago sessions, exclusive of regular schedule pre-emptions and the resultant loss of sponsor money.

With that kind of cash at stake, the networks went all out to enliven Chicago coverage rather than risk a repeat of the GOP convention, described by Vice President Humphrey as "a wake."

Once on convention floor, harried network reporters, admittedly rankled because Chicago Mayor Daley had restricted their numbers, flagrantly created, nurtured and mongered rumors among the delegates while anchor-men treated these manufactured myths as legitimate leads.

One video reporter nailed a delegate with this pertinent query: "And you're here on the floor for what purpose, Senator?"

To which the bemused Democrat responded, "Frankly, Dan, I came down because you asked me."

"Of course," said the reporter.

That delegates were taking advantage of the TV situation became obvious as the convention continued. United Press International writer Robert Musel wondered, "Since most other delegates had gone to dinner, would the New York delegation mixed choir have continued singing and swaying as long as they did in the emptying amphitheatre if the cameras had stopped?"

Efforts to sustain coverage from gavel-to-gavel reached a low water mark when actress Shirley MacLaine, attending as a delegate, twittered, "I keep abreast of what's happening on my little TV set over there."

David Brinkley solemnly confided that "nameless, faceless men" were dogging his floor reporters, eavesdropping on interviewers. "We don't know who they are," he said. And on CBS Walter Cronkite noted the convention was being conducted "in a police state."

For a man anchored to one spot during the entire proceedings, he editorialized more than homeviewers would have dared with the facilities of all three channels and newspaper coverage available to them.

Through it all the networks had a single overriding concern—one best summarized by this lead paragraph from a publicity release:

"NBC News' television coverage of the four days of the Democratic National Convention attracted a national audience 16 percent greater than CBS-TV's convention coverage

and beat ABC-TV's combination of entertainment convention by 17 per cent during the 20½ hours of coverage estimated by National Arbitron (a rating service)."

Would you believe that single sentence is worth seven million dollars?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE NATIONAL GUN CRIME PREVENTION ACT—THE TYDINGS BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, along with 17 other Senators, I have joined the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in introducing S. 3634, the National Gun Crime Prevention Act, which provides for firearms registration and licensing. To answer the questions most frequently asked about the National Gun Crime Prevention Act, I have, with the assistance of Senator TYDINGS, prepared a brief document entitled "Questions and Answers on the National Gun Crime Prevention Act," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE NATIONAL GUN CRIME PREVENTION ACT

INDEX OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is the National Gun Crime Prevention Act?
2. Why not just enforce existing state gun laws?
3. Congress just passed a gun law. Why do we need another?
4. Are registration and licensing proposals merely steps toward confiscation of all firearms?
5. Aren't registration and licensing bills actually just taxation measures?
6. Are registration and licensing constitutional?
7. What will the National Gun Crime Prevention Act cost the gun owner?
8. How does registration work?
9. Must every firearm be registered?
10. Would private firearms sales be registered too?
11. Doesn't registration impose a burden on the law-abiding?
12. But won't criminals refuse to register their guns?
13. Must an owner of several guns register each of them?
14. What about weapons which have no serial number?
15. What about antiques?
16. How does licensing work?
17. How about my son under 18 years old? Could he still hunt and shoot?
18. What's the difference between registration and licensing? Do we need both?
19. Must every gun be separately licensed?
20. Would there be any discretion to deny a license?
21. Won't criminals get guns anyway?
22. Why not just punish gun crimes more severely?
23. What about the argument that "guns don't commit crimes, people do"?
24. What about the argument that "No dictatorship has ever been imposed on a nation of free men who have not just been required to register their privately owned firearms?"

1. What is the National Gun Crime Prevention Act?

The National Gun Crime Prevention Act is a bill introduced by 19 Senators to help detect and deter gun crime. It provides for registration of all firearms and licensing of all firearms owners and ammunition users. It encourages state action by providing for state pre-emption of the federal law. Where a state enacts its own registration and licens-

ing law, the federal law would not apply. Where a state fails to act to protect its own citizens, the bill would provide a minimum floor of federal protection in that state.

Registration of all firearms will give the police the means to quickly trace guns used in crime to their owner.

Licensing of gun users will weed out persons who, by reason of criminal record, drug addiction, alcoholism, mental incompetence, or age should not be entrusted with a gun in the first place.

2. Why not just enforce existing state gun laws?

Most states' gun laws are totally inadequate to protect their citizens. Many states have practically no gun laws at all, eight states have no law against felons buying firearms. In 35 states lunatics can legally own guns. Only 3 states require a license to own or possess a gun.

Most state gun laws are either obsolete or meaningless, such as a Texas law forbidding carrying guns in a saddlebag, except when you are traveling, Vermont's law forbidding schoolchildren to have guns in the classroom, or Arkansas' law forbidding using a machine gun for offensive purposes. Clearly, existing state firearms laws are totally inadequate to protect the public.

3. Congress just passed a gun law. Why do we need another?

The law Congress enacted as part of the Omnibus Crime Bill in June was a watered-down compromise which, while worthwhile, for practical purposes only requires that pistol purchases be made in the purchaser's home state. The new law does make it illegal to transport or possess a gun if you are under indictment, a fugitive, a felon, an adjudged mental incompetent, an illegally entered alien, have renounced U.S. citizenship, or have been dishonorably discharged from the armed forces, but provides no means to actually prevent such persons from making firearms purchases.

The provisions of the Omnibus Crime Bill do not provide any way to trace a gun lost, stolen, or used in crime. They provide no way for gun dealers to determine whether the man they are selling to is who he says he is, does not intend to use the gun in crime, is not a felon, addict, or mental patient or otherwise disqualified from gun ownership. These dangerous people can still get guns by simply lying.

To make the law passed in June enforceable, we need firearms registration and licensing. Firearms user licensing would prevent criminals, addicts, lunatics, and juveniles from purchasing firearms, and registration would help find them if they used a gun in crime.

4. Are registration and licensing proposals merely steps toward confiscation of all firearms?

Certainly not. Firearms ownership and use by law-abiding citizens is a healthful recreation and does not contribute to the gun crime problem. But we urgently need adequate records of gun ownership to help trace guns used in crime to their criminal users. Registration of all firearms is the only way to gather these records. And we urgently need to deny access to firearms by criminals, addicts and mental incompetents. A licensing system, in which all law-abiding citizens automatically are entitled to licenses and all criminals, addicts and mental incompetents are automatically denied licenses, and which punishes purchase, possession or use of a firearm without a license, will severely inhibit criminal access to guns.

Those who oppose reasonable firearms control because they fear "confiscation" should be much more concerned that the rapidly rising gun crime rate may well lead to public demand for confiscation if reasonable measures to stem the gun crime rate are not taken now. The threat of confiscation arises not from reasonable action to stem the gun crime rate, but rather from no action at all.

5. Aren't registration and licensing bills actually just taxation measures?

No. The National Gun Crime Prevention Act contains no fee at all for either licensing or registration. It would be paid for out of the general revenues. Direct controls against criminal access to guns and good records for tracing guns used in crime—not taxes—are the best way to control the gun crime rate.

6. Are registration and licensing constitutional?

Yes, without question. Here's what the Library of Congress says about the National Gun Crime Prevention Act and the Second Amendment's "right to bear arms": "From what we know of the history and construction of the Second Amendment, it would seem that the major current proposals for gun control are not subject to any serious Second Amendment challenges." (Library of Congress Study UC460B, 450/77 A-251: "The Second Amendment as a Limitation on Federal Firearms Legislation," July 8, 1968)

The U.S. Attorney General has stated: "A federal system requiring the registration and licensing of firearms is a necessary and proper means to two legitimate legislative goals, the regulation and protection of interstate commerce and the preservation of the peace of the United States . . . it is within the power of Congress to enact."

The bill also contains a special provision, Section 935(c), to conform to recent Supreme Court decisions (*Haynes v. U.S.*) dealing with the Bill of Rights provision on self-incrimination.

7. What will the National Gun Crime Prevention Act cost the gun owner?

The bill imposes no fees. The operation of the licensing and registration system proposed by the National Gun Crime Prevention Act would be paid for out of the general tax receipts of the country. As a law enforcement and public safety measure, the cost of the Act should be borne by all citizens. As originally introduced, the Act did provide a \$1 fee for licensing and registration, but this provision has been deleted.

8. How does registration work?

A gun owner simply sends a law enforcement agency the makes, models, and serial numbers of his guns and his own name and address. It can be done completely by mail. Then, when a lost or stolen gun is found, its true owner can be discovered and his gun returned to him. If a gun is found at the scene of a crime, its last known owner can be quickly traced. When a suspicious character is arrested with a gun in his possession, its ownership can be quickly determined. If the gun has been stolen or is unregistered, the suspect can be booked for possession of stolen goods or possession of an unregistered weapon.

If a state enacts its own registration law, guns would be registered with whatever state agency the law designated. If the state failed to act, guns would be registered with the federal government.

9. Must every firearm be registered?

Yes, otherwise many guns lost, stolen, or used in crime could not be traced.

10. Would private firearms sales be registered too?

Yes. All firearms transfers, by dealers and private persons, would be registered so that up-to-date records of actual gun ownership could be maintained.

11. Doesn't registration impose a burden on the law-abiding?

Not a significant one. Everything can be done by mail on a form like this:

FIREARMS REGISTRATION FORM

Name: _____
 Address: _____
 Firearm: _____
 Make: _____
 Model: _____
 Serial #: _____

The registration would be free and permanent. No fees. No renewals.

12. But won't criminals refuse to register their guns?

Some criminals may refuse to register their guns and risk being jailed for having an unregistered gun. But any suspected criminal found with an unregistered weapon can be jailed on that charge alone, even if no other crime can be proved. So it will become very risky for a criminal to have an unregistered weapon.

13. Must an owner of several guns register each of them?

He must supply the make, model, and serial number of each, but could do so for all his guns on a single form.

14. What about weapons which have no serial number?

The bill provides that firearms dealers can imprint serial numbers on such weapons for identification purposes.

15. What about antiques?

No firearm manufactured prior to 1898 is covered by the bill.

16. How does licensing work?

Licensing is simply a way of denying fugitives, criminals, addicts, and mental defectives access to firearms and ammunition. Every purchaser, possessor, or user of firearms or ammunition would have to have a license, except for juveniles with their parents' consent and hunters or sportsmen who have borrowed a weapon for temporary use.

To get a license, you would simply submit a statement affirming that you are over 18, have never been convicted of a felony or committed to an institution by a court on the grounds of alcoholism, narcotics addiction, or mental incompetence, that you are not under indictment or a fugitive, and are not otherwise prohibited by law from obtaining a weapon. In addition, you would supply a physical description like that required for a driver's license and proof of identity (in the form of a draft card, driver's license, social security card, etc.).

If a state enacted a licensing law, the statement and identification would be supplied to whatever agency the state prescribed, but if the state does not act, then to any federal firearms dealer. The entire transaction could be conducted by mail.

Issuance of licenses would be automatic to all law-abiding citizens, without any discretion on the part of the issuing officer. Denial of a license would be automatic in the case of felons, fugitives, adjudged alcoholics, addicts and mental incompetents, and those under 18.

17. How about my son under 18 years old? Could he still hunt and shoot?

Yes, definitely. Although he could not own a gun in his own name, the bill expressly provides that he will be able to hunt and shoot with his parents' consent.

18. What's the difference between registration and licensing? Do we need both?

Registration is a means of tracing guns used in crime. Licensing is a means of reducing the gun crime rate itself by denying access to guns by known criminals, addicts, and mental defectives. Registration is a means to solve gun crime once it has been committed. Licensing is a means to prevent gun crime from being committed in the first place.

19. Must every gun be separately licensed?

No. Firearms purchasers, owners and users are licensed, not the guns themselves. The purpose is to deny licenses to criminals, addicts and mental defectives.

20. Would there be any discretion to deny a license?

Not where the federal law applies. If the applicant is not under indictment, or a fugitive, a felon, an adjudged addict, alcoholic or mental incompetent, or under 18, the license must be issued. The state could establish a different system, if they wish, just as they can today.

21. But won't criminals get guns anyway?

If a licensing law were in effect a criminal, addict, or mental defective could not legally purchase, own or use a gun, because he would not be entitled to a license. Thus, lawful channels of purchase would be cut off to him. Today they are not.

Today, in most states, criminals, addicts and idiots have access to guns on the same basis as the law-abiding. Even if, after enactment of the National Gun Crime Prevention Act hard-core criminals may be able to get some guns, the small-time but frequently deadly crook who holds up liquor stores, bus drivers and filling stations or housebreaks will find it much harder and much riskier to possess a gun.

No one claims gun laws are airtight or foolproof. The question is whether we should do what we can to detect and prevent gun crime or continue to do nothing, as we do today.

22. Why not just punish gun crimes more severely?

Heavier penalties for gun crimes already exist, but haven't answered the gun crime problem. Armed robbery is a more serious offense than simple robbery; aggravated assault is more heavily punished than simple assault. Murder is the most heavily punished crime of all. Yet the commission rates of all these crimes are climbing intolerably. Armed robbery increased from 42,600 crimes a year in 1964 to 71,000 in 1967; aggravated assault by gun from 27,700 cases in 1964 to 55,000 in 1967; murder by gun from 5,000 in 1964 to 7,700 in 1967.

Gun crimes should be more heavily punished. But clearly, heavier penalties do not answer the gun crime epidemic. They do not help solve gun crimes, as registration would. They do not prevent criminal access to guns, as licensing would. They do not bring gun crime victims back to life, repair their wounds, or return their property. Only disarming the criminal can do that.

23. What about the argument that "guns don't commit crimes, people do"?

Of course, guns don't commit crimes, but people using guns certainly do. People using guns last year alone robbed 71,000 Americans, assaulted 55,000 Americans and murdered 7,700 Americans. People using guns murdered John Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Robert Kennedy, along with more than 25,000 other Americans between 1963 and 1967.

24. What about the argument that "No dictatorship has ever been imposed on a nation of free men who have not just been required to register their privately owned firearms?"

That argument does not hold water. It is unsupported by fact and refuted by history. For example, regarding the German occupations of Europe, the Library of Congress has concluded:

"We can make no positive correlation between gun laws and dictatorships, as the following examples will show.

"First, four countries were examined which are democracies now, but in recent history came under Nazi dictatorships (Germany, Italy, France, and Austria). One may reasonably assume that if gun registration laws constituted a primary factor in the rise of dictatorships, these countries would have since revised their laws to prevent future dictatorships. This has not been the case. The four countries today have substantially the same gun laws as those in force prior to the advent of dictatorship. In fact, in Italy, where gun laws were relaxed by Mussolini, they have recently been restrengthened approximately to their pre-Mussolini level.

Secondly, two democracies were examined which have not suffered dictatorships in their recent history (England and Switzerland). Switzerland has had gun registration laws since 1874, England since 1831.

"It would be inaccurate of course to suggest that a dictatorship would be uncon-

cerned about the possession of firearms by its populace. Nevertheless these few examples would seem to indicate fairly conclusively that there is no significant relationship between gun laws and the rise of dictatorships at least in these countries."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News contained an editorial saluting Alabama's retiring senior Senator, Hon. LISTER HILL, and his identification with the Tennessee Valley Authority during all of the years of the life of TVA. The editorial recalled that Senator HILL, who was then a Member of the House, coauthored the TVA Act which was signed into law by President Roosevelt on May 18, 1933. The editorial is a fitting tribute to one whose congressional efforts have meant so much to the Tennessee Valley. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

HISTORIC HEARING

An era in the development of the Tennessee Valley and TVA came to an end last month.

It appeared to be a routine hearing on the 1969 TVA budget before a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

But this hearing had significance far beyond the TVA budget request for the new fiscal year. It marked the final appearance of U.S. Senator Lister Hill as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee subcommittee on TVA matters.

Senator Lister Hill is not running for reelection. His term as Senator expires before the next Congress goes to work.

And when he is no longer in the Congress, TVA will have lost the best friend it ever had. This is a broad statement, because TVA has had—and still has—many knowledgeable, capable Senators and Congressmen supporting its multipurpose program. But close observers agree that no member of the Congress has done as much for TVA as Senator Lister Hill.

There was no major production made of the fact that the June 28 hearing was the last TVA hearing at which Sen. Hill would preside. TVA Board Chairman A. J. (Red) Wagner and Board Member Frank Smith paid brief tributes to the Senator, who responded by thanking them "for those kind and gentle words."

Red Wagner said there were developments all over the Tennessee Valley which stood as tributes to Senator Hill and his work. Director Smith said that few things in American government could equal Senator Hill's leadership on TVA matters.

But Wagner and Smith knew full well that they had not adequately stated the significance of Senator Hill's years of work in behalf of TVA. It was impossible, with ordinary words, to do so.

It was typical that at this appropriations hearing Senator Hill was asking probing questions about the need for added funds for TVA's fertilizer and chemical facilities at Muscle Shoals. The smile, the gentle manner and voice, the occasional "uh-wuh" as he searched for the exact word he wanted—these were familiar to those who have attended TVA hearings over the years. And the Senator displayed his usual vast knowledge of TVA and its programs.

But with Lister Hill it was more than knowledge. With him it was understanding. He knows, more than any other member of the Congress, why TVA carries on its multi-

purpose program of water and power and resource development.

He should know why. He was—with Nebraska Republican Senator George Norris—a co-author of the TVA Act, signed into law on May 18, 1933 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was a member of the House-Senate conference committee which thrashed out the final specifics of the TVA Act; and today he is the only member of that important conference committee still serving in the Congress.

He once said:

"In TVA we tried something new and bold. The heart of the concept lies in the fact that for the first time in the history of Federal legislation Congress accepted the unity of nature. For this one river basin the inter-relationship of land and water, of trees and pastures, of men and nature, was recognized in a Federal statute."

"We gave one agency responsibility to inaugurate a total program committed to the full development of all nature's resources for all the people."

On May 18 of this year, TVA completed its 35th year.

During every one of those years, Lister Hill has been in the Congress—as a member of the House, and, since 1938, as a U.S. Senator. He helped write the TVA Act . . . he fought, year after year, to keep TVA moving ahead, to help it fight off its powerful enemies . . . he used his great prestige and influence, time after time, to pull TVA out of a legislative problem . . . he was the moving spirit and inspiration on TVA for new members of the Senate and House who turned to him for guidance.

Next May 18, when TVA observes its 36th birthday, Lister Hill will not be in the Congress. And TVA will, it deserves repeating, have lost its best friend.

For Senator Hill and for TVA, this should be an occasion for celebration, not sadness. For Senator Hill, there is a record unparalleled in American history in support of his unique Federal agency. A plaque on his office wall from the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association makes some small attempt to give him credit.

But the real credit, over the years, will be—as TVA Chairman Wagner put it—the developed resources, the controlled floods, the low-cost power, the growing, thriving region—all tributes to the genius and the dedication of this brilliant, mild-mannered gentleman from Alabama.

The Tennessee Valley salutes its greatest TVA statesman.

WYOMING RANCH WIFE "TELLS IT LIKE IT IS"

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in these times of depressed prices for America's livestock producers, many persons and organizations have presumed to speak or write at length about the causes of this worsening situation.

Cattle producers themselves know their problem and what causes it, but because they comprise such a small portion of the country's population, their voice is usually lost in the din from the consumer and from others who seek to advise the world about the cattle industry.

Every now and then someone comes forth with a hard-hitting, right-to-the-point explanation of the reasons for low income to cattlemen and the ties that bind the consumer and the producer.

Such an explanation was recently presented to a group of women consumers by Mrs. James May, of Laramie—the articulate wife of a cattleman in my State of Wyoming.

In comments directed at "Mrs. American Housewife," Mrs. May bridged that mysterious gap between the beef grazing on the range and the beef sizzling on the patio barbecue grill.

In "straight from the hip" language, she told the housewives why it would be to their benefit to know the facts about cattle production and income and why factors which hurt the livestock industry, such as inflation, have a direct bearing on the price of food.

Noting that the double-edged sword of inflation cuts into the already low income of the producer, while adding to the food costs of the consumer, Mrs. May said:

... Let's go where the action is to protest—not to the supermarkets, but to Washington, D.C., where inflation should be attacked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. May's excellent speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

A SPEECH BY MRS. JAMES MAY OF LARAMIE, WYO.

There is an old story that says you can't kill a frog by dropping him in boiling water. He reacts so quickly to the sudden heat that he jumps out before he is hurt. But if you put him in cold water and warm it up gradually, he never decides to jump until it is too late. By then he is cooked! People are just as foolish. Take away their freedom over night and you have a violent revolution. But steal it from them gradually (under the guise of "security," "peace," or "progress") and you can paralyze an entire generation. Look at the income tax. It started with a harmless sounding 1%. It would have been easy to have jumped out of water as warm as this, but like the frog, we waited while it climbed ever higher. Try jumping now!

Worst of all we never learn. Even today we cannot believe that Medicare is the same warm water that will one day boil us in socialized medicine. We see no connection between farm price supports and nationalized agriculture. And if we draw a parallel between subsidized teachers' pay and federal control of education, we are called "extremists." The tragedies of history are always repeated by those who refuse to learn. To seek guidance from the past is not turning back the clock as we are so often told. It is merely a good way to stay out of hot water.

I want to visit with you about an aspect of Beef which probably interests you most—the price. I don't claim to fully understand why beef costs so much in the market but I'll relate some of the things that are involved. We, the rancher, receive a small amount of the price you pay retail. So what happens between us and you, the consumer? In the first place, only 60% of a carcass is edible meat and in the second place, only a small part of a carcass is steak, and there are many necessary costs between beef on the hoof and meat on the table.

Let's say the packer pays 25 cents a pound for the whole steer—the meat, but every other pound too—the hide, the hoofs, the head, the bone, the blood, the water, etc. So from a 1000 lb. steer he has only 600 lbs. of salable beef left. This has brought the price up to about 45 cents a pound. The packer has had the costs of buying, slaughtering, selling, delivering, etc., so he has to make a few cents to cover these costs before it goes to the retailer.

The retailer has many costs to prepare the beef for the consumer. Rent, help, taxes, equipment, refrigeration, supplies, advertising, losses due to trimming, shrinkage, etc.

Now I believe the housewife asks for some of these costs because she wants her meat packaged and pan ready, and she has to pay for it. I call it built-in maid service.

When the retailer buys the carcass he pays the same price for every pound. But a carcass yields much more of some cuts than others; some cuts are in greater demand than others. He has to sell the cuts at varying prices—some for nearly twice as much and some for less than half. The more desirable and higher priced cuts represent a small portion, while the medium priced roasts, stew meat and hamburger, make up a larger part of the carcass. The price the retailer gets must average out to cover the original cost plus the cost of marketing.

Consumer boycotts of food stores might eliminate trading stamps and other gimmicks designed to build sales, but there is virtually no chance that consumers will be getting cheaper food in the future. Elimination of trading stamps and other promotion might cut 20 cents from a \$10 grocery bill. Retail profits, food advertising, transportation and storing food amounts to 50 cents of a \$10 grocery bill. So here is a total of 70 cents or 7% from the grocery prices without taking price cuts back to the farm. But of this total, only the stamps and gimmicks could be eliminated without also eliminating the food processors, storers, transporters and retailers. Food industries are simply low profit operations and modest levels of profit are necessary to keep them in business.

We'd like to boycott along with the women who have this in mind. But first we'd have to get together on what we are actually trying to accomplish. They have elected to boycott the supermarkets in protest of high food prices. This is quite understandable because that is where they feel the pinch. We'd like to register our protest in Washington, D.C. against the basic cause of the "symptom" toward which they have directed their boycott.

Let me, a cattleman's wife, tell you how it looks out in the country. For the past six years our husband's share of the food dollar has consistently gone down. This has meant that the budget to run our ranch, feed and clothe our family, has been mighty tight. Meanwhile, we are told your husband's pay has been increasing. Chances are, as in many reports, the increase is bigger in the report than in the pay envelope. Even so, we on the farms and ranches have not generally shared in the recent American affluence. We are receiving the same price today that we did 20 years ago, while our production costs have gone up 25%.

These are the facts—from ranch to plate is a small profit operation; at the ranch level it has been a hand to mouth deal for years. The cattle feeder has lost more than he has made in recent years; the meat packing business has the lowest net earnings of any similar sized business in the nation; the net earnings of the wholesalers and retailers would amaze you because they are so slim.

What you are looking at is inflation. Inflation finally catching up with the market basket. You've been spared that unpleasantness up to now by every one on the food team foregoing reasonable profits. But we are backed to the wall now and boycotts which might momentarily depress food prices cannot provide a permanent solution.

So let's go where the action is to protest—not to the supermarkets, but to Washington, D.C. where inflation should be attacked.

Farmers and ranchers are a minority group, but don't sell them short. Agriculture's progress has resulted in sharply lowered food prices relative to income. This both reduces inflationary tendencies and provides a larger market for industry. U.S. consumers last year paid out only 17.7% of their disposable income for food, and most of this went for marketing and other services. The world av-

erage is 60% of disposable income spent for food.

All of this points up the tremendous job that American agriculture has done during the past twenty years. If this job is to continue on into the future, it is absolutely mandatory that the profit motive be once again shared by American agricultural producers.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AGAIN CALLS FOR RATIFICATION OF CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on August 9 of this year, during the congressional adjournment for the conventions, the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year issued another public call for Senate ratification of the pending human rights conventions.

Time and time again the Commission, the President, and the Secretary of State have called for ratification of these conventions. A number of Senators, including myself, have called for a vote on these international guarantees of the rights of all men everywhere. Yet the Senate continues to abdicate its responsibility to again place the United States in a position of leadership in human rights and their protection.

We have before us the tragic examples of Biafra and Czechoslovakia. In these two areas the basic rights of man are being trampled. The existence of these basic rights are being effectively denied, and to some degree the responsibility for that denial is ours.

We have, as of now, failed to do everything within our power to guarantee to individuals those rights, which when secure, provide the foundation for national tranquility and world peace.

As the resolution of the President's Commission clearly states:

It is generally recognized that peace is related to progress and ultimately depends on the quality of life of the people governed. The quality of that life depends on the interest and willingness and capacity of each country to assure and to respect human rights. In a world in which enlightened and effective government is such an important and such an elusive goal, cooperative efforts to help countries promote internal tranquility and progress are proper activities for our Government.

Mr. President, surely guaranteeing the rights of man and insuring world peace are proper activities for a government built and maintained on principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the press statement of the President's Commission, their resolution calling for ratification, the list of Commission membership, and the status report of the pending conventions be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR, 1968, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 9, 1968

The President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968 announced today its support of President Johnson's appeal for Senate approval of the human rights conventions. The Commission ex-

pressed "its strong hope" that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would "act favorably at its earliest opportunity" on the seven conventions pending before the Senate.

Since the founding of the United Nations, eight human rights conventions (treaties) have been submitted to the Senate by Truman, Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. Hearings were held on the Genocide Convention, in 1950; on the Convention on Employment Policy, in 1966; and on the Supplementary Convention on Slavery, the Forced Labor Convention, the United Nations Convention on Political Rights of Women, in 1967. However, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended approval of only the Slavery Convention, which was ratified in 1967. The Committee has never held public hearings on two other conventions: the Inter-American Convention on Political Rights of Women and the Convention on Freedom of Association. The eighth of these conventions, the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, was sent to the Senate on August 1, 1968.

President Johnson urged the Senate to act on the human rights conventions last October 11, when he proclaimed 1968 as Human Rights Year in the United States. He repeated this appeal on January 30, when he established the President's Commission for Observance of Human Rights Year 1968. The Commission agreed at its third meeting, on June 11, to give public support to the President's position.

The Commission was established to help celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Commission is headed by W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador at Large, who is currently in Paris conducting peace talks with North Viet-Nam. The Vice Chairman is Mrs. Anna Roosevelt Halsted, daughter of President and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. In addition, the Commission is composed of the heads of seven Government agencies and nine other public members. Its purpose, as stated by the President, is to "enlarge our people's understanding of the principles of human rights, as expressed in the Universal Declaration and the Constitution and in the laws of the United States."

(Attachments: (1) Resolution adopted by the President's Commission; (2) Members of the President's Commission; (3) Status of the Human Rights Conventions.)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR, 1968, WASHINGTON, D.C.

At the third meeting of the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968 it was decided that the Commission should give the strongest support to the President in his call for the ratification of human rights conventions by the United States Senate.

The year 1968 was designated International Year for Human Rights by the United Nations General Assembly. The General Assembly in connection therewith requested Member States to ratify certain of the human rights conventions before 1968. In his Proclamation of Human Rights Year, the President also called for the ratification of human rights conventions. He stated:

"American ratification of these Conventions is long overdue. The principles they embody are part of our own national heritage. The rights and freedoms they proclaim are those which America has defended—and fights to defend—around the world.

"It is my continuing hope that the United States Senate will ratify these conventions . . ."

This call to the Senate to ratify human rights conventions was repeated by the President on January 30, 1968, when he signed the Executive Order establishing the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968.

The United States played a leading role in the drafting of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the United Nations Charter we as a nation undertook to take joint and separate action with other members to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all . . ." The United States also played an active part in the drafting of international conventions that would give legal force to some of the standards in the Universal Declaration. Thus far, however, the United States has ratified only one human rights convention—the Supplementary Convention on Slavery, in 1967.

It is generally recognized that peace is related to progress and ultimately depends on the quality of life of the people governed. The quality of that life depends on the interest and willingness and capacity of each country to assure and to respect human rights. In a world in which enlightened and effective government is such an important and such an elusive goal, cooperative efforts to help countries promote internal tranquility and progress are proper activities for our Government.

These human rights conventions are an expression of principles that have guided our own citizens in the development of a progressive and enlightened government. The fact that United States law is in accord with the provisions of these conventions does not mean that there is no necessity for this country to participate in them. It is the nature of international obligations, designed to promote a common objective, that they be cooperative in purpose and reciprocal in effect. Therefore, in the pursuit of world order and the welfare of all countries the United States must not deny to others its participation. By this participation the United States would not impose, or seek to impose, its laws or traditions upon any country; nor would any country impose its laws or traditions upon the United States.

The United States Senate should move forward on international human rights conventions, just as the Congress has moved forward on human rights legislation at home. Ratification of these conventions would help to set and uphold international standards. Ratification of these conventions would demonstrate once again our national commitment to a stable and democratic world order.

Therefore, the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968 endorses the President's "earnest hope that the Senate will complete the tasks before it by ratifying the remaining Human Rights Conventions" and expresses its strong hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will act favorably at its earliest opportunity on the six* conventions that are pending before it:

The Convention on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize

The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide

The Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Political Rights to Women

The Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor

The Convention on the Political Rights of Women

The Convention Concerning Employment Policy

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR 1968, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Chairman: The Honorable W. Averell Harriman.

Vice Chairman: Anna Roosevelt Halsted.

The Secretary of State.

The Attorney General.

The Secretary of Labor.

*The Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees was sent to the Senate on August 1, 1968.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The Staff Director for the Commission on Civil Rights.

The Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Bruno V. Bitker.

The Honorable Tom C. Clark.

Mrs. Elinor L. Gordon.

Dr. J. Willis Hurst.

Ralph E. McGill.

George Meany.

The Honorable Robert B. Meyner

A. Philip Randolph.

Maurice Tempelman.

STATUS OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

I. *Ratified with advice and consent of the Senate:* Slavery Convention, 1929; Nationality of Women, 1934; Supplementary Convention on Slavery, 1967.

II. *Pending in the Senate* (Date Transmitted by the President): Freedom of Association, 1949; Genocide, 1949; Political Rights of Women (Inter-American), 1949; Forced Labor, 1963; Political Rights of Women (UN), 1963; Employment Policy, 1966; Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, 1968.

FOREST FIREFIGHTING

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, an editorial written by William E. Towell and published in the July 1968 issue of American Forests magazine points up the fact that there is no national plan for dealing with fire emergencies. Disaster fires are bound to occur. Yet there is no program or organization set up to handle them.

Mr. Towell, who is chairman of the task force on a national program for wildfire control, has stated that national legislation will be needed to give the developing national program for wildfire control official recognition, emergency authority, and the financial capability to carry out its mission.

The National Governors' Conference, in July, adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to enact legislation promptly to provide a law similar to Public Law 99—relating to flood crises—which would make available to the States the services and resources of the U.S. Forest Service and other Federal agencies when fires become beyond the abilities and resources of the States to handle adequately.

I ask unanimous consent that both the resolution and the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREST FIRE FIGHTING

(A resolution adopted at the 60th annual meeting of the National Governors' Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 21-24, 1968)

Whereas, in most instances and in most years the several states have been able to handle their fire fighting problems adequately; and

Whereas, in major emergency years, such as 1967, the resources of the states, particularly in the West but potentially throughout the Nation, become exhausted in manpower and money; and

Whereas, the federal government, a major landowner in the West, but also represented throughout the Nation with the national forests and other federal ownerships, has ex-

tensive resources for use in times of emergencies; and

Whereas, the Corps of Engineers under Public Law 99 has rendered invaluable services to the states in times of flood crises; and

Whereas, these same services are vitally needed by the states from the U.S. Forest Service and other agencies of the federal government in times of fire crises:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the National Governors' Conference that the U.S. Congress enact legislation as soon as possible to provide a law similar to Public Law 99 which would make available to the states the services and resources of the U.S. Forest Service and other federal agencies when fires become beyond the control of the abilities and resources of the states to handle adequately; and

Be it further resolved that each state establish eligibility by implementing a basic fire plan for state and private forest land, embodying generally accepted minimum standards; and

Be it further resolved that all states cooperate in interstate forest fire training programs; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Members of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior and all other persons concerned with enactment of this proposed legislation.

[From the American Forests, July 1968]

DISASTER FIRES—A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR WILDFIRE CONTROL

(By William E. Towell, Chairman, Task Force on a National Program for Wildfire Control)

There's a hush in Northwest forests today. Fear is there. Even the wild things are infected with it. And with reason. Forests were as tinders dry in the spring as they would normally be on the Fourth of July. The snow pack was light last winter following an abnormally bad fire season. Now it's worse. "Hoot owl" rules are certain to be in effect again this summer. That means loggers will go to work long before dawn and close down in mid-day when the burning index rises to a critical level. Closures are certain to rise due to dangerous conditions. There will be disappointed children as camping families are turned away from favorite campsites.

The New York Times on May 18 took cognizance of this grim picture. Other newspapers followed suit. But members of The American Forestry Association had done so many months before. These members are worried and have been for a long time. Idaho's widely-publicized Sundance fire last year scared them stiff. They don't pretend to know what went wrong there or in other places. They only know that fires got away and they want something done about it—and soon.

This concern is getting results. Competent fire people are getting together to explore needs and prescribe remedial action. I am happy to report that all groups concerned, federal, state and private, have rallied behind the call of The American Forestry Association for corrective action. In fact, they all are ready to go.

To my mind, the most serious aspects in the present crisis is simply this: there is presently no national plan for dealing with fire emergencies and there should be. Disaster fires may not occur too frequently. When they do there is no program or organization set up to handle them. It seems incredible in a country that has become as conservation conscious as America that no system has yet been developed for putting out wildfires that exceed the capabilities of regular fire-fighting agencies. But that is the case. Even if an effective team of men and fire-fighting equipment can be mustered after

fires get out of control, there is no reliable source of funds for paying the bill.

One thing is certain. Disaster fires are bound to occur. That is one of the weak links in our fire-fighting armor. In spite of our best efforts to prevent forest fires; in spite of research and better methods of fire control; in spite of a public awareness and determination to protect our natural resources, *there will be disaster fire situations.* There will be more Bar Harbors; more Los Angeles conflagrations (yes, suburban and even urban needs are tied into this picture, too), more Sundances!

Disaster fires occurring in the Northwest during the summer of 1967 attracted nationwide attention and pointed to the serious gap in fire control planning. Although voluntary cooperation is good between governmental and private fire control agencies, there is little or no planning for the emergency situations that involve many ownerships at one time and perhaps even adjoining states or our neighbors, Canada and Mexico.

Concern has been expressed, too, for the hesitancy on the part of fire control agencies to commit their manpower and equipment to fires under another authority's jurisdiction. If they do, who is in charge and who pays for them? Such problems as legal liability and financing make such decisions difficult even under disaster conditions.

There is need also for advanced research in fire control methods that will be more effective under "blowup" conditions. We need better methods of forecasting or anticipating fire emergencies so that some disasters might be avoided. The problem is not one of forests alone but all open lands that will burn under conditions of high winds and low humidities—prairies and grasslands, farm crops and buildings, and chaparrals and brushlands of the arid West.

Several recent actions further emphasize the need for a national wildfire control program. At the National Governors' Conference in October, 1967, a resolution urged that "the U.S. Congress enact legislation, before the 1968 fire season, to provide a law similar to Public Law 99 which would make available to the States the services and resources of the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service when fires become beyond the control of the abilities and resources of the states to handle adequately." (P.L. 99 is the law under which the Corps of Engineers steps in to help when there is threat of floods.)

On May 5, 1967, Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, submitted to Congress "A Report on the Investigative Study of Forest and Grass Fires," pursuant to Public Law 89-769, Section 13. One recommendation contained in this report was that "the U.S. Forest Service establish a well-defined and aggressive program, supported by necessary administrative and budgetary measures to enhance the capabilities of existing interstate compacts and foster the development of new ones." The formation of these mutual aid groups recognized the need for emergency coordination and use of manpower, equipment and supplies.

In 1966, the National Association of State Foresters adopted a resolution calling for: "A Task Force to be designated to study the possibilities of a national program of state mutual aid through regional compacts or other organizational means to reduce losses from disaster fires." The State Foresters have not been able to come up with an acceptable solution and are still working on the problem.

Senator Jordan of Idaho, as an aftermath of the 1967 Idaho fires for which there are nearly \$5 million suppression costs still outstanding, introduced an amendment to a bill (S. 438) in the 90th Congress that would provide that "The Office of Emergency Planning is authorized to make grants and loans to any state to assist such state in

the suppression of a fire or fires on privately owned forest or grasslands which threatens destruction of such proportions to constitute a major disaster."

Such authorization is not necessary, however, as the President has such authority already under Public Law 85-875, the Federal Disaster Act administered by the Office of Emergency Planning. But, the only way O.E.P. funds can be made available to the states is through a declaration of disaster by the President upon request of a Governor. Fire disaster often cannot be recognized until the damage already has been done or the emergency is over. Often, the greatest need for emergency help is to prevent a fire situation from becoming a disaster. As valuable as they might be in times of real disasters, O.E.P. funds alone are not the answer to emergency fire needs.

Forest and grasslands must be protected against the destructive effect of fire in order to fulfill their role in the nation's economy. With rising standards of living increasing the drain upon our natural resources, there is also greater demand for and use of forest and water areas for recreation. Equally important is the role forests and grasslands play in the conservation of our water resources.

Adequate fire control is the essential foundation for all other conservation activities. Long recognized as the first requirement in natural resource management, however, fire control has been neglected for more sophisticated conservation problems such as air and water pollution control, natural beauty and outdoor recreation. The American public has taken fire control for granted or just left it to Smokey Bear. Unless public apathy and priority of resource management needs are reversed, we could encounter serious depletion of forests and grasslands through their oldest enemy, fire.

Recently, Dr. Maurice Goddard, Commissioner of Forests and Parks in Pennsylvania and a Director of AFA, told a group of professional foresters that forest fire control was taking a back seat in state conservation budgets. Growing needs for new parks and recreation areas, water pollution control and other natural resources programs, worthy as they all are, were making it difficult to obtain more than a bare minimum of state funds for fire control, an activity upon which all other resource values depend. "We are year after year fighting fires on a static budget while other resource needs attract any increases available in conservation appropriations," Goddard said.

Fire control agencies actually are the victims of their own efficiency because serious forest fires have become so infrequent. But, with added years of fire protection and the accumulation of forest fuels the potential danger increases. The need for fire control funds cannot be measured by the number of fires or the acreage burned each year but must be gauged by the hazard and the risk of keeping the forest unburned. Goddard's plea to fellow foresters was for some way to impress his needs upon both the public and state legislators who control public expenditures. What he feared most, of course, was being caught unprepared for the "blowup" or disaster fire situation that poses a constant threat to all forest areas.

Responsibility for fire protection on federal lands is centered primarily in the Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, and to a lesser degree in other agencies such as the Department of Defense and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The states have recognized their own responsibilities on state and private lands through the passage of numerous state laws and the development of state forestry agencies geared to protect these resources. Also, in many instances, private interests have established their own fire control organizations. As the protection of forests and wild lands often transcends property boundaries and even state lines, a

strong link of coordination and cooperation between private, local, state and federal agencies has developed.

The disastrous fires which occurred during 1967 brought forth critical comment from the press, conservation organizations, forest industries and the forest-using public. They raise the question: "Why are the existing fire organizations unable to cope with emergency fire situations?" Many others besides The American Forestry Association have expressed deep interest in this situation and have indicated the need for a hard look at the problem. Why, it is asked, with our ability to send men and rockets to the moon and to explore eight miles below the surface of the oceans, are we unable to control one of man's oldest and most familiar enemies, fire in the forest? Is it lack of money? Or is it shortage of manpower, training, or research into more effective fire-fighting techniques? America must find out and prepare for such emergencies.

Late in 1967 a small group of interested people got together to discuss the problem. Merle Lowden, Chief of Fire Protection on the National Forests, suggested that The American Forestry Association could perform a much needed public service by directing its attention to a National Forest Fire Emergency Program. Participating in early informal discussions of the proposed program along with Lowden were Gordon Zimmerman of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts; Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League and President of the Natural Resources Council; Bill Bacon, head of state cooperation in the U.S. Forest Service; Osal Capps, President of the National Association of State Foresters; and AFA's staff.

It was decided to call together an ad-hoc group, assembled for the first meeting in Washington on February 27, 1968, which resulted in the formation of a continuing Task Force on a National Program for Wildlife Control. To the original group were added Art Roberts of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association; Jack Muench of Forest Industries Council; George Kelly and Jim McClellan of the American Forest Products Industries; Jim Johnson of the National Governors' Conference, Mitchell Wendell, Council of State Governments; Ernest Palmer of the Bureau of Land Management; Vernon McKee, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture; John Witherspoon of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association; Eliot Zimmerman of the Forest Service; Earl Plourde, State Forester of Alaska; with Tom Casey of the Office of Emergency Planning meeting with the group as an advisor. In subsequent meetings additional representation has been added and as the National Plan is developed others will be invited.

The need for a disaster fire plan is national in scope. Every forest region could experience a major fire situation and will be included in the planning.

Acknowledging the need for an emergency fire plan is not a criticism of any state or any region for past fires or how they were handled. It is an admission, however, that previous planning has not been adequate to handle all fires under the most extreme conditions. Even if our national fire record had been perfect we would still need to anticipate the catastrophe that can occur under the right combination of fuels, winds, humidity, topography and other factors that affect forest fire behavior. This is the purpose of the proposal for a National Program for Wildlife Control, and the Task Force will direct its efforts toward such a program.

Considerable progress already has been made by committees serving as a "Working Group" within the Task Force. It has already been agreed that a National Wildfire Advisory Committee is necessary and that it must be representative of federal, state and private fire control agencies as well as other organizations and government interests con-

cerned with fire protection. Its purpose will be to develop general broad policies, guidelines and standards for preparing for and handling fire disasters, including dispersal of emergency funds. Regional and state coordinating committees also will be required to implement the plan at the local level, with the State Forester serving a key role in organizing an emergency plan in each state.

A reliable source of emergency firefighting funds must be provided and made available when disaster fires strike. The source of these funds must be worked out but an underlying principle will be to strengthen existing fire control organizations so that they are better able to handle their own emergency situations before they are eligible for outside assistance. Planning for the unexpected disaster fire will be a necessary prerequisite to participation in the program.

National legislation eventually will be needed to give the program official recognition, emergency authority, and the financial capability to carry out its mission. Regional fire compacts will need to be encouraged and strengthened where they exist. State laws may need changing in order for the states to participate in regional fire control activities and to permit movement of men and equipment across state lines.

Four committees now at work within the Task Force are directing their attention to these phases of the problem: 1) Organization and Planning; 2) Financing; 3) Legislation; and 4) Public Information.

All of their work is coordinated and directed by frequent meetings of the full Task Force. A study is being made of existing laws and federal programs for dealing with disaster situations in order to avoid conflicts or duplications.

The American Forestry Association occupies a key role in this effort to develop a National Program for Wildfire Control. It has been my privilege to serve as Chairman of the Task Force since its inception and both Jim Craig and Ken Pomeroy have been active in meetings of the Task Force and the Working Group. Our aim is to act as a catalyst to see this urgent natural resource problem through to a successful conclusion. Not being a land management agency itself, AFA can perform a great public service in helping to solve this national conservation problem by bringing together all those that are responsible for the wild lands of our country. AFA intends to do just that. But it cannot be overstressed that this is a national, not a regional or local problem. Right now, the crisis in Northwest forests is particularly acute. Next year it may be in the South, the Northeast, or the Lake States. Nor is it a problem to be relegated to Indian firefighting tribes in a far away state. It is as close to you as your nearest volunteer fire department. Yes, we've got to get them into the act, too, and train them to fight fires on our suburban fringes.

The plain truth is that Smokey needs some help. He's had it before and he will have it again. The Dixie Crusaders in the South, the Clarke-McNary Act for federal-state fire control, the Southern Fire Conference of 1965—these were all proud chapters in AFA and forest protection history.

Now we need a new chapter—a new awakening. Its main thrust must be to curb the disaster fire in the United States wherever it may strike and *do it now!*

TRIBUTE TO MISS MELINDA VON THRASHER OF ROSSTON, OKLA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation recently hosted a coffee for members of the Oklahoma Farmers Union. At that time we were fortunate to have presented to us several prize

winning speeches by Farmers Union Youth of Oklahoma. One such speaker was Miss Melinda Von Thrasher, of Rosston, Okla. I feel that her presentation was very outstanding, and I would, therefore, request that the text of her speech be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

FARMERS UNION

(By Melinda Von Thrasher, Rosston, Okla., year 1968)

As a 4-H member or Farmers Union member, how are you promoting good community living? We, as Americans, are aware of our many blessings. They could not all be listed this morning, but one of them is the very foundation of our democratic way of life—the acceptance of each individual as a person of dignity and worth. In much of the world this ideal is unknown. In some parts of the world it is accepted, for men and boys, but not for women and girls. In our country, it's accepted for all of us. Today, both girls and fellows can have equal opportunity to enjoy a wonderful nation, to choose the type of education or career we like. It is not the opportunities we have, but what we do with them that counts.

4-H members are the back bone of industries and farm communities. It develops, trains, and opens doors to many career possibilities. 4-H has grown from its grass roots, so has the great organization Farmers Union. It is the largest and most influential farm organization in Oklahoma. Farmers Union is a great supporter of and encouragement to our 4-H members, not only state but county, and local.

Through 4-H work, I was privileged this last summer to attend the National 4-H Citizenship Short Course in which Harper County Farmers Union was my cosponsor. I have been made to realize that citizenship just isn't something to talk about but needs to be practiced everyday. So many times we take our American Heritage for granted, but ignorance is the great enemy of democracy. No person has ever understood this fact so basically as our forefathers who fought and even died to make America as great a nation as it stands today. Yet servicemen are fighting and giving their lives today to preserve this freedom we so cherish as our American Heritage.

Our nation was founded on the firm foundation of fundamental belief in God with the United States Constitution designed to serve the people. A strong democracy needs a pledge of loyalties from all its people and a determination on the part of all citizens to learn the ways of democracy and to apply their knowledge wisely and courageously. Only by cooperation and giving of ourselves and time are we able to strive to make the best better. Without cooperation we cannot reach our goals. A century and half ago Thomas Jefferson said, "The fate of our democratic government rests on the hope that every citizen does his own thinking." You and only you can fulfill this obligation.

As a recent area winner of the 4-H Personality Improvement Program, I've been made aware that each of us has a body, a mind, and a soul, and each of us has a responsibility to make the most of what he has. Some poet said, "Use what talents you possess; how silent the woods would be if only those birds sang who sing the best."

Our body can be considered as our "social self." If our social self is in the right orbit, our goals will be chosen because of what they will do for someone else, rather than what they will do for ourselves.

Our spiritual being, our soul, is the most important. If we keep it on the right track, we will move in a positive direction—that is we will make the right decision to do the

right thing. Our ethics, moral, and our religious training are a significant part of our life.

I'd like to challenge all of you, whether you are a leader or a follower, a boy or a girl, to be the kind of person who:

Is generous, and wants others to have a place in the limelight;

Is fair, and wants to see justice done;

Is honest, and not afraid to say, "That was my mistake;"

Is humble, and willing to be one of the group;

Is courageous and takes a stand for what is right;

Is patient, and willing to help a person who is less able;

Is tactful, and considerate of the feeling of others.

If you accept this challenge, you'll make your corner of the world a better place in which to be.

Farmers Union has been an inspiration to my local 4-H club by presenting 4-H jackets, plaques, awards of ribbons and gift certificates. Yes, 4-H members can depend on Farmers Union to give us a guiding and helpful hand in promoting good community living.

Again, I say my organization, 4-H Club, as Farmers Union, is the back bone of all progress. What we do now will make tomorrow.

BRITISH THINKING TAKES STRONG LEAP RIGHT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last month while I was in the British Isles, my attention was attracted by a public opinion poll reporting a strong leap to the right in British thinking.

As stated in the Sunday Times, London, England, on August 25, that newspaper's opinion research center found that—

Anglo-Saxon attitudes on a wide range of social and economic issues are fundamentally far more rightwing than might be suggested by the division of voting allegiances between the right and the leftwing political parties.

This summation was supported by a tabulation of opinions on a number of issues of major interest to the British people. Notably, these issues parallel

those currently provoking deep concern here in our own United States. And I believe, too, that the conclusions drawn—that there should be a crackdown on crime, a cutback on the dole, that welfare services should be pegged, and that a great majority of the people oppose their Government's policy against the Rhodesian Government—closely parallel U.S. public thinking.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT LEAP RIGHT: CRACK DOWN ON CRIME—CUT BACK ON THE DOLE—PEG WELFARE SERVICES—SUPPORT THE WHITES IN RHODESIA—REDUCE PLANNING

(By Ronald Butt)

Anglo-Saxon attitudes on a wide range of social and economic issues are fundamentally far more Right-wing than might be suggested by the division of voting allegiances between the Right and the Left-wing political parties.

This is revealed by a special Sunday Times poll, conducted by Opinion Research Centre, which has put questions designed to separate "Right" from "Left," "conservative" from "radical" or (to use another pair of convenient alternatives accepted by some sociologists) "tough" from "tender" political attitudes.

The results of this survey reveal a much heavier Right-inclination on these issues than might be suggested by the voting intentions now being shown by the public opinion polls—which give the Conservative Party a substantial lead over Labour.

But, in addition, when compared with what is known about public responses three or four years ago—when Labour was at the peak of its popularity—the survey also shows a distinct movement towards the Right on particular issues as well as in general voting intentions.

In only one respect is the advantage now clearly with the "Left-inclined" but it could conceivably be a decisive one for the Labour Party. The poll showed that 54 percent thought that "understanding ordinary people" was more important than "education and experience of governing" while only 36 percent made the opposite assessment.

On most particular issues, however the

electorate normally feels more Right-wing than it votes—and this discrepancy has almost certainly been accentuated by the experience of Labour Government in the last four years.

This could have a profound significance for the Conservative Party's prospects. For it means that the electorate has criticisms of traditional Labour attitudes which go far deeper and wider than simple discontent with the Labour Government's failure, so far, to solve Britain's economic problems.

For example, 83 per cent regard punishment for crime as not tough enough; 79 per cent think it would be better if "unemployment" benefit were more difficult to get; 67 per cent would rather see taxation reduced than welfare services improved (if given the straight alternative) and, perhaps most significantly, 66 per cent, believe that the Government interferes (i.e., plans) too much with industry.

This last point is especially relevant when compared with the findings of an NOP poll in January 1964—the period when the fashion for planning was at its height and when even the Conservative Government had (during and after Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's Chancellorship) converted itself to a modified form of the doctrine.

In answer to the question "would you like to see more or less planning?"—65 per cent in 1964 answered "more"; 9.2 per cent, "less"; and for 25.8 per cent, the answer was "about the same" or "don't know." The Sunday Times poll shows that today these figures are now reversed.

Similarly, 49.2 per cent of all voters (including 35.6 per cent of Conservatives) thought in 1964 that more Government regulation would make the country more prosperous compared with 25.6 per cent who thought it would make it less prosperous and 25.2 per cent who thought it would make no difference.

The table indicates the opinions of the people interviewed on various questions. Inevitably, there are reservations to be made in interpreting these answers and in some cases there are significant differences according to class, party, age and sex.

One surprise is that on the "dole" question the working classes are very nearly as Right-wing as the middle classes—despite the fact that a high proportion of working-class people are potentially liable to need unemployment benefit themselves for at least a short time at some point in their working lives.

TABLE SHOWS, IN DESCENDING ORDER OF "RIGHTWINGNESS," PUBLIC OPINION ON THE QUESTIONS ASKED (FIGURES IN PERCENTAGES)

| | "Right" | "Left" |
|--|---|--|
| Crime: In general do you think that punishment given to people convicted of crimes in Britain is too severe, not tough enough, or about right? | Punishment not tough enough..... 83 | Punishment too severe..... 1 |
| Unemployment benefits: Do you think it would be better or worse if it was more difficult to get unemployment benefits—the "dole"? | Better if "dole" more difficult..... 79 | Worse if "dole" more difficult..... 13 |
| Taxation and social services: Which do you think is more important—to reduce taxation, or to increase and to improve the social services? | Reduce taxes..... 67 | Increase and improve social services..... 20 |
| Economic affairs: Some people say the Government should have a bigger say in the control and planning of industry, other people think the Government already interfere too much. Which do you think? | Government interfere too much..... 66 | Government should have bigger say..... 20 |
| Racial discrimination: Do you think it should be against the law to refuse a job to someone because of his race or color? | Should not be against the law..... 53 | Should be against the law..... 42 |
| Rhodesia: If there was a civil war in Rhodesia between white Rhodesians and black Rhodesians which side would you want to win? | Support white Rhodesians..... 44 | Support black Rhodesians..... 17 |
| Elitist/Populist Government: Which do you think is more important in a government—education and experience of governing, or understanding how ordinary people feel and think? | Education and experience..... 36 | Understanding ordinary people..... 54 |

12 percent think the current situation is about right.

Note: The balance of percentages is made up by "don't knows."

However, it is not too difficult to see a likely explanation of the apparent inconsistency. The objection of most people is probably to the abuse of unemployment benefit which they believe is too prevalent—not to its application to deserving cases, in which category each man would presumably include himself if the need arose.

In assessing the 53 per cent, who, in the present poll, do not believe that racial dis-

crimination should be against the law, allowance must be made for the position of many Conservatives who, though totally opposed in principle to racial discrimination believe it to be difficult, or impossible, to prevent by law.

In general there was little between the sexes on most of the questions asked.

The main differences were between age groups and classes. The middle-age groups

(35-54) were much more Right-wing on Social Services and taxation than either the under-35s or the over-55s.

The middle-classes were more Right-wing on taxation and the social services, on economic policy and on "elitist" versus "populist" government; the working classes on Rhodesia as well as crime.

The fact that the only "Left-wing" majority response was in favour of a govern-

ment "understanding ordinary people" as against the "elitist" (Conservative?) concept, presumably explains the discrepancy between the general predominance of Right-wing attitudes and the weight of built-in support for Labour in the electorate, particularly the working classes.

In the extremity of the polling booths, many voters will stomach particular Left-wing attitudes which predominate among Labour activists because they believe that Labour in general is the party which best represents working-people's material interests.

The crucial political question is how far this approach will remain for Labour an effective bulwark against the hardening of Right-wing attitudes on almost every major individual issue of social and economic policy.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 18037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

WAIVER OF RULE OF GERMANENESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed with my address, notwithstanding paragraph 3 of rule VIII, dealing with germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRISIS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA: MOSCOW AT A CROSSROADS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on July 29 I addressed this distinguished body on the crisis in Czechoslovakia. On that occasion, I warned of the real possibility of a Soviet military intervention, a repetition of the Hungarian tragedy of 1956. My fears were justified.

At that time, the general expectation seemed to be that the Soviets would not invade Czechoslovakia, and the conclusion of the conferences at Cierna and Bratislava early in August seemed to fortify the judgment of those who believed that the Soviets had decided to compromise and permit Czechoslovakia's distinctive road to socialism.

CONFERENCE IN MOSCOW

It was in this evolving mood of hopeful expectation that I left the United States

early in August to attend the Seventh World Power Conference in Moscow. I was assigned by the Senate Commerce Committee, along with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable HUGH SCOTT, to represent the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce as a delegate to this conference.

I might add that this World Power Conference is made up of representatives of some 40 principal industrial nations of the world. It is held approximately every 4 years; this was the first World Conference in the Soviet Union. The conference lasted 4 days, from August 20 through 24, and I am proud to say that the United States played a prominent part in the technical discussions that were undertaken.

Prior to the convening of the conference, however, it was my opportunity and good fortune to visit various parts of the Soviet Union. In large measure, I retraced the route I had taken 9 years ago when I was chairman of a committee that was sent by the Senate to survey the water and power resources of the Soviet Union, and to report as to how they compared with those of the United States. I went out to Siberia, the Soviet Union's frontier, as far as Irkutsk and Bratsk, then down into Soviet Central Asia to Tashkent, Baku, and to Yerevan, and finally we flew to Leningrad. In all, I was gone about 18 days.

For me, this return trip to the Soviet Union was most instructive. The Soviets continue to make great progress in this field of power development. Their great hydro and thermal power stations are huge and efficient. In the technique of long-line transmission at high voltage the Soviets are undoubted leaders. In 9 years they have progressed greatly and their momentum continues.

My inspection prior to the power conference was completed and I was in Moscow during the most serious moments of the crisis in Czechoslovakia; for it was in those 4 days of the World Power Conference, August 20 to 24, that the second chapter of this crisis was being written, a chapter that we well know has been filled with tragedy, anguish, and despair.

STATEMENT IN COPENHAGEN

In the days preceding Soviet military intervention, I continued to be skeptical of the optimistic judgment that the Soviets would not so intervene. While in Copenhagen on August 7, during a stop-over on the way to Moscow, I issued a statement in which I recalled my doubts expressed in the speech of July 29 and, directing my attention to the conclusion of the Cierna-Bratislava conferences, declared that we should view with cautious concern the drama unfolding in Central Europe. I expressed the hope that the ancient and proud people of Czechoslovakia might indeed regain full freedom, independence and self-determination, suggesting further that the Soviets would gain by permitting this course and in building a friendship of equals in political and economic independence.

Alluding to the great economic and military power of the Soviet Union, I expressed the further hope that a spirit of detente and cooperation would grow be-

tween the U.S.S.R. and the United States, and indeed among all nations of the world. But I warned that the suppression of freedom by the use of military threats and actual force would lead only to wider conflict and to an escalation of the arms race rather than political agreement and, the hope of all mankind, arms control.

THE INVASION VIEWED FROM MOSCOW

Unfortunately, my skepticism of Soviet acceptance of Czechoslovakia's new road to socialism was proved correct by developments on the opening day of the conference, August 20. For, on that day Soviet military forces, along with units from Poland, East Germany, Bulgaria, and Hungary, numbering, we were told, some 600,000 men, invaded Czechoslovakia and set out on a course to crush by force of arms the movement toward liberalization in that country.

Immediately, the Soviet press attempted to justify this military intervention. It was reported that Czechoslovak citizens concerned about the trend toward "counterrevolution," asked for Soviet assistance. Thus the best face was put on this brutal display of military power. Major efforts were made to seal off the U.S.S.R. from all information from the West. For the first time in about 6 years, the Soviets jammed all broadcasts in the Russian language that were coming into the Soviet Union, and we expected that they soon would jam all other foreign broadcasts.

In view of this political crisis and its implications for American policy, especially with the conference opening, the American Embassy in Moscow got in touch with us at once. Both Senator SCOTT and I conferred with Embassy officials on the advisability of withdrawing from the conference or otherwise expressing our disapproval. Ultimately, we decided that no practical value could be achieved by a walkout; much important work was to be done at this conference; and such a conference, essentially dealing with technical matters, was not really the proper channel through which to lodge a protest.

However, both Senator SCOTT and I advised our Embassy authorities that we thought they should make it perfectly clear to the Russians that we disapproved of the Soviet action and that we urged the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Czechoslovakia. We agreed to express such sentiments at any appropriate time and place.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S RESPONSE TO THE SOVIET INVASION

The Soviet invasion was swift; the military occupation was total. Czechoslovakia's military forces were no match for the 600,000 invaders. The invasion was unexpected; hence, Czechoslovakia was unprepared. Wisely, Alexander Dubcek, the First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, and other Government leaders urged the Czechoslovak people to acquiesce in this brutal military act, to avoid provocations that would bring on bloodshed, and to support their own government in its efforts to reach some sort of a negotiated settlement with the invader. The goal of Dubcek was to reach agreement on the

withdrawal of Soviet forces as quickly as possible and hope to resume the work of liberalization begun in January 1968.

Once again Soviet military forces were in Czechoslovakia but in 1945 they came as liberators, this time as oppressors. The contrast was not ignored by Czechoslovaks who taunted the invaders, painted swastika signs on their tanks, greeted them with cold contempt, staged strikes, and in countless individual acts demonstrated their hostility.

Faced with this awesome display of Soviet power, the people of Czechoslovakia were determined to resist, not by a senseless resort to military force, which ultimately could not succeed, but in a uniquely Czechoslovak manner of defiance by inaction, a sort of passive acquiescence in the inevitable but in a spirit that would draw world attention to this colossal blunder by the Soviet Union.

The people of Czechoslovakia listened to their leaders and in general abided by their warnings. Negotiations were undertaken at Moscow, negotiations in which the Prague leaders, who were spirited off to Moscow like common criminals, had little other choice than to accept the terms dictated by the Soviet Union. We are now told that at one point in the discussions the Russians, when faced with continued Czechoslovak resistance to their demands, stated categorically that they would destroy Czechoslovakia, annex Slovakia and establish a military protectorate over the Czech lands. The Czechoslovak leaders threatened suicide if this were done.

The Soviets appeared to be determined to destroy the enlightened Dubcek regime, set up a quisling government, and turn back the clock to Stalinism by imposing a new era of harsh suppression.

But the Soviets had miscalculated: They expected Dubcek to collapse under Soviet military pressure and they then could inaugurate a political takeover with little difficulty. However, they had failed to judge correctly the temper of the people, the attitude of the party, and the collective loyalty of the Czechs to their leaders.

The people resisted courageously, but passively and without undue provocation; they were unmoved in their support of Dubcek.

The Communist Party, having met in a secret congress, determined to support their Czech leaders.

The entire Czechoslovak nation was behind their Government, a very unusual spectacle in a Communist country.

Thus, the Soviets succeeded militarily but failed politically.

A NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT

Faced with the open hostility of the Czechoslovak masses and an obstinate, popularly supported Government in Prague, the Soviets were left with only two alternatives: They could clamp down upon Czechoslovakia a military government with a Soviet military governor in command—clearly, they had the power to do this—or they could restore the Dubcek-Svoboda regime, and through negotiations reach a political agreement, the heart of which would be the continuation of the Government, but under serious, Soviet-imposed restrictions.

The Soviets chose the latter course.

Dubcek, who had been charged with treason by Moscow, was permitted to resume his position by the terms of a new compromise settlement. Other terms reached at Moscow were said to include a phased withdrawal of Soviet and Warsaw Pact military forces, but with the acceptance of a permanent garrison force of two Soviet divisions on the West German border and the reimposition of censorship. Whatever other terms were in the agreement and how the Soviets will play out their role as occupiers, are matters to be determined in the future. The essential point is that the Soviets are in control. However, this presence of power ought not to obscure the fact that the Russians have on their hands an enormous political problem, one which they clearly had not thought out in their hasty resort to military force; namely, the problem of leading a people.

At the moment, the people of Czechoslovakia are adjusting to the new situation. This is not easy, for fear infects the environment of this country as all are bracing for a new era of Soviet oppression. Purges of liberals are expected; the Soviets are said to have lists of thousands to be removed from the party and the Government. Censorship of the press and all other media of mass communications has been instituted. Czechoslovak citizens are fleeing their country by the thousands.

Uncertainty and fear seem to be the dominant mood of the nation as the engine of Soviet tyranny gives every indication of consuming the liberal leaders of Czechoslovakia and arresting their course of liberalization.

AMERICA'S RESPONSE

Earlier this year, the official response of the U.S. Government toward Dubcek's liberalization in Czechoslovakia was one of cautious optimism. Our Government did not want to embarrass the new regime by seeming to encourage a too rapid reorientation of Prague's foreign policy. We realized that the Dubcek government was in a difficult position in its relations with Moscow and any undue haste on our part to applaud the Czechoslovaks could hinder rather than assist the Prague government in its search for a new independent road.

Moreover, there was little else in a practical way that we could do beyond making understanding gestures; for in the power relationship that has taken shape between East and West during the postwar decade, Eastern Europe has come to be recognized internationally, by implication rather than by specific agreement, as a particular area of vital interest to the Soviet Union. For this reason, the United States did not intervene militarily in Hungary during the revolution of 1956; the underlying presumption was that a thrust by the United States into this area of Soviet vital interests could trigger a third world war, and this could be a thermonuclear war. Thus, in 1968, as in 1956, we were boxed in by existing political realities and by the harsh realization that the danger of thermonuclear war, like the sword of Damocles, hangs over all crises between East and West.

So, as the Czechoslovak crisis reached a new and dangerous stage in July, the United States was again faced with the same realities that existed in 1956; indeed the situation was even more complicated by our massive military commitment to Vietnam. The administration acted wisely, I believe, in its efforts to caution the Soviets against intervention. By a series of informal actions, the Soviets were made fully aware of the negative impact intervention would have on American public opinion and also how this would be translated into a slowing down of the detente between the Soviet Union and the United States.

But the Soviets must have placed their relations with Washington on a lower priority; they were willing to accept the risk of a negative impact on their relations with the United States which might be caused by their invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Americans were naturally stunned and shocked by the military invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. They did not expect it. Apparently, administration officials and specialists in the Government felt certain that the Soviets were willing to accept the Cierna-Bratislava settlement, at least momentarily. It was presumed that continuing detente in relations with the West, unity of the world Communist movement, and the obvious good behavior of the Dubcek government would together stand as valid arguments against the risk to their policies that was inherent in any invasion.

SOVIET DECISION FOR INTERVENTION

Presumably, these were valid assumptions during the first weeks after Cierna and Bratislava; it seemed as if the Soviets were indeed acting upon the terms of agreement announced. But military maneuvers were resumed in western Russia. These were ominous signs of things to come, for now we know these maneuvers were actually preparations for a possible invasion.

However, the final decision to intervene is believed not to have been made until the day before the actual invasion on August 20. On that occasion, some Soviet leaders were called back from their vacations; presumably some members of the Central Committee were consulted; and the decision was made at the highest level of political authority; that is, the party's Politburo.

Reports in the press indicate that the military, especially Marshal Grechko, had played a major role in influencing the political leadership; the military had long wanted a Soviet force in Czechoslovakia as added security against West Germany. The hardliners in the collective leadership, notably Pyotr Shelest and Andrei Kirilenko and possibly Shelepin, coalesced with the military, it is surmised, against those opposing intervention; the balance was tipped accordingly. Kosygin, Brezhnev, and Suslov were believed to be opposed to intervention.

WHY THE SOVIETS INVADDED

The reasons for Soviet intervention must, of course, be a matter of conjecture. On the basis of what the Russians have said thus far and what was said during June and July, it seems evident that fear of the spreading infection of

Czechoslovak liberalism was the primary reason for intervention.

The Russians have been profoundly troubled by dissenting intellectuals in the U.S.S.R. In recent years, they have separately tried to suppress them. The Soviet intelligentsia, notably the writers and some scientists, have advocated a wider range of freedom; they applauded enthusiastically liberalizing developments in Prague. The implication seemed to be that here was a model for the future, a scheme for leading Communist countries out of the dismal impasse in which they have found themselves, a scheme which had the promise of reconciling political authoritarianism with the irrepressible forward thrust of the human spirit into new realms of creativity.

But Soviet Russia was not alone in its trouble with the intellectuals. Poland has had its dissenters, and they have made their grievances known. Late in 1967 and early in 1968, some of Poland's leading philosophers, teachers, and writers joined with dissenting students in protesting against cultural suppression in their country. Gomulka responded with massive repression, with the result that Poland, in counterpoint to Czechoslovakia, has moved progressively to the right to the extent that observers now speak of a new Stalinism, even neo-Fascism, in a Poland suffused with heightened nationalism, acute authoritarianism, and blatant anti-Semitism. Gomulka fears the intellectual; and the dissenting intellectual he fears with a passion. He disliked what was going on in Prague; developments there were a threat to his regime, and he wanted something done about it.

East Germany, too, has been concerned about the infection of liberalism. While Ulbricht, unlike Gomulka in Poland, has instituted some economic reforms, and thus has improved the nation's economy, he has not modified his harsh Stalinist rule. He, too, feared the liberalizing developments in Prague.

Thus, fear of spreading liberalization—an acute concern for a threat in the ideological realm—was a key factor in the decision to intervene. Moscow was not alone in its purposes; it had willing allies in Poland and East Germany whose interests coalesced.

The other reason for intervention was undoubtedly related to national security, that is, a fear that liberalization in Czechoslovakia would create a chink in the defensive wall in this vital northern tier area adjoining West Germany. Soviet, Polish, and East German vital security interests are deeply involved here. Apparently, they came to believe that Dubcek's reformers could not be trusted to protect this vital sector against the possible threat of a resurging West Germany.

Together, the ideological and strategic factors apparently combined to persuade the Soviets that there was justification for intervention. These factors took a higher priority in the scale of Soviet foreign policy interests, so detente with the West and unity of the world Communist bloc had to go by the board.

JUSTIFICATION QUESTIONED

But, we might ask, was Soviet intervention justified?

Certainly on the ideological level the Dubcek government had given repeated assurances of its fidelity to Communist doctrine. This was done both by word and by deed. The 2,000-word statement by Czechoslovak liberal intellectuals asking for wider liberties and for forceful action against the conservative element within the regime was soundly rejected by the government. Moreover, administrative actions were taken that reduced the influence of the liberals and widened that of the conservatives. In addition, Dubcek had made it clear that competing parties would not be permitted; the monopoly of political power in Czechoslovakia was to continue in the CPC.

What Dubcek and his reformers were trying to do was not to destroy communism, but to purge it of some of its most offensive characteristics; their goals were to maintain the prerogatives of the party and preserve the essentials of doctrine. So sure were they of popular support for their brand of communism that they permitted a larger area of intellectual freedom. We must remember that these writers and journalists who supported the regime and subsequently were attacked by Moscow, are Communists; they are committed to the fundamental concepts of Marxism-Leninism. But these reformers, this new breed of Communists, sought to make communism work as a viable political system. They had seen doctrinaire communism bring the most progressive country in Eastern Europe before World War II to a point of ruin. But, rather than change the basic concepts governing this country, they sought to liberalize the national environment and at once harness the entire energies of the nation for the sake of making communism a success in Czechoslovakia. Even dissenting Soviet intellectuals saw in developments in Prague the possibility of a new form of communism that, adapted to the Soviet setting, would permit a massive thrust forward for Soviet power and world communism.

Dubcek's reformers were no threat to Moscow: If they could have created a humanistic socialism popularly supported and combining the best of public and private economic systems, that would have been a new model for world communism, especially in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

On the security level, Dubcek and his reformers were even less a threat to Moscow than on the ideological level. Time and again they reaffirmed their allegiance to Moscow's security system, the Warsaw Pact. These were not idle, meaningless declarations; they were declarations derived from the natural law of politics; that is, that smaller nations gravitate to the political orbit of great powers particularly when faced with what they believe to be a common danger—in Czechoslovakia's case what it regards as the potential threat from a resurging Germany.

As a people, Czechoslovakia suffered more from the Nazi war machine in proportion, than did the Soviet Union. None will ever forget Lidice. So their concern over German militarism is a real one, a concern derived from harsh experience. And it is ironic that the first Germans to

violate Czechoslovakia's frontiers since 1945 came from the "fraternal" Communist East Germans.

Moreover, a serious issue remains between Germany and Czechoslovakia; namely, the irredentist ambitions of the many millions of Sudeten Germans who were expelled from Czechoslovakia in 1945 and have taken residence in West Germany.

This practical issue, along with other compelling political considerations, has created a natural bond of common interest between Prague and Moscow. Thus Moscow should have had no fears of a political rapprochement between Czechoslovakia and West Germany. What the Czechoslovaks wanted from West Germany was no more than what the Russians themselves have sought from the West Germans, the French, Italians, British, and others, namely, economic support in the form of technical assistance, possibly hard currency loans, and expanded trade.

It is hard for me, therefore, to see any justification for Soviet fears on either the ideological or strategic level. Presumably, Kosygin, Brezhnev, and Suslov were satisfied with Prague's assurances of continued fidelity; but others in the Soviet policymaking machinery felt otherwise.

RESULTS OF THE SOVIET INVASION AND MILITARY OCCUPATION

As for the results of the Soviet invasion and military occupation, we have only the perspective of just over 2 weeks upon which to make some judgments. But some things seem rather self-evident.

First of all, the Soviets have destroyed—at least for now—Czechoslovakia's dream of a new road to socialism, as it was initially conceived. How far they will turn back the clock we do not know. If it is true—as it now appears—that hardline Stalinist types have assumed the upper hand in Moscow, then it seems fairly clear that in form and content Czechoslovakia might well experience a great reversal, perhaps even revert to the days of Novotny. Reports from Prague indicate that a widespread purge of liberals is expected. A new fear seems to have gripped their country, a fear reminiscent of the worst days of Stalinism in the 1950's. How well founded these fears are can only be demonstrated in the future.

A second result seems to be a perceptible hardening of Soviet policy. Reports of Soviet pressure against Rumania, again in the form of a demand for Warsaw Pact military maneuvers on Rumanian soil, indicates the extent to which the Russians seem determined to reassert a hardline-inspired obedience from its allies within the pact. Rumania's trouble stems from its independent foreign policy; internally the regime is very much hard line in character. Thus, it is possible that all of Eastern Europe may experience a renewal of modified Stalinism.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE CRISIS

For Czechoslovakia the implications of the crisis are profound. For 8 months the Czechoslovaks had hoped for a genuine renewal of their country and the achievement of a new and higher form of political life, one that would preserve

socialism but combine with it a genuine respect for the dignity of man. In a word, to synthesize the humanism of Thomas Masaryk with the socialism of Karl Marx.

All this appears to have been lost.

The Soviets have imposed a military occupation on Czechoslovakia; they now control all the mechanism of power. For a while they may continue to work through Dubcek, who has tried desperately to preserve the gains of his regime and the dignity of his country, but reports from Prague in the last week indicate the odds that he faces.

For the Soviets, the invasion and occupation has by far the most serious implications. For a few weeks they had a choice, whether to accept the natural evolution of what might have been a competing form of socialism or to insist upon the Soviet model. In other words, whether to face the future hopefully and boldly or return to the dismal and unpromising past: they chose the latter; and by so doing they have demonstrated again that they cannot tolerate any semblance of freedom within their system or that of a fraternal ally. From this clearly articulated political reality, it is possible to derive the most dire implications: a return of the cold war; an exacerbation of tensions in Europe; renewal of Stalinism on a modified scale not only in Eastern Europe but in Russia itself.

The problem of bloc unity has been exacerbated by the invasion; this has serious implications for Soviet claims to leadership and control over the world Communist movement.

Once the Russians crossed the frontier to chastise their fraternal Czechoslovak ally, they inevitably quickened the centrifugal forces of bloc disunity. In recent years the Soviets have tried to manage this problem; by and large, they have failed. Only by the most vigorous arm-twisting and application of much political pressure were they able to get even respectable support for their unity conference scheduled in Moscow at the end of this year.

Intervention has magnified this problem; it has deepened the rift in the world Communist movement; it has shaken the confidence of the fraternal parties; it has weakened Russia's control over the movement:

The Russians won for themselves the everlasting hatred of the Czechoslovak people, including the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia;

Threats of intervention in Rumania embittered relations with the Bucharest party leaders and firmly set that nation against Moscow;

The Chinese Communists seized upon the intervention issue to broaden their attack on Moscow's leadership;

The powerful Western parties in France and Italy and those of lesser strength elsewhere are visibly shaken and protested the invasion.

Even the CPUSA is split right down the middle, its leadership in open contention, its strength dissipated.

In brief, intervention has thrown world communism into disarray; it has sown the seeds of distrust of Soviet power; it has accelerated bloc disunity.

Can this bloc unity be restored?

I doubt it. Certainly it will take more than the next 3 months for the Russians to pacify their agitated brethren and to rebuild their shattered confidence in the "wisdom" of the Soviet leadership. Scrapping of the Moscow unity conference may be part of the cost to the Russians when the full bill of intervention has been totaled up.

At the same time the Russians will be hard pressed to repair their damaged image among their neutralist supporters in the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Africa. Having passed themselves off as protector and friend of the small nation against the imperialist West for decades, they are now faced with the problem of reconciling their propaganda claim with hard, demonstrated evidence of Soviet imperialistic intervention very much in the classic 19th Century manner.

We Americans can take little comfort in the events of the last weeks, however much we may insist that this was really a family affair. In a narrow sense it was a family affair, but it was a family affair that has far-reaching implications for East-West relations. Surely none of us can now advocate a policy of reducing our troop strength in NATO. The military balance in Central Europe has been radically changed by the presence of 600,000 Warsaw Pact troops in Czechoslovakia. Before the August crisis, reduction of our troop strength in Europe appealed to me; this is no longer the case. For, if this invasion has demonstrated anything, it has demonstrated the speed, the efficiency, and the skill with which the Soviets could launch an invasion of conventional forces and complete the conquest of a country. All this talk of nuclear deterrence now seems to have been somewhat meaningless: conventional forces have proven their value once again. The West must take this into account when it rethinks its military policy in the aftermath of the crisis in Czechoslovakia.

EAST-WEST RELATIONSHIP

Perhaps, it is in the realm of Soviet-American relations that the crisis may well have the most serious implications. This invasion has destroyed a premise of American policy and some of the basic assumptions of our Nation's policymakers. Ever since the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, perhaps even before that, we Americans, especially our specialists in Communist bloc affairs, came to believe that Soviet conduct in foreign affairs was becoming rational; that it was somewhat tractable and consistent, restrained and more according to traditional Russian interests. Threat of a thermonuclear war introduced a new ingredient in Soviet foreign policy calculations that tended to generate these characteristics. Serious analysts have never denied the Soviet commitment to ideology or its relevance to foreign policy; but all available evidence, particularly the compelling reality of the thermonuclear bomb with virtually instantaneous, massive, long-range delivery systems, pointed in the direction of a more stabilized Soviet Union, a nation whose stake in world peace and in the continuation of reason-

ably good relations with the United States were absolutely necessary.

August 20 seems to have changed this, at least at this reading.

If the Soviets cannot feel secure and stable with a Czechoslovakia whose ethnic origins are Slavic, whose ideological preferences—at least the leadership's—are Communist, and whose national policy and national interests are by any objective assessment directed toward a close relationship with Moscow—if this is the case with Czechoslovakia, if military invasion is their reaction to change within the political system of their friend and ally—how then can there ever be a tolerable relationship established in Soviet-American relations?

If this Czechoslovak crisis is indicative of the quality of thought and judgment of Moscow's collective leadership, then I do not see how we can avoid serious trouble ahead.

AND THE FUTURE

Probably within any political system, a collective leadership is a potentially dangerous leadership, for it can breed uncertainty and instability in policy formulation. We have seen the results of this phenomenon in the reversal of the decisions made at Cierna and Bratislava: the hardline faction was apparently able to overturn the judgment of the most prominent figures in the political leadership and commit the Soviet Union to a political course the end and implications of which only God knows.

In all probability the future will be filled with uncertainty for us. We have come to know Kosygin and Brezhnev, but who are these other men and what are their purposes? For this reason, I was delighted to read President Johnson's warning to Moscow against unleashing the "dogs of war" in Eastern Europe. While our foreign policy options remain severely restricted in Eastern Europe, still we have by this declaration put the Soviet leadership on guard that their actions can have the most serious impact on our relations and those of our NATO allies.

In the final analysis, therefore, the August crisis may well have more far-reaching implications for East-West relations than was the case in any other crisis since the fall of 1962. For, should the Russians, under the pressure of new hardline forces within that nation's leadership, inaugurate a new era of Stalinism in East Europe, they would inevitably sharpen the cold war, the consequence of which would surely be, a strengthening of NATO forces, particularly those of West Germany, a downgrading of the goals of detente, and a general renewal of East-West tensions.

We face a dangerous future; there seems to be no doubt of that.

What of the Czechoslovaks and their future? The situation is far from clear. A harsh Soviet occupation has been predicted. The exodus of reformers has already begun, certainly the most grievous commentary on Soviet tyranny; the brains of the country are being forced into exile at Soviet gunpoint.

Now there can be no doubt that the Soviet Union has the power to impose a total police state system on Czechoslo-

vakia. But it is one thing to rule a nation; it is quite another to lead a nation. Novotny could rule Czechoslovakia; he could not lead it; he was a total failure and the Communists themselves disposed of him. The limits to which any ruler can go, including the Soviets, are imprecisely defined, but they exist. Being political realists, the Russians know this. Thus, this reality can and possibly will act as a mitigating force on Soviet rule on Czechoslovakia. It is significant that the Soviets have tried to avoid unpleasant confrontations with people; for the most part they accepted their taunts; and they have withdrawn their tanks from the cities to areas where they will be less conspicuous. The Russians know they have a serious political problem on their hands; they know there are limits to authoritarianism.

Another hopeful aspect is the nature of the Czechoslovak people themselves. They have the stuff, the inner discipline, the great qualities that it takes to resist the occupier and still seek to control their environment and political destiny. Centuries of foreign rule have instilled in them these unique qualities, qualities that have been amply manifested in recent weeks. By their obstinate resistance, the people of Czechoslovakia may yet force the Russians to adopt a more conciliatory course. The meeting of the CPC's Presidium over this past weekend and the carryover of many liberals by Dubcek into the new Presidium are manifestations of this manly courage. Surely, this is a subtle act of defiance; whether Dubcek can get away with it remains to be seen.

But we would deceive ourselves if we believed that developments in Czechoslovakia could ever go beyond the permissible limits established by the Soviet Union. In large measure, therefore, the future of Czechoslovakia depends on the future of the Soviet Union: it is the Russians who determine the bounds of liberalism, conservatism, reaction, and neo-Stalinism. In the final analysis it is they who call the tune. We can only watch with great concern political developments within the Soviet Union itself. If the Russians have clearly gone back to the past and to the path of Stalin with all its dire implications for world communism, the West, and Russia itself, then we can expect the worst for Russia as we can for Czechoslovakia; but if this August crisis proves to be only a momentary divergence, if it is recognized as a gross blunder and miserable failure—which objectively it is—to be righted by counterpressures and corrective action by leaders more responsive to Russia's genuine best interest and that of its people, then this reevaluation can be expected to make a favorable impact in Prague, as indeed elsewhere.

Meanwhile, we can only hope that a new, repressive madness has not taken over that strange land of Russia.

We can only hope that the demonstrated rationality and restraint of Russia's leaders in the immediate past will be resumed.

We can only hope that the Russians will not try to arrest and reverse the main thrust of history within the world Communist movement, the thrust toward divergency, diversity, independence, in-

deed, interdependence. We must hope that they cannot arrest and reverse the forward thrust of progress, especially in the political and social realm, that has been so marked a positive characteristic of Soviet life in the past decade.

For, our fate and that of all mankind is involved in the decisions taken in Moscow during the weeks and months ahead.

Let us pray that historians of the future will not write that the Russians in the autumn of 1968 turned their backs on their responsibilities to civilization.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong] and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the amendment offered by the Senator of Virginia [Mr. Spong], insert the following:

On page 16, line 5, after the period insert the following language:

"For grants and payments under the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), and under the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 9), \$90,965,000, fiscal year 1968; *Provided*, That these funds shall not be subject to the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Statute, Revised Statutes 3679, 31 U.S.C. 665 (c): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of this appropriation shall not be taken into consideration for the purposes of title II of the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, are we operating under any controlled time arrangement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no controlled time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my amendment in the nature of a substitute deals with a very urgent matter concerning the schoolchildren of our country, as does the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], for whose amendment my amendment provides a substitute.

In our conference just before the adjournment for the two political conventions, the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House agreed unanimously on the provision of \$90,965,000 to meet these critical needs.

That money has been withheld by the

President. The purpose of my substitute is to make this money immediately available for the duration of the fiscal year and to provide exemptions from the prohibitory statutes which the President relied upon in freezing the funds.

I propose to discuss the amendment a little later, as I understand the plan of the leadership of the Senate is not to pursue any rollcall votes today.

In that event, I shall defer my discussion in detail of the amendment until we are ready to begin operating on the bill.

I ask that my amendment be made the pending business.

May I have the attention of the majority leader? I have just offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is lying on the desk. I understood the plan of the leadership was not to have any rollcall votes this afternoon. In that event, I shall defer action on my amendment until somewhat later.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield, without losing his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 939

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] I submit an amendment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed and lie on the table, and I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 59, lines 20 and 21, strike out "\$1,873,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,088,000,000".

Mr. PASTORE. I intend to call up the amendment tomorrow, and I should like to explain it at this time.

This is an amendment to increase the appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity by \$215 million to a total of \$2.088 billion for fiscal year 1969.

This modest increase is the absolute minimum with which we can effectively continue the attack on poverty. It is almost \$100 million less than the amount Congress authorized for the antipoverty program and the amount the President requested for OEO in his budget.

Why does the Office of Economic Opportunity need an additional \$215 million?

Only last December, Congress adopted a 2-year authorization bill for OEO. It proposed that \$1.98 billion be appropriated for fiscal year 1968 and \$2.18 billion for fiscal year 1969.

The President supported these authorizations and requested a \$2.18 billion appropriation for fiscal year 1969.

Yet, last year, Congress appropriated only \$1.773 billion—\$200 million less than the authorization figure.

This year, the House and the Senate appropriations Committees have proposed an appropriation of \$1.873 billion—a full \$307 million under the authorization figure and the President's request.

I should like to add at this juncture, parenthetically, that I have heard time and time again, until I have become weary of hearing it, the criticism being leveled at the administration, that it talks big and then does not provide the money. The fact is—and if anyone wants to challenge me on this, I would like to debate the subject—that every time Congress has acted on authorizations for the poverty program, we have never appropriated the full amount that was authorized and the amount that was requested by the President of the United States. I believe this is our opportunity, at this time, to correct it.

Some may say this is a windfall—\$100 million more than the program received last year—in a time of general belt tightening.

But is it? Let us look at the fiscal facts surrounding the antipoverty program.

In the arithmetic of the administration of Federal programs, an increase of \$100 million does not mean 100 million of new money for an agency or department to use as it wills. In fact, the increase for OEO contained in the appropriation bill before us actually is less than the amount necessary to keep current OEO programs going.

OEO officials testified that simply to continue present programs at current levels, an appropriation of \$1.392 billion is required. This means no money to start any new antipoverty efforts.

This situation comes about because of the refunding cycles of community action, legal services, Job Corps, health centers, and many other antipoverty activities. Further, a number of programs which need only modest funding in the startup stage require greater amounts when they become fully operational. For example, comprehensive health centers needed only \$33 million in fiscal year 1968 but would require about \$90 million to carry on this year.

Therefore, far from providing OEO with new program funds, the Appropriations Committee mark of \$1.873 billion could actually necessitate a cutback in antipoverty programs. It falls \$59 million short of the amount needed for current programs.

This will hardly prick the consciences of those who disapprove of the whole concept of OEO, but they may not be aware of what has been happening lately.

The latest figures show that almost 3 million Americans came out of poverty in 1967. Since OEO was created in 1964, well over 7 million people have left poverty—more than 2½ times the annual rate for the preceding 5-year period.

Obviously, somebody has been doing something right. OEO does not take credit for all of the improvement, but there can be no denying that the new programs of the last 3 years have had a significant impact.

Another exciting development in the war on poverty is the success of the partnership between the Federal Government and the Nation's business community in developing employment training and jobs for the hard-core unemployed.

This is the job opportunities in the business sector—JOBS—program operated by the National Alliance of Businessmen.

The most recent figures show that NAB has secured 165,000 pledges and has actually placed 40,000 previously unemployed, and once largely unemployable, persons in jobs.

It is significant to note that, last year, \$60 million in OEO funds went into this important program.

But there are still 26 million Americans living below the poverty line. There are 5 million Americans whose earnings even when they are working full time do not bring them above the poverty line.

These are the poverty targets. These are the targets which an increased OEO appropriation will help us reach. We cannot do so by cutting the funds available in the war against poverty.

Look, for example, at what has happened to Headstart Follow Through. Headstart had the almost universal endorsement of the Congress and the public, but it has still been impossible to begin the entirely logical Headstart Follow Through program.

The Follow Through program is to find out how these programs develop and to reach out and talk with the people who are under these programs, to find out whether or not they have been effective. I believe it would be foolhardy on our part to spend millions and millions of dollars to initiate a program and to train people under it and then not follow through to find out how the program has developed.

Evaluation of Headstart has made it clear that there is a need for a program to reinforce the significant gains made in Headstart and to insure that Headstart children continue at a rapid rate of development when they enter school. This is particularly true in the case of more than two-thirds of the children who derive benefit only from the short summer programs of Headstart.

OEO and the Office of Education have been ready to implement this in-school phase now for almost 2 years. They need funds. In fiscal year 1968 the President requested and was ready to use \$120 million to begin a Follow Through program; the Congress voted only \$15 million—barely enough to maintain an experimental pilot program effort at a very modest level.

This year's tight budget request was \$50 million, which would provide \$26 million for program expansion beyond the operation of last year's classes and the continued participation of last year's children in the program. An appropriation of only \$1.873 billion would hardly keep last year's token efforts going.

The JOBS program run by the NAB is another vital example of the promise of antipoverty efforts.

Yet, the appropriation reported by our committee falls \$21 million short of the amount required to take advantage of the

job opportunities offered by this unique program. Obviously, additional funds for these jobs could be found within the reported amount, but again only at the unconscionable cost of depriving the poor of what they have already been offered to escape their condition. It would be shameful to develop a father's job opportunity, but only through depriving his son of Headstart opportunities. When the private sector is responding so magnificently to our challenge, can we afford to turn our backs on it?

My amendment would add \$215 million to the Appropriations Committee figure of \$1.873 billion to meet some of these critical needs.

Of this amount, \$59 million would permit full continuance of fiscal year 1968 programs, \$26 million would permit mounting the President's recommended program for Headstart Follow Through, \$9 million would permit additional emphasis in rural areas, and the remaining \$121 million would permit full realization of the JOBS program.

This is still \$92 million less than the President requested. Several smaller program expansions will regrettably have to go.

The poor, too, must apparently make some sacrifices to the Nation's need to tighten its belt. I trust that OEO, as programs are refunded in the coming year, will economize wherever possible and that the special concerns expressed in our committee's report will receive close attention. We cannot in conscience force the poor to bear the full burden of our efforts to reduce Federal spending.

I hope that when this amendment is called up it will be agreed to.

THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall make the following statement very slowly for the benefit of all who will listen to me.

I do not know in what lasting mood the American public is going to remember the recent Democratic National Convention in Chicago. I do know, and I feel this rather strongly, that as the situation now stands the American public will remember more of what happened in Grant Park and away from the convention hall than they will of the fine debate therein on the majority and minority Vietnam planks.

For myself, I have returned from Chicago with a feeling not too favorable. I want that clearly understood. I have received a flow of mail from constituents back home who have read the newspapers and who have viewed the television. The mail has been rather mixed. There are those who felt that the right thing was done, and there are other persons who felt the wrong thing was done. All seem confused as to where law and order begins and ends—or survives.

I am not here today to pass judgment on the rights or the wrongs of this situation. I feel pretty much as Milton Eisenhower feels, now that his Commission has been called upon to make an investigation of what happened in Chicago. He has stated he does not want to place himself in a position of prejudging the

matter. That is exactly the position I take here today.

However, I believe the American public is entitled to know all the facts. What came through the television sets was rather ugly. There is absolutely no question about it. In my mind, whether what was done was done in the heat of the moment I do not know, nor do I know what the provocations may have been; but surely it appeared to me that possibly more force was used than was reasonably necessary.

Mayor Daley, on behalf of his city of Chicago, feels that he should be given time, at prime time, by the networks to explain his problems and his performance. I have no way of knowing what his case is, but I think the American people have a right to know and to make their own decision.

Mayor Daley has asked for this time on prime television time to be given by the networks. He has been turned down by CBS. NBC has offered to give him time on the "Meet the Press" program. At this moment I do not know what the attitude of ABC might be. I do know the networks are confronted with very delicate questions because all of these situations do set precedents. Their decision could plague them in the future and come back to haunt them, so they have to look down the long road to assess what the ultimate results might be.

Be that as it may, what happened in Chicago has rocked this Nation. Right, wrong, or indifferent, it has rocked the Nation and so much so that the American public is confused as to exactly what did happen. How much took place that did not show on television, and how much of what was shown on television might have been the result of provocation are questions needing to be answered and I do hope that in due time those questions will be answered.

Inasmuch as I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce, I have a definite responsibility because no matter what the Commission reports, no matter what the President chooses to do, whether it be this President or the next President, whoever he may be, the fact still remains that the Congress has an independent responsibility of its own. I am sure my majority leader will agree with me. The Congress is the watchdog of communications.

My purpose in rising today is not to prejudice the situation and not to pass comment on the whys or wherefores, but merely to appeal to the networks to review their position, to become a little more condescending, so that America will have all the facts. I would hope, if Mr. Daley is given the time, it will not be another program of recrimination and indictment. I hope we will get the clear facts of all the evidence and incidents that led to this very rigid security that all of us experienced in Chicago.

How much of it was necessary, I am unable at this moment to say. I do know this: If as few as 2,000 young people—strong and able-bodied and even stronger minded—inaded or stampeded the convention hall with 5,000 or 6,000 people already there, only God in heaven knows

what might have happened. That, of course, could not be tolerated. Whether there was provocation, I repeat, I do not know. But I do know this: The American people should be told.

On television, I know that 1 hour is sometimes too long. It might be much too long a time in this case. I would hope that the networks would sit down with the mayor. I do not know that it has to be across the board—NBC, CBS, or ABC—but they could straighten this out among themselves. Somehow, I think it will do us all a lot of good if at least we heard all sides of the matter. If Mayor Daley were given the time to explain to the American people his side of the situation. I think that in the long run all of us would be better off.

I repeat, I am not here as anyone's advocate, but because I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and, in all probability, I am going to receive a lot of mail on this subject, and pressing requests will be made of my committee, I am going to suggest, openly and publicly, here today, that the presidents of the three networks sit down with Mayor Daley to see whether they cannot reach a reasonable agreement and allow Mayor Daley to appear on television and explain his side of the story to the American people.

Then, let the American people judge who was right, who was wrong, and whether anyone went too far.

DEATH OF ROGER PEACE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the August recess, our State and Nation, and especially the journalistic world, was deeply saddened by the death of Roger Peace, one of the ablest of newsmen, and one of the finest of civic leaders.

Roger Peace was no stranger to the U.S. Senate, since he was the interim U.S. Senator from South Carolina in 1941 after James F. Byrnes was appointed to the Supreme Court. His distinguished record while a Member of this body speaks for itself.

At the time of his death, Roger Peace was the chairman of Multimedia, Inc., an enterprise whose importance to our people is evident in the listing of its component divisions: The Greenville News-Piedmont Co., the Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co., and the Multimedia Broadcasting Co., consisting of WFBC-AM-FM-TV, Greenville; WBIR-AM-FM-TV, Knoxville, Tenn.; WMAZ-AM-FM-TV, Macon, Ga.; and WWNC, Asheville. As the steward of these operations, Mr. Peace turned in a remarkable record in the public interest.

Roger Peace was a pioneer in the newspaper, radio, and television fields, and his progressive policies were instrumental in the tremendous industrial growth of the Piedmont area of South Carolina, and especially Greenville. His father, B. H. Peace, bought the Greenville News in 1919 at his urging. Roger successively became sports editor, general manager, and editor before moving on to managerial positions. But it was the title of editor that he always liked best.

Roger Peace believed in our country and the principles that made it great. He

always stood for what was best for the people. He had a great vision for the South, and spurned offers which would have made him rich, but which would have taken control of the vital news media out of the region. He had faith that the South would prosper, and his faith was rewarded.

Roger Peace always made himself part of his editorial columns. He attacked the growing centralization of the Federal Government, and the waste of Federal funds. He knew what the Constitution meant, and saw how it was being eroded. He had traveled in the Soviet Union and understood the nature of international communism and its threat of squelching the free world. Once we had gone into Vietnam, he favored a military victory.

I would be much amiss if I did not mention Roger Peace's astonishing record of community service. It has been said that not a single educational institution in our State has failed to benefit from his efforts and his substance. He was a trustee of the South Carolina Foundation of Independent Colleges. He was instrumental in organizing the Greenville County Foundation. He was a former president of the Greater Greenville Chamber of Commerce, and the Community Chest of Greenville.

Above all, Roger Peace remained a newspaperman to the end. In everything he did, he sought to raise the sights of the community. His newspapers set the standards, and they are standards which it will be difficult to surpass.

In the death of Roger Peace, I have lost one of my finest and most loyal friends. I frequently consulted with him, and valued highly his wise counsel. His views were imaginative and thought-provoking. His dedication and his enthusiasm for his country's welfare were a source of inspiration.

Roger Peace was a distinguished citizen, a true patriot, and a great American. In his passing, our State, the South, and the Nation have lost an eloquent spokesman. He was truly a great builder, and as the poet said:

When a great builder dies
For years beyond his ken
The light he leaves behind him
Will shine upon the path of men.

I have had personal experience with Roger Peace's effect upon the lives of others, especially our young people. Two of his grandsons served as pages in the U.S. Senate upon my appointment, Edmund A. Ramsaur, Jr., and Roger C. Peace III. Both proved to be splendid young men of character and ability and dedication, and the imprint of their grandfather's life was evident in them.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathies to his lovely daughter, Mrs. E. A. Ramsaur, his grandchildren, and his brother, Mr. B. H. Peace, Jr., and his sisters, Mrs. Gertrude P. Leake, and Mrs. Laura P. Echols, and other surviving members of the Peace family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials and articles concerning this late distinguished citizen be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. They include editorials from:

"Roger Craft Peace," the Greenville News, August 22, 1968;

"Our Humble Gratitude," the Greenville News, August 25, 1968;

"Roger Craft Peace," the Greenville Piedmont, August 22, 1968;

"Roger C. Peace," the Index-Journal, August 22, 1968;

"Mr. Roger Passes," the Spartanburg Herald, August 22, 1968;

"Roger C. Peace," the News and Courier, August 3, 1968; and

"Editorial, WSPA Voice of the Air," August 23 and 24, 1968.

Also the following articles:

"Roger C. Peace, Publisher, Civic Leader, Dies at Home," the Greenville Piedmont, August 21, 1968;

"Roger Peace Mourned by Community," Greenville Piedmont, August 21, 1968;

"Roger Peace, News Media Bulldozer, Dies," Greenville News, August 22, 1968;

"Tributes Are Paid to Roger Peace," Greenville News, August 22, 1968;

"Roger C. Peace Funeral Planned Friday at 11," Greenville Piedmont, August 22, 1968;

"Mortal, but Irreplaceable, Said of Roger Peace at Funeral Rites," Greenville Piedmont, August 23, 1968;

"Roger Peace Called an Irreplaceable Man," Greenville News, August 24, 1968; and

"Roger C. Peace Tributes Flow In," Greenville News, August 24, 1968.

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

[From the Greenville News Aug. 22 1968]

ROGER CRAFT PEACE

"Thou wert my guide, philosopher and friend."—Essay on Man, Pope.

Roger Craft Peace was all of these things and more to those of us who worked with him during a distinguished newspaper and broadcasting career which began when he was about 16 and ended only the day before his sudden death at 69 as he sat in the evening quiet of his home.

"Mr. Roger" looked upon all of us not as employes but as associates. He had the command presence of the natural executive which made orders superfluous and leadership ability which conveyed his advice and desires without the necessity of directives. When he spoke of employes of the company, he included himself.

The editorial "we" was literally that in the policies of the newspaper; he was not a personal journalist in the sense that many of his own and the preceding generation were. Rather, he insisted that what went into the newspapers represent the best thinking of all in position to contribute.

In later years, when the managerial burden had been partly shifted to others and he had time again, he resisted urging that he write a personal, signed column, insisting that he preferred to be merely a part of the editorial page. And, indeed, he was, regardless of whether he was actually writing. His high principles, set forth by precept and example, insured his imprint on the newspaper in a manner that will live longer than the youngest of us.

We recognized and admired the enormous grasp and depth of his intellect and his knowledge. We were grateful for his common sense which could strip a problem or a complicated situation down to its bare essentials, so that solutions and analyses came more easily.

Above all, he taught and he practiced per-

sonal and institutional integrity and intellectual honesty.

He was the "open door" kind of executive who was quickly available to an employe or a member of the public with a professional, personal or community problem. Except when he secluded himself to write or to think, he answered his own telephone without the screening of calls by a secretary.

As he was thus available with his wit and wisdom to all of us, so he was to the civic and governmental leaders of the community, state and nation which he believed in with fervent patriotism. He might have had a brilliant public career, but was unwilling to give up his great love, the printed page, to pursue it.

Even so, his advice and counsel were eagerly sought by elected and appointed leaders at all levels, just as his professional knowledge and judgment were known and respected nationwide.

While building and presiding over a communications organization which has few equals anywhere, Mr. Peace gave freely of his time and talents to civic causes too numerous to mention. His and the corporation's philanthropy touched thousands in ways calculated to help them to help themselves and others.

There isn't a single educational institution in the state which hasn't directly benefited from his efforts and his substance, and he assisted many outside of it.

Thousands of South Carolinians work today at better jobs created for them by the wisdom and efforts of Roger Peace and a few other men back in the 1940's and 1950's.

Mr. Peace was chairman of the Preparedness for Peace Commission which blueprinted the post-World War II governmental reforms and set in motion the industrial development program upon which this state's present economy was built. He helped implement the South Carolina industrial revolution by a decade of service on the State Development Board which grew out of his commission's recommendations.

But first, and always, Roger C. Peace was a newspaperman.

In his teens he was a reporter, before the Peace family headed by his late father, B. H. Peace, acquired ownership of The Greenville News and some years later of The Piedmont. In his twenties he was an editor and in his thirties a publisher and manager.

The economics of publishing and broadcasting demanded more and more of his time. But despite this, and despite broad and deep involvement in public and other business affairs as a participant and consultant, he was in mind and heart fundamentally a reporter and editor.

In both these roles, which he combined and balanced, he had few peers. He possessed to a rare degree what newsmen know and feel as a sort of professional instinct. He was instrumental in launching the careers of several distinguished editors, in each of whom he discovered and developed this instinct which is more inbred than instilled or acquired.

His great regret in later years was that the pressure of other duties prevented his functioning more actively in the area of writing, a skill he exercised with unmatched facility and clarity, and editing, a task to which he brought extraordinary insights. This man who had held many titles, public and private, often said, "No title meant more to me than that of Editor."

But, so great was his capacity to adapt and to grow that, unlike most newspapermen, he also possessed or developed great business acumen marked by a rare combination of stability and daring, foresight and caution.

It was this foresight, wisdom and concern for the welfare of the state and community that prompted him to take several steps, which culminated in the formation of the

public corporation, Multimedia, of which the Greenville and Asheville newspapers are a part. His basic purpose was to provide, as far as was humanly possible, that the newspapers, as quasi-public institutions, would continue under community control in perpetuity.

Nobility and compassion were hallmarks of Mr. Peace's relations with his fellowman. His capacity for friendship was virtually limitless and his friends were legion and representative of almost the whole spectrum of humanity.

He had a full measure of the divine gift of laughter, most often turned upon himself, and a natural and wholesome personal jollity. He insisted that those around him possess and exercise the trait he invariably referred to as "levity."

People were attracted to him because they could look upon him and say with the poet, "Here is a man!"

[From the Greenville News, Aug. 25, 1968]

OUR HUMBLE GRATITUDE

We are confident that our readers and friends will understand that it will be impossible for us, much less the Peace family, to acknowledge all of the tributes and expressions of grief and sympathy which have come in a comforting tide since the death of our beloved Roger C. Peace.

So many have been in the form of telephone calls and notes to individuals among the scores of men and women who make up The News-Piedmont and associated companies. Others have been simple verbal expressions impossible to record or to remember accurately. Many have come from strangers.

In many ways, these are more meaningful than the more formal messages from persons of prominence. Their manner and tone of themselves indicate that the speakers or writers recognize the personal sort of loss each of us has experienced and the grief we feel; and that members of the public share our feelings, for as a public man "Mr. Roger" belonged to them also.

We would be less than honest, and guilty of false modesty, if we did not say that the most pleasing gesture of all was that of Mayor David G. Traxler in asking that the United States flag be flown at half-staff on all city buildings during the hours of deepest mourning.

Postmaster Robert A. Jolley Jr. concurred in Mayor Traxler's opinion and directed that the flag on the city's principal federal building likewise be lowered in tribute to Mr. Peace.

We thank them both in their personal feelings and official capacities.

It first was an honor befitting a public spirited citizen who felt and practiced deep patriotism, dedicated the news media he headed and gave so much of himself to community, state and nation.

It also recognized his position as a former United States Senator, an honor bestowed upon him by another distinguished South Carolinian and his lifelong friend, the late Governor and Senator Burnet R. Maybank. It was he who as governor in 1941 appointed Mr. Peace to succeed James F. Byrnes for the interim term while he himself successfully sought the seat. Mr. Peace considered this position one of the highest and most honored an American could hold.

All of these things were said and done, not in pride but in humility for a man who was himself both great and humble.

As we often presumed to speak for him while he lived, we think we speak for him as well as for ourselves now when we acknowledge these gestures and express gratitude for the words of praise, sympathy and comfort—all in the spirit of the ennobling humility which enabled our beloved friend and mentor to "walk with kings, nor lose the common touch."

[From the Greenville Piedmont,
Aug. 22, 1968]

ROGER CRAFT PEACE

Roger Craft Peace, above all else, was a working newspaperman.

His interests covered a broad spectrum—government, politics, finance, industry, business, education, travel, state and local planning—but his heart was in the newspapers he published, the people who put them together and their content.

Newspapers were his life, from the day in 1916 that he went to work on The Greenville News as a cub reporter till his death yesterday at 69.

Many honors came to Mr. Peace, local, state and national. From one of them developed the first of the two things in which he took paramount pride.

It was in 1942 that Mr. Peace was appointed chairman of the South Carolina Preparedness for Peace Commission. That commission, in 1945, presented a comprehensive postwar plan for South Carolina, including a recommendation for the formation of the South Carolina Research, Planning and Development Board. The Board and its extremely effective operation was a prideful thing to him.

The other of the two was the employes trust fund that he set up within the News-Piedmont Company. That was reflective of his immediate concern for his associates (he never called them employes) and was indicative of his larger concern for all who moved within his sphere.

Mr. Peace was a man of many facets. His business acumen was recognized by all with whom he had business. His integrity was just as great. His friendship was a thing of value. His love of family and friends, his compassion for others, his ability to bear sorrow with a strong heart—all had an amazing depth. His judgment, ability and dedication to whatever public or private task he undertook brought the greatest admiration.

He was a man who will be long and lovingly remembered because of the kind of man he was.—W.F.G.

[From the Greenwood (S.C.) Index-Journal, Aug. 22, 1968]

ROGER C. PEACE

The strong and restless mind of Roger Peace led him in many directions as a state and community leader, and for a time on the national scene.

But wherever these other interests led, they always spread out from the central core of his being as a newspaperman.

His identity was as the guiding hand of the Greenville News and the Greenville Piedmont, and later radio and television interests. But he served in many ways, not only as an active participant in programs for state and community uplift, but as a man whose counsel was often sought by those in public life.

Perhaps his greatest tribute comes in the deep respect and affection with which he was held by his associates on all levels in all departments of the newspaper and other enterprises he headed.

Our sympathy goes out to the Peace family, and to our friends on the Greenville newspapers who have lost a valued friend and counselor.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald,
Aug. 22, 1968]

MR. ROGER PASSES

Twenty some years ago, we had the pleasure of working for Mr. Roger. He was president and publisher of two great newspapers . . . yet he was affectionately referred to as "Mr. Roger." He was "Mr. Roger" from Judson Chapman, editor of The Piedmont, to the bald-headed elevator man.

Normally when one writes an editorial of the passing of a fine citizen, the effort is

made to list his accomplishments. With the passing of Mr. Roger the list is too long. He wouldn't have liked it, anyway.

Yet, one cannot refrain from thinking of the many great and lovely things he did for his profession, his community, state and nation. He was a newspaper reporter and later a United States Senator. That's a great spread in the endeavor of one man.

"Mr. Roger" was Roger C. Peace. When he died Tuesday, he was president and publisher of the Greenville Newspapers. He stood tall among present day Americans. His shadow will long stand bold and wide from the Piedmont of his South Carolina to the Atlantic Ocean.

So long, Mr. Roger.—PHIL B.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 23, 1968]

ROGER C. PEACE

An able business man with a keen sense of obligation to public service, Roger C. Peace combined the basic qualities for a successful newspaper publisher. His management of The Greenville News and The Greenville Piedmont, purchased earlier by his father, the late Bony Hampton Peace, was so efficient that radio, television and the two Asheville newspapers were added to the family holdings.

A man who commanded both respect and loyalty, Mr. Peace was held in high esteem by others in the publishing field and by fellow citizens generally. As a tribute to his leadership in South Carolina, he was appointed U.S. Senator to serve an interim term when James F. Byrnes became an associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We knew Roger Peace as a courteous, intelligent and affable colleague. He bore personal sorrows with cheerful fortitude. His death at 69 after a long illness is a source of grief to a large number of friends, associates and admirers.

WSPA: VOICE OF THE AIR, AUGUST 23 AND 24, 1968

The sudden passing of Roger Peace removes from the South Carolina scene a public figure who can ill be spared in these troublesome times.

His perception was worldwide, but his heart and his dedication always were to his community, his state and his country, and in that order.

Although extremely successful in many and varied business enterprises, he was fundamentally a newspaperman. What he did in building the Greenville News and Greenville Piedmont into the outstanding publications they are today exemplifies the best in journalism. In this era when so many Southern newspapers have been bought up by outside interests, Roger Peace never gave a second thought to the fabulous offers received for the Greenville newspapers which would have made him several times a millionaire early in life.

Roger Peace believed a state's greatest asset was its young people. The only time he ever thought about leaving South Carolina was when his father, the late B. H. Peace, hesitated about taking advantage of an opportunity to buy the Greenville Piedmont on which young Peace cut his journalistic teeth. When Mr. Peace returned home one night, he found his eldest son sitting on his packed trunk ready to take off for faraway places to pursue his chosen profession unless his father bought the Greenville newspaper. Mr. Peace told his son if he wanted a newspaper that badly, he would buy it.

And there began the building of the two fine daily newspapers which have meant so much to the growth of Greenville and the growth of the Piedmont. The Greenville News-Piedmont are shining examples of what home-owned newspapers can mean to a community and a region.

The Greenville newspapers attained their success because the Peaces recognized that the news columns belonged to the readers, and they never lost their objectiveness.

One example will serve to show Roger Peace's devotion to true journalism. His papers had waged an editorial campaign for extension of the city limits to include a community outside of Greenville which resented the effort to bring it in. A carnival came to West Greenville, and Roger Peace and members of his family and staff attended it. The police arrested the party for some undisclosed reason and locked them up.

The elder Peace was furious. Of course, his son and party were released without difficulty, and then came the question of publicity. The elder Peace wanted to play down or kill the story. Roger ordered that it be put on the front page of the Greenville paper. His reasoning was that no one, not even the publisher's family, had immunity from the readers of the newspapers having the news.

There are scores of examples of the wisdom and courage of Roger Peace in the building of the Greenville newspapers. But when all is said and done, it was this man's big heart, friendliness and his ability to attract intelligent and loyal associates that enabled him to scale so many ladders of success.

Roger Peace will be missed and mourned by people in all walks of life. But those who will miss him and mourn him most will be those with whom he was associated over the years and who knew him best.

A real big 30 goes up on life's scoreboard in the passing of Roger Peace, and South Carolina journalism has lost its brightest star.

[From the Greenville Piedmont, Aug. 21,
1968]

ROGER C. PEACE, PUBLISHER, CIVIC LEADER, DIES AT HOME

Roger Craft Peace, 69, noted Greenville newspaperman, business and civic leader and chairman of the board of Multimedia, Inc., died last night at his home, 201 Crescent Avenue.

Mr. Peace was born May 19, 1899, the eldest son of the late Bony Hampton Peace and Mrs. Laura Estelle Chandler Peace.

Mr. Peace was married in 1920 to Miss Etca Tindal Walker. They had two children, the late Roger C. Peace, Jr. and Mrs. E. A. (Dorothy Ann Peace) Ramsaur of Greenville, Mrs. Etca Peace died June 21, 1965.

Mr. Peace's second wife, Mrs. Amy Newgren Peace, died Sept. 19, 1967.

Also surviving are a brother, B. H. Peace, Jr., of Greenville; and sisters, Mrs. Gertrude P. Leake and Mrs. Laura P. Echols of Greenville and grandchildren, Edmund A. (Ted) Ramsaur, Jr., of Greenville, Etca Ann Ramsaur of Greenville, Norlin Craft Peace of Coral Gables, Fla., and Roger C. Peace, III of Coral Gables, Fla.

Another brother, Charlie Peace, died in 1958, and a sister, Mrs. Frances P. Graham died in 1967.

He was educated in the public schools of Greenville and was graduated from Furman University with a bachelor of arts degree in 1919. He entered ROTC training in 1918 and served later as an instructor in the United States Army.

Mr. Peace began his newspaper career as a reporter in 1916 on The Greenville News. Soon thereafter, at the behest of two other sons, his late father, B. H. Peace, who operated a commercial printing business, acquired The News from the late Capt. Ellison A. Smyth. Father and sons began the building process that has developed the newspaper into one of the most successful in the Southeast.

Roger Peace served as sports editor in 1919-20 and as editor from 1920-24, at which

time he became business manager. He remained active in the editorial direction of the paper. When his father's health began to fail about 1930, he began to assume more responsibility in the overall operation of what is now a large publishing company.

The Greenville News acquired The Piedmont in 1927 and merged it into the business operation of The Greenville News-Piedmont Co. In 1932 the company established Radio Station WFBC, which later entered the television field.

Upon his father's death in 1934, Mr. Peace became president of the News-Piedmont Co. and publisher of the two newspapers, holding the title of editor of The News for a period of time.

The News-Piedmont Co. purchased the Asheville, N.C., newspapers in 1954, forming The Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co., Inc., which publishes the Asheville Times and the Asheville Citizen and operates a radio station.

Multimedia, Inc., was organized last year. Its divisions are the Greenville News-Piedmont Co., the Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co. and Multimedia Broadcasting Co., the latter consisting of WFBC-AM-FM-TV, Greenville; WBIR-AM-FM-TV, Knoxville, Tenn.; WMAZ-AM-FM-TV, Macon, Ga., and WWNC-AM, Asheville, N.C.

Mr. Peace has served as director of the Peoples National Bank of Greenville, the Piedmont and Northern Railway, the Greenville Community Hotel Corp. and as chairman of the board of WMRC, Inc.

He served an interim term in the United States Senate from August to November, 1941, former Sen. James F. Byrnes was appointed to the United States Supreme Court.

Other community and civil activities ranged from presidency of the Community Chest to the Chamber of Commerce. He was connected with a number of charitable agencies.

He was a trustee of the South Carolina Foundation of Independent Colleges and was instrumental in organizing the Greenville County Foundation.

In 1942 Mr. Peace received an appointment as chairman of the Preparedness for Peace Commission, which in a 1945 report presented a comprehensive postwar plan for South Carolina. It embraced a complete study of the state and local governments with suggestions for sweeping reforms.

Among the recommendations was the formation of the State Research, Planning and Development Board, which was subsequently renamed the State Development Board. When the General Assembly created the agency, Mr. Peace was one of the first directors appointed and served continuously until his resignation in 1955.

Mr. Peace was honored on his 66th birthday in 1965, when friends, relatives and newspaper associates paid tribute to him for his contributions in the community, state and nation. He was praised especially for his role as publisher of newspapers that have "set the tone of the community."

Funeral arrangements will be arranged by The Mackey Mortuary.

[From the Greenville Piedmont, Aug. 21, 1968]

ROGER PEACE MOURNED BY COMMUNITY

Mayor David G. Traxler expressed shock today over the death last night of Roger C. Peace, prominent Greenville Communications media executive.

"I am sorry to hear about the death of Roger Peace, who has consistently, over the years, been a friend and supporter of all of Greenville, especially of the city government," he said.

"The loss of him, one of our finest citizens, will be felt over a long period of time."

Mayor Traxler said Peace had planned to accompany him to Washington in January

in connection with the Mayor's PERT plan to ease cities' tax problems.

Leonard M. Todd, president of the Greater Greenville Chamber of Commerce, spoke of the publisher's death as a "personal loss to me as a friend."

Todd said, "There is no question that Mr. Peace's handling of the news media has had a tremendous impact on this area's growth. He has handled it impartially. He has been interested in cultural activities and his efforts have greatly advanced the arts.

"His death will be a very great loss to our community."

Former Gov. James F. Byrnes of Columbia, a long time friend and associate of Mr. Peace, said, "I am shocked to learn of the death of Roger Peace.

"When I was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court Roger Peace succeeded me as U.S. senator and ably represented South Carolina in that body.

"During all my public service I consulted Roger about important problems and always profited by his wise counsel. I had no more loyal friend and his death is a source of great sorrow to me."

[From the Greenville News, Aug. 22, 1968]

ROGER PEACE, NEWS MEDIA BUILDER, DIES

Roger Craft Peace, 69, chairman of the board of Multimedia, Inc., died Tuesday night at his home, 201 Crescent Ave.

His career as a southern newspaperman spanned more than half a century from his first days in 1914 as a reporter for The Greenville News, and he became eminently successful as editor and publisher, business and civic leader in later years.

Mr. Peace was born May 19, 1899, eldest son of the late Bony Hampton Peace and Mrs. Laura Estelle Chandler Peace, and was married in 1920 to Miss Etca Tindal Walker, who died June 21, 1965.

They had two children, Mrs. E. A. (Dorothy Ann) Ramsaur of Greenville and the late Roger C. Peace Jr.

Mr. Peace's second wife, Mrs. Amy Newgren Peace, died Sept. 19, 1967.

Also surviving are a brother, B. H. Peace Jr. of Greenville; two sisters, Mrs. Gertrude P. Leake and Mrs. Laura P. Echols of Greenville; and grandchildren, Edmund A. (Ted) Ramsaur Jr. and Etca Ann Ramsaur of Greenville, and Norlin Craft Peace and Roger C. Peace III of Coral Gables, Fla.

A brother, Charlie Peace, died in 1958 and a sister, Mrs. Frances P. Graham, died in 1967.

Funeral services will be conducted Friday at the Mackey Mortuary by Dr. L. D. Johnson and Rev. James G. Stertz. The time will be announced. Burial will be in Springwood Cemetery. He was a member of the First Baptist Church.

An honorary escort will consist of employees of The Greenville News and the Greenville Piedmont.

At Mr. Peace's urging, his father, B. H. Peace, in 1919 purchased The Greenville News and the newspaper rapidly progressed to become an influential enterprise. "Mr. Roger," as he came to be familiarly known, was editor, 1920-24, after serving a year as sports editor, then as business manager. However, he maintained interest and direction of editorial content throughout his career.

The Peace family acquired the Greenville Piedmont in 1927 and it was merged into the News-Piedmont Co. which became the nucleus of an expanding publishing and broadcasting endeavor. The elder Peace's health began to fail in 1930 and he died in 1934.

On his father's death, Roger Peace became president and publisher of The News-Piedmont Co. and also retained his responsibility as editor for a time.

With his leadership, the company established Radio Station WFBC in 1932, and in

the 1950s WFBC-TV was founded. The Asheville newspapers and radio station WWNC were bought in 1954 and Mr. Peace was chairman of the board.

Mr. Peace for many years was a director of numerous corporations and civic organizations, and he was an interim U.S. senator in 1941. He was chairman of the Preparedness for Peace Commission for South Carolina during World War II years and a study of the commission resulted in the formation of the S.C. Research, Planning and Development Board, now known as the State Development Board.

He was U.S. senator from August to November 1941 after James F. Byrnes was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Peace was a trustee of the S.C. Foundation of Independent Colleges and was instrumental in organizing the Greenville County Foundation. He also was a former president of the Greater Greenville Chamber of Commerce and the Community Chest of Greenville.

He served as a director of Peoples National Bank, the Piedmont and Northern Railway and Greenville Community Hotel Corp.

Mr. Peace was honored on his 66th birthday in 1965, when friends, relatives and newspaper associates paid tribute to him for his contributions in the community, state and nation. He was praised especially for his role as publisher of newspapers that have "set the tone of the community."

Multimedia, Inc., of which he was chairman, was organized in 1967. Its divisions include The News-Piedmont Co., the Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co. and the Multimedia Broadcasting Co., the latter consisting of WFBC-AM-FM-TV, Greenville; WBIR-AM-FM-TV, Knoxville, Tenn.; WMAZ-AM-FM-TV, Macon, Ga.; and WWNC, Asheville.

Mr. Peace was educated in Greenville public schools and was graduated in 1919 from Furman University, becoming sports editor of The Greenville News that year and assuming his first management responsibility in the newspaper field.

[From the Greenville News, Aug. 22, 1968]

TRIBUTES ARE PAID TO ROGER PEACE

The death of Roger C. Peace, board chairman of Multimedia, Inc., and a moving force in Greenville and South Carolina, for many years, brought an immediate response from officials and citizens from all over the state and elsewhere.

His leadership among those who knew and worked with him was summed up by J. Kelly Sisk, president of Multimedia, Inc., and president and publisher of The Greenville News-Piedmont Co., who said of his long-time friend and associate:

"Roger Peace was a self-made leader, who all his life was quick to gain the respect of the common man and the great. He was humble but never meek. And he was fair, never allowing himself the privilege of making decisions based on petty personal reasoning but always thinking of the right and just cause of all concerned. His sound judgment cannot be replaced.

"His ability to inspire was unique. He will be missed."

Messages included one from former Gov. James F. Byrnes, of Columbia, a close friend and associate of Mr. Peace for decades. The state's elder statesman said:

"For 40 years he and I were the closest of friends. I had not a closer friend than Roger Peace.

"When I was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, Roger Peace succeeded me as U.S. senator and ably represented South Carolina in that body.

"During all my public service I consulted Roger about important problems and always profited by his wise counsel. I had no more loyal friend and his death is a source of great sorrow to me . . . a terrible shock." Gov. and Mrs. Robert E. McNair said:

"South Carolina has lost an able and eloquent spokesman. We share with the family their deep loss and extend our heartfelt sympathies. We have long admired Mr. Peace personally and professionally and count his passing a great loss."

The state's two U.S. senators expressed their regrets in separate messages. Sen. Strom Thurmond said:

"I was shocked and grieved to learn of the death of my close friend, Roger C. Peace. Our state and nation have lost one of their ablest and most distinguished newsmen."

"He was a pioneer in the newspaper, radio and television fields and his progressive policies were instrumental in the tremendous industrial growth enjoyed in the Piedmont area of South Carolina, and especially Greenville."

"He was a great patriot and his wise counsel meant much to me and all South Carolinians."

Sen. Ernest F. Hollings said:

"The death of Roger C. Peace marks the further passing of a great era for South Carolina."

"Through the years he stood for the finest things that make our great state and we have lost some of our character with his passing."

"He was always a credit to his profession, to his community, to his state and—as a former U.S. senator—to his country."

"Men of his ability, integrity and principle can ill afford to be lost during times of such peril."

Evangelist Billy Graham said:

"I am shocked and grieved. He was one of the great men of the South."

U.S. Rep. Robert T. Ashmore telephoned:

"It was with great sorrow that I learned of the death of Roger, one of Greenville's leading citizens in many respects. Undoubtedly he was one of the ablest businessmen in this area and had achieved great success in the news media field."

"He was a loyal Greenvillean, always ready and willing to lend his great influence and support to those things which would improve and promote the interest of the city he loved so much. We shall miss him greatly."

U.S. Rep. W. J. Bryan Dorn of Greenwood said:

"Mr. Peace was one of the truly greatest men that it ever has been my privilege to know. He was a man of vision, of integrity, and was intensely patriotic and believed in the future of the Southland and the United States."

"He exemplified the very highest standards and ethics in the field of journalism. He was a leader and he will be greatly missed by thousands of people in our state and nation. For the period he served as U.S. senator, he was a statesman."

Dr. R. C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, said:

"Roger C. Peace, as a citizen and as a newspaper publisher, was a man of high attainments and broad interests. He was especially concerned throughout his career with the educational needs of South Carolina. He was a true friend of Clemson University, and the Clemson community is saddened by his death."

Wes Gallagher, general manager of The Associated Press, wired from New York:

"I deeply regret the death of Roger Peace. His was a long and most distinguished career and your community and state will surely miss his vision and leadership. His passing is a severe loss to journalism."

Ambrose Hampton, chairman and publisher of The State at Columbia, said:

"The South and its news media have suffered a great loss and we have lost a loyal friend."

Frank Daniels, president and publisher of the News-Observer Co. at Raleigh, N.C., said:

"Please express our deepest sympathy and regret to Roger Peace's family. The South and the nation have lost a great newspaperman."

Anderson Independent and Daily Mail publisher Wilton E. Hall said:

"Roger will long be remembered as a distinguished South Carolinian whose leadership in journalism and other endeavors will be greatly missed."

Mayor David G. Traxler said:

"I am sorry to hear about the death of Roger Peace, who has consistently, over the years, been a friend and supporter of all of Greenville, especially of the city government."

"The loss of him, one of our finest citizens, will be felt over a long period of time."

Mayor Traxler said Peace had planned to accompany him to Washington in January in connection with the Mayor's PERT plan to ease cities' tax problems.

Leonard M. Todd, president of the Greater Greenville Chamber of Commerce, spoke of the publisher's death as a "personal loss to me as a friend."

Todd said, "There is no question that Mr. Peace's handling of the news media has had a tremendous impact on this area's growth. He has handled it impartially. He has been interested in cultural activities and his efforts have greatly advanced the arts."

"His death will be a very great loss to our community."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Aug. 22, 1968]

ROGER C. PEACE FUNERAL PLANNED FRIDAY AT 11

Funeral services for Roger C. Peace, 69, chairman of the board of Multimedia, Inc., who died Tuesday, will be conducted Friday at 11 a.m. at The Mackey Mortuary by Dr. L. D. Johnson, Rev. James G. Stertz and Dr. Billy Graham.

Burial will be in Springwood Cemetery.

Honorary escort will be his associates of The Greenville News and Greenville Piedmont.

Mr. Peace's death ended a career of more than 50 years which included prominence in writing, publishing and civic fields.

Mr. Peace was born May 19, 1899, eldest son of the late Bony Hampton Peace and Mrs. Laura Estelle Chandler Peace and was married in 1920 to Miss Etca Tindal Walker, who died June 21, 1965.

They had two children, Mrs. E. A. (Dorothy Ann) Ramsaur of Greenville and the late Roger C. Peace Jr.

Mr. Peace's second wife, Mrs. Amy Newgren Peace, died Sept. 19, 1967.

Also surviving are a brother, B. H. Peace Jr. of Greenville; two sisters, Mrs. Gertrude P. Leake and Mrs. Laura P. Echols of Greenville; and grandchildren, Edmund A. (Ted) Ramsaur Jr. and Etca Ann Ramsaur of Greenville, and Norlin Craft Peace and Roger C. Peace III of Coral Gables, Fla.

A brother, Charlie Peace, died in 1958 and a sister, Mrs. Frances P. Graham, died in 1967.

At Mr. Peace's urging his father, B. H. Peace, in 1919 purchased The Greenville News and the newspaper rapidly progressed to become an influential enterprise. "Mr. Roger," as he came to be familiarly known, was editor, 1920-24, after serving a year as sports editor, then as business manager.

The Peace family acquired the Greenville Piedmont in 1927 and it was merged into the News-Piedmont Co. which became the nucleus of an expanding publishing and broadcasting endeavor. The elder Peace's health began to fail in 1930 and he died in 1934.

On his father's death, Roger Peace became president and publisher of The News-Piedmont Co. and also retained his responsibility as editor for a time.

With his leadership, the company established Radio Station WFBC in 1932, and in the 1950s WFBC-TV was founded. The Asheville newspapers and radio station WWNC were bought in 1954 and Mr. Peace was chairman of the board.

Mr. Peace for many years was a director of numerous corporations and civic orga-

nizations, and he was an interim U.S. senator in 1941. He was chairman of the Preparedness for Peace Commission for South Carolina during World War II years and a study of the commission resulted in the formation of the S.C. Research, Planning and Development Board, now known as the State Development Board.

He was U.S. senator from August to November 1941 after James F. Byrnes was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Peace was a trustee of the S.C. Foundation of Independent Colleges and was instrumental in organizing the Greenville County Foundation. He also was a former president of the Greater Greenville Chamber of Commerce and the Community Chest of Greenville.

He served as a director of Peoples National Bank, the Piedmont and Northern Railway and Greenville Community Hotel Corp.

Multimedia, Inc., of which he was chairman, was organized in 1967. Its divisions include the News-Piedmont Co., the Asheville Citizen-Times Publishing Co. and the Multimedia Broadcasting Co., the latter consisting of WFBC-AM-FM-TV, Greenville; WBIR-AM-FM-TV, Knoxville, Tenn.; WMAZ-AM-FM-TV, Macon, Ga.; and WWNC, Asheville.

[From the Greenville Piedmont, Aug. 23, 1968]

MORTAL, BUT IRREPLACEABLE, SAID OF ROGER PEACE AT FUNERAL RITES

Roger C. Peace, honored by hundreds of associates from over 50 years of enlightened service in business, community, state and nation, was eulogized and put to final rest today in ceremonies which matched the simplicity of his own "common sense" life.

"I have been nurtured by the flow of that greatest of all fountains, his fountain of common sense," was the personal eulogy of Dr. L. D. Johnson, Mr. Peace's pastor, who drew the phrase from Mr. Peace's recent praise of long-time friend Gov. James F. Byrnes.

Gov. Byrnes and hundreds of others associated with the Multimedia, Inc., board chairman through the years heard Dr. Johnson, former First Baptist Church pastor and now at Furman University; Dr. Billy Graham, famed evangelist; and Rev. James G. Stertz, present First Baptist pastor, repeatedly recommend Mr. Peace's life as an example of courage, devotion and service.

"We believe that God's noblest creation is man, and that man's best good is to honor God by making the most he can of the intelligence and ability entrusted to him," Dr. Johnson said. "Roger Peace was a man who did that—in his business, in his service to his community, state and nation."

"Our common mortality is the ultimate and indisputable answer to the human feeling that any man is indispensable. But some are irreplaceable. To a great many people who were indebted beyond calculation to him, Roger Peace was such a man."

"We have lost wisdom and common sense, a quality of life with which we are not abundantly endowed in the country just now . . . Roger Peace was a man who was content to know and to be unknown, a man who believed in the meaning of integrity, a man who knew how to listen, to extend the hand and heart of friendship and sympathy . . . He was a man who believed in the future of his own nation. He deplored the crepe hangers . . . He never doubted the clouds would break."

Dr. Graham, who read from Psalms 91, John 14 and Romans 8, said "When death comes we have the real Roger Peace. He is more alive now . . . His memory will help us redouble our efforts."

Brief services at the capacity-filled Mackey, Mortuary this morning were followed by even simpler final rites in nearby Springwood Cemetery. Dr. Graham read from the 23rd Psalm, Dr. Johnson offered verse, and Rev. Stertz short prayer.

The honorary escort included Mr. Peace's associates in The Greenville News and Greenville Piedmont. Representatives of far-ranging Multimedia operations in Greenville, Asheville, Knoxville and Macon also attended.

Also seen among those paying respects were Gov. and Mrs. Byrnes, several members of their family and Miss Cassie Connor, Mr. Byrnes' secretary for many years; U.S. Sen. Strom Thurmond; Republican senatorial candidate Marshall Parker; U.S. District Judge Donald S. Russell; U.S. Rep. Robert T. Ashmore; Greenville Mayor David G. Traxler, State Sens. Thomas Wofford, Dick Riley and Harry Chapman and other members of the Greenville County Legislative Delegation; S. L. Latimer, editor emeritus of The Columbia State; Ambrose Hampton, publisher of the Columbia newspapers; Dean Albert Scroggins and Dr. Reid Montgomery of the University of South Carolina Journalism School; Wright Bryan, Clemson University vice president for development; Franklin Way, Piedmont and Northern Railway president; Lee Ward of Ward-Griffith, national advertising representatives; Pierson Mapes of New York, representing the National Broadcasting Co.; Chief Judge Clement Haynsworth Jr. of the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals; Dr. Gordon Blackwell, Furman University president; and Cliff Barrows of the Billy Graham evangelistic team.

Remembrances poured in from hundreds of others with whom Mr. Peace was associated during his 69 years of life, including more than a half-century in which Mr. Peace remained a working journalist as well as civic leader and foremost builder in the communications field.

[From the Greenville News, Aug. 24, 1968]

ROGER PEACE CALLED AN IRREPLACEABLE MAN

Roger C. Peace was eulogized Friday as a man "who made the most he could of the intelligence and ability entrusted to him" in serving his community and fellowman.

The final tribute to the native Greenville native who built a communications media organization after beginning his career as a cub reporter was delivered by Dr. L. D. Johnson, Furman University chaplain.

Hundreds of Mr. Peace's associates and friends attended the services. Among them were dignitaries from throughout South Carolina.

The rites were simple, in keeping with the life of the writer, publisher and civic leader, in whose death Tuesday, "we have lost wisdom and common sense, a quality of life with which we are not abundantly endowed in the country just now," Dr. Johnson said.

Dr. Johnson quoted Mr. Peace's own tribute to another great South Carolinian, former Gov. James F. Byrnes, of whom he said:

"I have been nurtured by the flow of that greatest of all fountains, his fountain of common sense."

The state's elder statesman and Mrs. Byrnes were among the host of long-time close associates who attended the final rites.

Dr. Johnson called Mr. Peace "irreplaceable."

"Our common mortality is the ultimate and indisputable answer to the human feeling that any man is indispensable. But some are irreplaceable. To a great many people who were indebted beyond calculation to him, Roger Peace was such a man," he said.

"Roger Peace was a man who was content to know and to be unknown, a man who believed in the meaning of old fashioned integrity, a man who knew how to listen, to extend the hand and heart of friendship and sympathy," Dr. Johnson said.

The Furman chaplain and former pastor of the First Baptist Church, of which Mr. Peace was a member, also commented on the patriotism of Mr. Peace, who served on many local public boards and organizations,

on state advisory groups and for a time as U.S. senator:

"He was a man who believed in the future of his nation. He deplored the crepe hangers who keep telling us how sick we are. He never doubted the clouds would break."

The simple and brief services at The Mackey Mortuary were joined by evangelist Dr. Billy Graham and the Rev. James G. Stertz, pastor of First Baptist Church.

Brief graveside rites in Springwood Cemetery, including reading of the 23rd Psalm by Dr. Graham and a prayer by the Rev. Stertz, concluded the final tribute by Greenville and South Carolina residents to the man who had become a giant in the business and civic lives of both his hometown and state.

Honorary escort included associates of Mr. Peace at The Greenville News and Piedmont.

Joining Gov. and Mrs. Byrnes in paying last respects to Mr. Peace were other members of the Byrnes family and Miss Cassie Connor, Byrnes' secretary for many years; U.S. Sen. Strom Thurmond; U.S. Rep. Robert T. Ashmore; Chief Judge Clement N. Haynsworth Jr. of the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals; U.S. District Judge Donald S. Russell; former state Sen. Marshall Parker; Greenville Mayor David G. Traxler; State Sens. Thomas Wofford, Dick Riley and Harry Chapman and other members of the Greenville County Legislative Delegation; S. L. Latimer, editor emeritus of The Columbia State; Ambrose Hampton, publisher of the Columbia newspapers; Dean Albert Scroggins and Dr. Reid Montgomery of the University of South Carolina Journalism School; Wright Bryan, Clemson University vice president for development and a former newspaper editor; Franklin Way, Piedmont and Northern Railway president; Lee Ward of Ward-Griffith, national advertising representatives; Pierson Mapes of New York, representing the National Broadcasting Co.; Dr. Gordon W. Blackwell, president of Furman; and Cliff Barrows, of the Graham evangelistic team.

[From the Greenville News, Aug. 24, 1968]

ROGER C. PEACE TRIBUTES FLOW IN FROM ACROSS UNITED STATES

Messages of tribute to Roger C. Peace continued to flow in Friday from business officials and friends all over the United States.

They included many from executives who knew and worked with him in the various news media fields, many of them in broadcasting:

Charlie Crutchfield, president of Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co.—"He leaves behind a legacy of respect of citizenship, service and of significant contribution."

Julian Goodman, president, National Broadcasting Co.—"He was a leader in broadcasting and journalism whose accomplishments and services we will long remember."

Paul Rittenhouse, National Broadcasting Co.—"A gentle man."

Walter D. Scott, chairman of the board, NBC—"We will miss the warmth, affection, good humor and loyal support which he so generously gave for so many years."

David C. Adams, senior executive vice president, NBC—"... vigorous and far-sighted leadership made so many contributions to Greenville and South Carolina."

Donald J. Mercer, vice president, NBC station relations—"We shall remember him warmly for his many contributions to the communications world."

R. C. Doane, board chairman emeritus, International Paper Co.—"He was a great person and will be missed by many persons."

William H. Gambrell of Belton, former New York City banker now associated with Peoples National Bank—"I knew him 50 years and always admired him. His life was an inspiration to thousands."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the

remarks of my distinguished colleague, Senator THURMOND, concerning the passing of a former Member of this great body, Senator Roger C. Peace, of Greenville, S.C.

Mr. Peace served here only a short time, but he won the admiration and respect of all his colleagues and indeed of all in government with whom he came in contact. Although Mr. Peace served as U.S. Senator, he was first and foremost a journalist with a long and distinguished career as publisher of one of South Carolina's leading newspapers, the Greenville News.

During my tenure as Governor, our State embarked on an extensive program designed to lure new industry to South Carolina. Through these efforts I learned that one of the first things a prospective industry looks at when considering a relocation or a plant site is the newspaper of the particular community involved. This is a prime reason that Greenville, S.C., succeeded in attracting the largest share of new industry.

Roger Peace's personal philosophy was reflected in his newspaper—a philosophy of fairness, free enterprise, community pride, and progressive local government. I am also happy to say that the policies and traditions of Roger Peace are now being ably carried on by Mr. Ned Ramseur and Mr. Wayne Freeman. Under their guidance, the Greenville News has continued to be the outstanding newspaper that Roger Peace sought to make it, and it continues to provide a living monument to a great and loved South Carolinian. Roger Peace's passing is mourned by many in the State of South Carolina, but his accomplishments will live long after the mourning has passed and indeed as long as the ideas of free enterprise, progressive government and a responsive democracy are cherished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

A GOOD EDUCATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, there is one thing that cannot be taken away from a person after he has received it. And that is a good education. If our country and her citizens are going to be able to rise above the seething unrest that grips so many of our young people today, it will only be through the process of edu-

cation—the process of providing the very best in facilities and teachers and equipment that can be obtained.

A great number of school people in thousands of school districts in the United States understand this and feel keenly their responsibilities to serve our country's best interests by helping to train young people for future leadership. Surely, no other process is so closely tied to our country's future greatness than is education.

Almost all of us can agree that in any kind of listing of priorities of spending—and certainly the time is well past due that these priorities should be established—education should occupy one of the highest positions.

I have been consistent in my support of expenditure cuts and yield to no one in my desire to stop the erosive effects of more inflation by hewing to a hard, tough position insofar as balancing the budget is concerned.

Many of the cuts I have supported have had a direct impact on Wyoming, but I cannot support the withholding of school district funds which are needed to provide the necessities of an adequate education for the children of my State.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am pleased to support the Spong and Ribicoff amendments that deal with school assistance in federally affected areas and I urge, in the strongest possible terms, their approval.

School has already started across America, and yet the Federal Government withholds the funds which were provided by Congress to finance activities in the 1967-68 school year.

Additionally, hundreds of school districts have begun the 1968-69 school year in an extremely vulnerable and frustrating position because of the uncertain status of Public Law 874 funds.

The money for 100 percent funding for these school districts with large numbers of children whose parents live and/or work on Federal property was provided by action of the Congress, but the President has chosen to withhold these moneys.

If his action is not corrected, funds for a school year that has already ended—back in May of this year—will be denied and school budgets already drawn up and approved for the current school year will be thrown into a state of confusion and doubt.

In my State of Wyoming, 26 schools depend to a great extent on Public Law 874 moneys—some of them for as much as two-thirds of their budgets.

In Fremont County, Wyo., School District No. 14, which depends on Public Law 874 funds for 70 percent of its budget, will not have a student counselor, a librarian, or an art teacher unless these moneys are released.

This school district, which educates Wyoming's Indian children, has been forced to change its budgetary plans almost as the direction of the wind changes, because of the varying status of Public Law 874 moneys. The superintendent of the school tells me the district cannot continue to operate under these conditions.

The situation is not confined to School District 14. It is repeated throughout Wyoming in federally impacted areas.

Unless these funds are released, an adequate education will be denied to many Wyoming children.

I would hope these amendments could be approved so that the Public Law 874 program can go forward.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to correct an error in reporting the bill, to make certain that States will receive their fair share, which the Congress intended they should receive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the Senator that amendments are pending.

Mr. HILL. What is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama can ask unanimous consent that the amendments be temporarily set aside.

Mr. HILL. Which amendment is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Mundt amendment to the Spong amendment, in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I know of no reason why we should not set that amendment aside, with all due deference to the Senator from Virginia. I understood he was not going to request action on the amendment until the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had an opportunity to offer his amendment. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] made a statement on his amendment and said he would ask for a vote on it tomorrow. So I ask unanimous consent that the Mundt amendment be laid aside temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which would simply correct an error that was made in reporting the bill. It does not add any money at all to the amount provided by the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 14, line 20, insert the following: "Provided, That the aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants therefor within States shall not be less than the amounts allocated from the fiscal year 1968 appropriation to local educational agencies in such States for grants:"

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I have said, the amendment adds no money whatever to the amount provided by the bill, but corrects an error that was made in reporting the bill, which would have denied certain States that which it was intended they should receive. The amendment simply means that the money would be allocated exactly as it was in the past fiscal year, and those States would get their proper share of the amounts provided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, since the Senator from South Dakota is not present, and since he announced that he would not ask for a vote on his amendment until tomorrow, and since the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] is also not present, and the two Senators are working in close relationship, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota be temporarily laid aside, so that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, both amendments will be temporarily laid aside.

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 925

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Alabama.

On behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself, I call up amendment (No. 925), and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 925), as follows:

Insert at the end of title II the following: "Sec. 208. Appropriations in this title available for any of the health functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be available for the expenses of a fifteen-member President's Commission on Preventive Medicine the findings and recommendations of which are to be reported to the President by August 1, 1969, and the members of which are to be compensated while on business of the Commission, including traveltime, at rates not in excess of the rate specified at the time the service is performed for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am proud to join with the farsighted senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in urging the Senate to act today on a matter that could decide the health and happiness of tomorrow. I strongly recommend that the Senate adopt amendment No. 925 to the appropriations measure for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. This amendment would provide for the funding of a Commission on Disease Prevention and Health Protection.

The need for such a Commission is outlined in a paper, "Ounce of Prevention," presented to the Senate on July 31. In that document, a distinguished group of physicians, medical educators, and private citizens state quite emphatically "that the most effective control of disease will always be prevention." The compelling case for a Commission is based on the "lack of a national goal, or a national will, to undertake preventive programs."

Clearly, in a nation where chronic disease costs \$57 billion annually, but where we spend only about 8 percent of our national health outlay for disease prevention and health protection, an imbalance exists.

To alert the Nation, and to mobilize our resources for the task ahead, "An Ounce of Prevention" outlined the creation of the Presidential Commission, now under consideration in the amend-

ment Senator MAGNUSON and I are supporting.

That Commission, as I told the Senate in an August 2 statement, will do far more than carry out a much-needed detailed investigation of our health maintenance structure. It will also give us the impetus we need to start planning for a national action program of health protection and disease prevention.

This is a particularly rewarding suggestion to me, because I have long argued the need for a system of health screening centers. Many of the arguments for the Commission extend and amplify the things I have been saying about preventive health screening—some call it "preventicare"—and both proposals share the philosophy that preparation and planning are better medicine than repair and restoration.

As chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have heard time and again that prevention will be the ultimately workable solution to our health problems. The case for screening and effective followup was emphatically drawn in the 1966 report of the Health Subcommittee, "Detection and Prevention of Chronic Disease Utilizing Multiphasic Health Screening Techniques." The full committee supported the subcommittee findings when it reported that "there is great need for additional efforts to prevent chronic disease on a national scale."

The Committee on Aging was concerned about older Americans, because they suffer the severest penalties from chronic disease. But Americans of all ages would benefit if they could call on the resources and information needed to keep disease from taking its present toll.

Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate today could be the beginning of a major shift in emphasis and attitude toward medicine and illness. I urge that the Senate give its prompt approval of this vital measure.

Mr. President, I have a statement by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], which includes as an attachment a letter from Secretary Wilbur Cohen, in which he endorses this proposal, and a letter from Deputy Assistant Secretary John Crupenhoff, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which states that there is no objection to the amendment by the Bureau of the Budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Senator from Washington, together with the letters, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams), I rise in support of an amendment to HR 18037, the Labor and Health, Education and Welfare appropriations bill, to make funds available for the expenses of a fifteen member Presidential Commission on Preventive Medicine.

As I said to the Senate on July 31, such a Commission would undertake four major tasks. First, after a study of existing knowledge, it would make a series of recommendations for immediate programs of preventive medicine. The Commission would investigate

and recommend ways to increase the understanding, support, and implementation of preventive medical techniques by the health profession and the public. It would plan long-range programs for the prevention of disease and illness. Finally, a Commission on Preventive Medicine would spear-head a national effort to stimulate and support the field of preventive medicine.

The proposal for the Commission, which was presented to the President last month, was developed and put forward by a group of medical and business leaders with whom we have been most privileged to work. I am pleased to advise my colleagues that the President gave emphatic support to the proposal.

In addition, I offer for the RECORD a letter from Wilbur Cohen, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In this letter Secretary Cohen expresses his enthusiastic support for the proposed Commission on Preventive Medicine. I also offer, as a supporting letter, a statement from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicating that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the proposal.

Mr. President, I believe that the Commission on Preventive Medicine will play a key role in developing the kind of national commitment to prevention which this most promising and important approach to disease and health hazards must have.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., September 4, 1968.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The amendment which you have proposed to the 1969 Labor-HEW Appropriations bill, H.R. 18037, providing for a Commission on Preventive Medicine has my enthusiastic support. A vigorous, dynamic program emphasizing the preventive aspects of medical care can preclude needless suffering and insure longer, happier, more healthful lives for all Americans. Although medical science and the health professions have given us many benefits over the years, and although quality care is becoming increasingly available to our population, there is yet much to be done.

The toll of chronic diseases with their impairments and disabilities, the tragedy of accidents with their deaths and injuries and the attendant drain on our health resources are all increasing in spite of our efforts.

I believe it stands to reason that the application of some of the techniques and measures of prevention that have been so successful in controlling our infectious and communicable diseases—like poliomyelitis, and measles—and even some serious types of mental retardation—can and should be applied to the problems of heart disease, cancer, injuries, and other disease conditions.

The amendment you have proposed would provide Congressional recognition of the importance of preventive medicine to the Nation's health. Such a Commission would define the nature of the problem, examine the gaps in our existing knowledge, and point the way to application of techniques of preventive medicine. Hence, I endorse and support this proposal wholeheartedly.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., September 4, 1968.

MR. MICHAEL PERTSCHUK,
General Counsel, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERTSCHUK: You should know that the Bureau of the Budget has indicated to us that there is no objection to the submission of our letter on the Commission on

Preventive Medicine. We had been waiting for this clearance, but had not received it before Secretary Cohen signed the letter.

Perhaps Senator Magnuson could make the statement in his floor speech that the Bureau of the Budget has cleared the letter.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. CRUPENHOFF,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislative Service.

MR. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, after discussions with our revered chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill, who is also chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I hope I am not overstating it when I say that there is no objection to the amendment.

MR. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

MR. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the amendment of the Senator does not add 1 cent to the bill. No additional appropriation whatever is proposed to the bill. The amendment merely means that the President, with funds carried in the bill for health services, shall set up the Commission to study preventive medicine.

MR. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

MR. HILL. As the Senator knows, we have made much progress in the field of preventive medicine in recent years. The thought is that, with study by the Commission, we may be able to take further steps in the field of preventive medicine.

MR. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would think there is no doubt about that. The answer to the money question is there is no additional money added.

MR. HILL. No additional money.

MR. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Moreover, great strides have been made in early detection of possible disease; and an ounce of prevention, we all know, is worth many pounds of care.

MR. HILL. That is right. We have found that, with the development of the measles vaccine, measles, which was a common disease a few years ago, has now been pretty well wiped out. Two or three years ago, we provided some funds to study rubella, or what we know as German measles. If a woman, during the first 2 or 3 months of pregnancy, has rubella, the child is likely to be born with some physical deformity, perhaps mental retardation, a deformity of the heart or circulatory system, or some other terrible physical disability. Certainly anything we can do in the field of preventive medicine to prevent such tragedies ought to be done. And the Senator's amendment adds not \$1 to the cost of this bill.

MR. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct. I thank the Senator very much.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 925) of the Senator from New Jersey.

MR. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is quite agreeable to have this amendment acted upon at this point.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I deeply regret that arrangements made some time ago will prevent my being present tomorrow when, as I understand, the votes on this measure will take place. I

have been in my seat today and yesterday. It was my earlier information that the bill would be acted upon yesterday and today.

The fall meeting of the employees of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Florida will be held tomorrow, and I have agreed to be there. Likewise, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States has agreed to be there. I feel it is an appointment that I cannot break. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance upon the Senate tomorrow, Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], increasing the entirely inadequate appropriation for the Teachers Corps.

Mr. President, in the dark world of poverty, one door that does remain is the one marked "education." With a good education, many opportunities can become available—jobs, income, advancement, housing. Without it all the other barriers remain.

But a headstart is not enough, for the dropout potential continues in our ghetto schools. Change all along the way is required if the disadvantaged child is to reach graduation. Teacher Corps members are change agents. It is they, like the VISTA and Peace Corps volunteers, who work to modify the system to meet the needs of the people it is supposed to serve. Teacher Corps members learn what the children need. They adapt traditional concepts and methods so that the young men and women who otherwise would be permanent under-achievers can learn to their full potential.

Mr. President, we hear much rhetoric these days about law and order; about violence; about repression. Yet if we deal with the causes of the problem, we will not have to worry so much about the cure.

Mr. President, the Teachers Corps has only been in operation for a short time. Yet already its praises are being sung, not only by children and parents, but by professional educators as well.

As John B. Davis, Jr., superintendent of Minneapolis public schools has stated:

I can report an early recognition of the value of the Teachers Corps as an agent for unifying the efforts of local school districts, teacher-training colleges, deprived communities and concerned and competent young adults into a combined attack upon the problems of poverty through education.

Mr. President, the Teachers Corps has proven a resounding success in Minnesota, and around this Nation. The currently approved \$17.3 million is little more than half the administration re-

quest. It is a totally inadequate commitment to a program that has proved its worth. I urge and support the increase to the administration request level of \$31.2 million.

I urge this because I believe we may yet find the Teachers Corps to be a two-edged sword in our battle to improve life for all Americans. It can bring hope to despairing young people in the schools of our central cities. And it provides an opportunity for committed young American men and women to devote themselves to helping solve the real problems of urban America, to work within the system to bring about change.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate committee report on this measure earmarks \$50 million of OEO title II funds for use in the senior opportunities and services program authorized by Congress last year. The report, also directs the Department of Labor to assure that not less than \$10 million, over and above the amount obligated last year for community senior service programs, will be available to continue, to expand, and to extend these programs.

The Senate Special Committee on Aging on which I serve as chairman, has had a longstanding interest in making the war on poverty responsive to the needs of more than 5 million Americans over the age of 65 whose incomes are below the officially designated poverty level. During 1965 and 1966, our committee held hearings and issued a report on "The War on Poverty as It Affects Older Americans." As a result of those hearings, the Office of Economic Opportunity launched a number of programs to lift income levels and to improve living conditions generally among poverty-stricken older Americans. These included foster grandparents, medicare alert, green thumb, and other programs conducted locally.

As I have already indicated, the Congress last year authorized another program to benefit the elderly under the war on poverty. The purpose of this "senior opportunities and service" program is to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons above the age of 60 in one or more of a number of areas listed in the law. The OEO Director is required to utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Administration on Aging of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Bright as the promise of this authorization is, thus far it has been only that—just a promise—since it has not been possible to obtain the legislative and executive action necessary for funding the program.

Now, the Senate Appropriations Committee has earmarked funds in the bill before us to implement this program of "senior opportunities and services." With the \$50 million earmarked by the report for this purpose, the program could get off to a magnificent beginning, and could go far toward meeting the needs of our impoverished elders. One factor assuring the success of this program would be the cooperation and participation of the Administration on Aging, as required in the authorization enacted last year. The Office of Economic Opportunity and the Administration on Aging have already

shown that they can work effectively together to benefit America's elderly poor, most notably in their highly successful foster grandparents program.

In my judgment, we can confidently rely upon the good faith and zeal of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administration on Aging, and other executive agencies in implementing this congressional directive.

As a member of the Committee on Aging, I appreciate the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations in funding "senior opportunities and services," a program which should be of tremendous assistance to the Nation's elderly poor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 46, line 12, after "vocational rehabilitation," insert "aging and other research and training by the Social and Rehabilitation Services."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the House of Representatives, by making the changes stated in the amendment the language of existing legislation, narrowed the use of counterpart funds for research and training under the special foreign currency program administered by HEW. This program is for research and training in social welfare and maternal and child health care. Many of these projects also affect the aged. This amendment would restore the program and would add no new funds to the appropriation.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and I understand it is acceptable to him.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, it would simply permit these counterpart funds to be used as they have been used in the past. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. HILL. It is to make sure that they can be used this fiscal year, just as they have been used in past fiscal years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not travel much, but wherever one goes, he sees the inadequacy of health care. We worked together on a hospital in Po-

land for children. We used counterpart funds for that.

Mr. HILL. These are counterpart funds. There would be no additional appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There would be no additional appropriations. It might cut down a little on congressional travel. That is the only thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is pending at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 22, line 13, strike out the figure "\$87,967,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,967,000".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in March of this year, President Johnson proposed a major model school experiment in the District of Columbia. The goals which he set forth for the experiment were to revive the interest of citizens in their schools, help teachers improve the skills of their profession through retraining opportunities, bring to students the best in teaching methods and materials, revise the curriculum to make it serve the young people of our city, equip high school graduates with marketable skills, seek alliances between employers and the schools, give children the chance to learn at their own pace, reducing both dropouts and failures, and serve a section of the city where the needs of students and schools are greatest.

To support this effort, the President requested \$10 million in the 1969 budget of the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The District of Columbia immediately began planning for the model school project proposed by the President. This planning has involved the District of Columbia government, the District School Board, a Community Planning Council from the neighborhood where the proposed model school project would be established, and many other interested organizations.

As the plans are now drawn, the people of the District of Columbia are now ready to launch what they hope will be an exciting new venture in education.

With new approaches to instruction, curriculum, and school organization.

With new learning and recreational opportunities for the family and the community.

With new services for young and old.

With new activities during the summer, on weekends, and in the evening.

Unfortunately, there is now apparently some question as to whether the Federal Government will do its part to make this

project a success. When the budget request for the Office of Education was acted upon by the House of Representatives, only \$1 million was provided for this program, instead of the \$10 million requested by President Johnson.

I am well aware of the budgetary stringencies which have been imposed on all Federal programs. But to eliminate funds entirely or at least to appropriate only one-tenth of the amount requested by the President for this important educational project would be false economy. At least we should give it a try. We ought to give the model school project an opportunity to prove itself and perhaps become a model for the Nation.

What we are talking about here is not simply spending; we are talking about an investment. We are talking about an investment in people, an investment in the future, an investment in children. Funds for the model school project are concrete evidence that life can be made better for the disadvantaged children of our inner cities, and for people who have ambition and drive and who want to develop whatever potential may be within them.

I do not think anyone has ever regarded me as a pushover when it comes to voting for the expenditure of Federal tax dollars. In this case, however, the problem is clear, the need is great, and the justification is valid.

Mr. President, I have offered an amendment which would increase the amount in the bill by \$5 million, making a total of \$6 million in response to the budget request of \$10 million.

This model school project would be in the Ballou area of Anacostia. It is thought that this would be the best location because of overcrowding, the higher ratio of public housing, and the very high juvenile delinquency rate.

The project has been developed on the basis of a plan which would include the newest ideas in education and provide a very concentrated program to significantly change the life prospects for these people.

The project, it is hoped, would become a model for the Nation, to be followed and utilized in other great urban centers throughout the country. The administration of the program and the responsibility for carrying on the project would be that of the District of Columbia School Board. The Office of Education would finance the project and would make grants directly to the District of Columbia School Board.

Mr. President, this project has never come before my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. It was considered by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

As I have said, the project would be funded through the Office of Education and, therefore, appropriately comes within the province of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the bill before the Senate today.

However, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia I have manifested what I believe to be a very strong, enthusiastic, and appropriate interest in education in

the District of Columbia, and throughout the country, for that matter, during the 10 years I have served on the subcommittee and during the 8 years I have served as chairman of the subcommittee.

It is because of my interest not only in the District of Columbia but also in the education of the children of the District of Columbia, and my interest in providing what may become a model project for education throughout the Nation, that I have offered this amendment, not to restore the full budget amount, but to restore \$5 million out of the \$9 million disallowed by the House. The House allowed \$1 million so that with the amount of \$5 million provided for in my amendment, the amount appropriated would total \$6 million.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished and able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and I hope he will find it possible to accept the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I know of the authority with which the Senator from West Virginia speaks on this matter, inasmuch as he has been a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia for some 10 years and for the last 8 years he has been the chairman of that subcommittee. I know the time, work, and effort he has put into these various programs for the District of Columbia and also the effect they may have so far as programs throughout the country are concerned.

I see no reason why we should not at least take this amendment to conference.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for his generous remarks. I appreciate his willingness to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after conferring with appropriate Members on both sides of the aisle, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on Friday, September 6, 1968, during the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 18037, an act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health, Education, Welfare and related agencies for fiscal year 1969, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except amendments dealing with legislation which are subject to a point of order and can only be considered under a suspension of the rules, and except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Alabama [Mr.

HILL] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, before the motion is acted upon, that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, before any action is taken on the pending request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VACATING OF ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT, AND ENTRY OF ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, now I ask unanimous consent that the order be vacated calling for adjournment of the Senate until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning and that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it would be my understanding, then, that tomorrow, immediately after the prayer by the Chaplain and the reading of the Journal, the time limitation will begin to run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I ask, What is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG].

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is assumed that action on the pending appropriation bill

will be completed probably tomorrow; is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. If I may interject there, I would say that I would certainly hope so. I shall make every effort myself toward that end.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The reason for the inquiry is that I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if he can tell us now what he proposes to calendar for next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that it is anticipated, on Wednesday or Thursday of next week, that the gun control legislation, having to do with interstate traffic in firearms, will have been reported by the Judiciary Committee and the Commerce Committee and will thus be ready for consideration by the full Senate at that time.

In the meantime, we will take up one or two of those measures on the calendar that can be most readily agreed to, but as of now I am not in a position to state which or in what order.

I would anticipate that the gun control bill would take 2, 3, 4, or 5 days. After that, it would be anticipated that the Department of Defense appropriation bill might be ready.

It is hopefully anticipated that the foreign aid authorization bill will be settled in conference and the pertinent appropriation bill made ready.

Then, of course, there is the supplemental appropriation measure. It is also possible that soon, the Colorado River conference report, which I understand has passed the House today, will be ready for consideration.

Any other matters will be discussed with the distinguished minority leader as they become available for Senate consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 449) to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 20) to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1004) to authorize the construction, operation and maintenance of the central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes.

HILL-BURTON FUNDING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Ver-

mont [Mr. AIKEN], who is necessarily absent today, is concerned over a problem concerning the Hill-Burton hospital construction and modernization program.

He has described for me a specific problem involving the construction of two new hospitals in his State which may well have counterparts in other sections of the country.

Hospital administrators are worried over a problem that stems partly from the Health Service Amendments of 1968 as passed by the House, which would allow Hill-Burton to expire next June 30. On the other hand, the Senate version of this bill provides only a 2-year extension of Hill-Burton instead of the usual 5. This concern is further enhanced by the work of a special Presidential Advisory Commission now studying the effectiveness of Hill-Burton. It is reasonable to suppose that such a study contemplates extensive overhaul of the entire program.

Against this background of uncertainty the Senator from Vermont says that in the Barre-Montpelier section of his State a new regional hospital known as the Central Vermont Medical Center was opened last month and the first patients admitted. Still needed is additional basic construction requiring about \$304,000 in Hill-Burton funds. To qualify for this money, all work must be completed within 6 months after the first patient was admitted.

In the meantime, under the State program for the allocation of funds, the Central Vermont Hospital no longer enjoys top priority for support. Priority now rests with another regional hospital to be constructed in the Northeastern part of the State to serve residents of Vermont and New Hampshire living in that general area.

The Northeastern Vermont Regional Hospital's sponsors are understandably reluctant to surrender their priority to the Central Vermont Medical Center when there are reports Hill-Burton may be discontinued or supplanted by a new program with an entirely different formula for funding.

The Senator from Vermont wishes it to be clearly known that if any hospital willingly surrenders its priority under such circumstances as those just described and a new hospital construction program is enacted, provision should be made in the new law for hospitals in this predicament to receive full Federal funding under the revised schedule just as if there had been no change in Hill-Burton.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be temporarily laid aside so that I may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, both amendments will be laid aside.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Between lines 5 and 6, on page 65 add the following:

"No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan or grant to any individual who (A) has, within the 5-year period immediately preceding his application for such loan, guarantee of a loan, or grant, received a loan, guarantee of a loan, or grant the funds for which were made available pursuant to an Act making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and (B) has used any of the proceeds resulting from such loan, guarantee of a loan, or grant for any purpose other than the purpose for which the loan or grant was made."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the bill as passed by the House, section 411, starting on page 64, provides as follows:

SEC. 411. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan or a grant to any applicant who has been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction of any crime which involves the use of or the assistance to others in the use of force, trespass or the seizure of property under control of an institution of higher education to prevent officials or students at such an institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies.

Mr. President, I think most of us understand the meaning and intent behind the language which the House put in the bill. However, I do not believe that it covers another situation which has caused a number of Members of Congress, and also a number of students, concern. I refer to reported situations where some students—they are very much a minority, but they are still there—abuse the purpose for which a loan is granted.

I do not think it is good for one who has obtained a loan or grant under congressional legislation and who has observed the purposes for which that loan was granted, to have a friend obtain a similar loan and use it for the purchase of a car or furniture, a trip, a party, or any other purposes other than that for which Congress has appropriated the money.

I believe the proposed addition to section 411, which has been added by the House, will be helpful not only to insure taxpayers that the money they are spending will be properly used, but also for the purpose of letting the great majority of students who are taking advantage of this legislation know that all of their compatriots will observe the purpose for which Congress is passing the legislation.

I have discussed the amendment with my friend the able Senator from Alabama. I hope he will say that this amendment is acceptable to him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand the language of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, it would simply

insure that the money would be expended as Congress intended for it to be expended when Congress wrote the law and Congress so authorized the appropriation of the funds. It would simply mean that the money shall be expended as was the intent of the Congress at the time the Congress authorized the funds.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. The amendment provides that if there has been a receipt of a grant or a loan within the last 5 years which has not been spent according to the purposes for which Congress has appropriated the money, then the application will be denied.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I see no reason why we should not take this amendment to conference and make certain that the intent and purpose of the act of Congress is fully carried out, as the Senator from Iowa proposes.

Mr. MILLER. May I say to my friend from Alabama that I think section 411 probably is generally acceptable to Members of Congress. Certainly, the House saw fit to put it in the bill. There is some controversy about it, but I cannot see how there can be any controversy about my proposal. Rather than delete section 411, and perhaps offend the sensibilities of the House, I think it would be much better to add this amendment to what the House put in the bill.

Mr. HILL. And thereby put the whole matter in conference.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is right. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

A \$20 MILLION WINDFALL FOR NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING CORP.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to a \$20 million windfall—or unnecessary payment—which the Defense Department approved for the New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., a company controlled by the Louis Wolfson group.

On August 22, 1962, the New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., which was one of Louis Wolfson's operations, was awarded a contract—NOBs 4581—for the construction of one nuclear submarine at a fixed price of \$33,500,000. Subsequently change orders totaling \$5,405,236 were approved, bringing the potential cost to \$38,905,236. The submarine was to be delivered during July 1966, but when the delivery date arrived the submarine was nowhere near completion.

The Department of the Navy files show that by the latter part of 1966 the Navy had become dissatisfied with the contractor's capability and actual performance in the construction of the submarine because of the contractor's slippage in the delivery date, its progressive disposal of its major submarine-building equipment, and its loss of skilled trade and engineering manpower.

On March 21, 1967, nearly 9 months after the scheduled delivery date, recognizing this failure of the company to fulfill the terms of its agreement to deliver

the submarine, the Navy took action and notified the contractor of its intention to terminate the contract.

The original contract price had been adjusted as follows:

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Basic contract price..... | \$33,500,000 |
| Negotiated change orders..... | 3,655,236 |
| Provisional increase for change orders to be negotiated..... | 1,750,000 |
| Potential adjusted contract price..... | 38,905,236 |

At the time of termination, March 21, 1967, the contractor had already received payments totaling \$29,685,787. But on July 6, 1967, 1 year after the promised delivery date and nearly 4 months after it was evident that the company had reneged on its contract, the contractor received another payment of \$3,612,051 for what was described as reimbursement of costs incurred up to the time of termination. This brought to \$33,297,838 the payments made on this contract which was originally awarded at \$33,500,000.

The Government attempted to justify this latter payment on the basis that it was a "termination-for-convenience cancellation" of the contract by the Government under which the contractor would be entitled to receive reimbursement for all costs incurred, thus bringing the total payments to the contractor by the Government to \$33,297,838, or 85.5 percent of the \$38,905,236 adjusted contract price—\$33,500,000 original contract price plus change orders which would add another \$5,405,236.

This represented a substantial overpayment since the record shows the ship was only about 50-percent completed.

To determine the status of the uncompleted work on this submarine and to determine the amount that would be required to complete this submarine for service the Naval Ship Systems Command in June 1967 awarded a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract in the amount of \$474,572 to the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn.

Under this survey the Government was told that the submarine was only about one-half completed. In October 1967 all material and documentation prepared by the Electronic Boat Division was sent to the supervisor of shipbuilding, conversion, and repair, U.S. Navy, Pascagoula, Miss., and at the same time the unfinished submarine was transferred to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., at Pascagoula.

In November 1967, Ingalls proposed a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract of \$19,148,371 as the amount that would be required for the completion of the submarine. The General Accounting Office estimates that if this amount proves to be the amount necessary to complete this nuclear submarine, the final cost to the Government for this one submarine will be about \$59,300,000, as follows:

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Interim proposal (including transfer charge)..... | \$39,693,890 |
| Electric boat contract..... | 474,572 |
| Ingalls' proposed cost-plus-fixed-fee contract | 19,148,371 |
| Total | 59,316,833 |

This aggregate cost of \$59 million for one nuclear submarine compares with an estimated cost of \$75 million that the

Government paid for two submarines of the same class which were constructed by Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.

Thus this nuclear submarine will be over 2 years late in delivery and will represent an extra cost of about \$20 million. An examination of this contract clearly establishes that the New York Shipbuilding Co. defaulted on this contract.

The contract with New York Shipbuilding Corp. provided, in pertinent part, that it could be terminated for default under the following conditions:

(1) If the Contractor fails to make delivery of the vessels or supplies or to perform the services within the time specified herein or any extension thereof; or

(ii) If the Contractor fails to perform any of the other provisions of this contract, or so fails to make progress as to endanger performance of this contract in accordance with its terms, and in either of these two circumstances does not cure such failure within a period of 10 days (or such longer period as the contracting officer may authorize in writing) after receipt of notice from the contracting officer specifying such failure.

Under a termination for default the Government could have been indemnified by the defaulted contractor for any additional costs incurred in the completion of the submarine. Instead we find the Government paying damages.

The questions which still remain unanswered are—

First. Why was this contract not canceled for default rather than ruled as a cancellation for convenience of the Government?

Second. Why did the Government not try to collect damages instead of paying a cancellation charge?

Third. Who was responsible for this decision which cost the Government an extra \$20 million, and what steps are being taken to recover this amount?

Earlier in February 1968 I called this alleged overpayment to the attention of the Comptroller General for his examination. I ask unanimous consent that their interim report of July 11, 1968, as signed by Acting Comptroller General Frank H. Weitzel be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1968.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In your letter of February 16, 1968, you requested that we review certain matters relating to the termination of a Department of the Navy contract with New York Shipbuilding Corporation, Camden, New Jersey. This interim report is being submitted in accordance with your request of June 13, 1968. We plan to submit a final report upon completion of our examination.

Contract NObs-4581 was awarded to the New York Shipbuilding Corporation on August 22, 1962, for the construction of one nuclear submarine at a fixed price of \$33,500,000. The submarine was to be delivered during July 1966.

Correspondence in the Department of the Navy files indicates that, during the latter part of 1966, the Navy became dissatisfied with the contractor's capability and actual

performance in the construction of the submarine because of the contractor's slippage in the delivery date, its progressive disposal of its major submarine-building equipment, and its loss of skilled trade and engineering manpower. Further, the Navy felt that, because of the reduced workload at the contractor's yard, the cost of completing the submarine at that yard would be higher than elsewhere. On March 21, 1967, the Navy notified the contractor of its intention to terminate the contract.

The contractor contended that the slippage in delivery was caused, in part, by the numerous design changes and late delivery of Government-furnished property.

TERMINATION OF CONTRACT

An agreement was reached in April 1967 between the Navy and New York Shipbuilding Corporation providing that, if the submarine were launched on or before June 3, 1967, the Navy would terminate the contract for the convenience of the Government rather than for default. The contractor met the launch date requirement, and the contract was terminated for the convenience of the Government on June 5, 1967.

The contract had not been settled as of June 21, 1968, although the contractor had submitted a final settlement proposal in the amount of \$39,693,890.

At about the time of the termination, the potential adjusted contract price was \$38,905,236, as follows:

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Basic contract price | \$33,500,000 |
| Negotiated change orders | 3,655,236 |
| Provisional increase for change orders to be negotiated | 1,750,000 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Potential adjusted contract price | 38,905,236 |
|-----------------------------------|------------|

In June 1967, the Naval Ship Systems Command awarded a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract in the amount of \$474,572 to the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corporation, Groton, Connecticut. The contract required that the contractor, among other things, determine the status of completed and uncompleted work on the submarine and the amount and kind of work required to complete it. The contract required also that the contractor prepare a schedule for completion of the work and a workload analysis.

TRANSFER OF SUBMARINE TO INGALLS SHIPBUILDING CORP.

In October 1967, Electric Boat was informed by the Navy of a decision not to send the submarine to Groton for completion. Electric Boat sent all material and documentation to the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, United States Navy, Pascagoula, Mississippi. The submarine was then transferred to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation at Pascagoula.

In November 1967, Ingalls proposed a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract of \$19,148,371 for the completion of the submarine. If this amount proves to be the amount necessary to complete the submarine, the total cost to the Government will be about \$59,300,000, as follows:

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Interim proposal | \$39,693,890 |
| Electric Boat contract | 474,572 |
| Ingalls' proposed cost-plus-fixed-free contract | 19,148,371 |
| Total | 59,316,833 |

This compares with an estimated cost of \$75,000,000 for two submarines of the same class constructed by Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, Newport News, Virginia.

TERMINATION FOR DEFAULT

The contract with New York Shipbuilding Corporation provided, in pertinent part, that it could be terminated for default under the following conditions.

"(1) If the Contractor fails to make de-

livery of the vessels or supplies or to perform the services within the time specified herein or any extension thereof; or

"(ii) If the Contractor fails to perform any of the other provisions of this contract, or so fails to make progress as to endanger performance of this contract in accordance with its terms, and in either of these two circumstances does not cure such failure within a period of 10 days (or such longer period as the contracting officer may authorize in writing) after receipt of notice from the contracting officer specifying such failure."

Slippage in delivery dates, as well as the contractor's failure to maintain an adequate work force and acceptable inspection and quality control systems, might be considered conditions which fell within these termination provisions. We propose to examine into the termination action of the Navy from the standpoint of whether termination should have been for default rather than for convenience.

Under a termination for default, the Government would have the right to be indemnified by the defaulted contractor for any additional costs incurred in the completion of the submarine.

PROGRESS PAYMENTS

Contract NObs-4581 with the New York Shipbuilding Corporation provided that the Government make progress payments of 90 percent of the costs incurred until 50-percent completion of the submarine, after which progress payments would be 95 percent of the costs incurred.

Up to the time of the termination, the contractor had received payments totaling \$29,685,787. On July 6, 1967, the contractor received a payment of \$3,612,051 for reimbursement of costs incurred up to the time of the termination. This payment was made under the termination-for-convenience provisions of the contract by which the contractor was entitled to receive reimbursement for all costs incurred, and it brought the total payments to the contractor by the Government to \$33,297,838, or 85.5 percent of the contract price, compared with the degree of completion of the submarine of 78.5 percent established by the Navy.

In view of the considerable additional work proposed by Ingalls, we plan to review the Navy's procedures for establishing the percentage of completion up to the time that the submarine left the New York Shipbuilding Corporation's yard.

We have not solicited comments from either the Navy or the contractors concerned on the contents of this interim report.

We plan to make no further distribution of this report unless requested by you.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the
United States.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on a nomination favorably reported earlier today by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond H. Lapin, of California, to be President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ELMER J. HOLLAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to offer a resolution on behalf of the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I send the resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 388) was read,

considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 388

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable Elmer J. Holland, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now recess.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, pursuant to the resolution just agreed to, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative Elmer J. Holland, from Pennsylvania, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, September 6, 1968, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 5, 1968:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Haywood R. Smith, U.S. Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be lieutenants

Fred S. Long
David M. Mauthe
Anthony Vecino

Roger G. Svendsen
Gary R. Polvi
Bernard N. Mandelkern

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate September 5, 1968:

POSTMASTER

I withdraw the nomination sent to the Senate on March 13, 1967, of Doris L. Oldham to be postmaster at Fishertown in the State of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 5, 1968:

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Raymond H. Lapin, of California, to be President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 5, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.—Galatians 5: 13.

O God, our Heavenly Father, in the quiet of this moment of prayer and with all sincerity of mind and heart we come to Thee who art the source of all wisdom, of all goodness and of all love.

Thou hast called us to work with Thee on behalf of our Nation and for the good of the world. Quicken Thou our love for our country and our concern for all mankind. Now and always may we keep our dedication to freedom, our devotion to truth, our delight in our democratic ways and our desire to make the world a better place for all people.

Grant us courage to be faithful in the struggle to make liberty the law and the life of all lands.

In the name of Him who sets men free we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

THE LATE HONORABLE RUSSELL TUTEN

Mr. STUCKEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with much sadness that I address my colleagues today to tell them of the passing of one of our former colleagues, James Russell Tuten.

James Russell Tuten was a fine man and a dedicated public servant. Some might think it strange that the man who battled with Mr. Tuten for the Eighth District of Georgia congressional seat as recently as 2 years ago would rise to praise Mr. Tuten's merits.

But, I do not think it strange, Mr. Speaker, and I want to unhesitatingly discuss this man who gave so much of his life to the service of his community and his fellow man.

It is true that Mr. Tuten and I did not see eye to eye on how some of the issues which are presently facing our country should be dealt with. However, even though we did not always agree on the solutions to our local and world problems, we each recognized and respected the other's genuine concern with these problems and with our fellow man.

Mr. Tuten was concerned and his concern lead to involvement. This was demonstrated throughout his lifetime, as he continuously served his community and

his State in various capacities; among these, Representative in Congress for 4 years, mayor of Brunswick, Ga., for 4 years, and Brunswick city commissioner for 6 years.

Mr. Tuten was a religious man. He was a deacon of the First Baptist Church of Brunswick for over 11 years. And, he carried his devotion to God into his daily life. He was a kind man and a sensitive man.

After leaving the Congress, Mr. Tuten served as cochairman of the Coastal Plains Regional Commission where he was a credit to the position he held until those final hours.

Russell Tuten will be missed, Mr. Speaker. He will be missed by those who knew him. And, he will be missed by those who did not know him, but were affected by his dedicated and devoted service.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUCKEY. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding because it gives me the opportunity to express my deep sorrow and my great respect for Russell Tuten. Most of us knew for a long time that his death was coming, because he had a long and progressive and irreversible illness. Yet when it did come it was a shock.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely sorry that I was not in the country at the time it occurred so that I might have attended the funeral and pay my respects in that way.

Mr. Speaker, Russell Tuten was a kind man. I know of no one who knew him