

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER AT TULLAHOMA, TENN., RECEIVES NATIONAL ACCLAIM FOR ITS ROLE IN SPACE EXPLORATION

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry J. Taylor, the nationally syndicated columnist, recently outlined in an article the role of the fantastic Arnold Engineering Development Center in Tullahoma, Tenn., in space exploration. The giant AEDC research and wind tunnel testing facility is located in the district which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

This facility includes the largest hypersonic wind tunnel in the free world. Mr. Taylor dramatically details the AEDC testing in connection with the exploration probes which are expected to soon touch down on the moon.

As the Apollo 10 streaks toward the moon on the last preliminary flight prior to an actual landing, I place in the RECORD herewith Mr. Taylor's column in the Nashville Banner because of its interest to my colleagues and the American people.

The column follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner,  
May 13, 1969]

TULLAHOMA CENTER PLAYS VITAL ROLE IN CONQUEST OF SPACE  
(By Henry J. Taylor)

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA.—The blast off of Apollo 10 will draw the great drama of the moon-shot to this famous place. But I have just reached here from a lovely spot in the Tennessee hills—a miracle place, really, that seems hardly known to our country in the whole incredible project.

The basic problem of space-engineering is that the environment changes but the landing vehicle does not. What happens to it on the moon where the surface temperature falls from the boiling point of water to 240 degrees below zero in 170 hours? What is the effect of the shadows of the peak called Epsilon, nearly a mile higher than Mt. Everest, the highest mountain on earth, if the module lands thereabouts? These are some of the questions involved in research at Tullahoma, Tennessee.

There the U.S. Air Force's unobtrusive Arnold Engineering Development Center has brought much of the universe down to pocket-size for the handiwork of the testing scientists for this moon-shot.

The name Arnold honors the late five-star General H. H. ("Hap") Arnold, World War II commander of the U.S. Air Force, a matchless man in many, many ways. It was he who coined the famous Air Force phrase: "What's difficult we do right away. The impossible takes a little longer." No better monument could be built to "Hap" Arnold than this miracle-source nestling in a forest in north central Tennessee.

The nearest star, our sun, is 93 million miles away. We know it burns at some 20 million degrees centigrade. It is nearly 3,000 times hotter inside than on its surface. This is fortunate, because if the sun's surface were as hot as its center the heat on us

would vaporize the earth in a few minutes, alas.

It gives off energy in changing hydrogen to helium at the incredible rate of 564 million tons per second. This is about seven million times the energy output of all electric power stations in our nation. What will happen to the landing module and our men in this environment? For it is one thing for Apollo 10 to fly around the moon, miraculously enough, but quite another to stand stationary on it. Tullahoma found the answer.

The wind tunnel ("C") at Tullahoma is the largest hypersonic wind tunnel in the free world. Motors totalling 216,000 horsepower drive compressors that produce a wind of 8,000 miles an hour. I saw a model of this Apollo 10 glow cherry-red from the air's friction—standing still while air passed it at this speed.

In the section known as the Von Karman Gas Dynamics Facility, which has eight wind tunnels of its own, nitrogen gas is being heated to 10,000 degrees Fahrenheit and then expanded through a nozzle to test speeds beyond anything dreamed about until this moon-shot. These structures were developed for it that withstand forces working against them that are equal to 200,000 times their own weight.

Many of the buildings in this little known development center are as heavily constructed as a battleship. Some are enormous grey monsters billowing skyward from their rustic setting in the trees and shaped unlike anything previously designed by man. Some have a definite sober majesty. Others are low and rambling and you enter them as if into the yawning mouth of a giant snake. Several others consist of row after row of aluminium-colored tubes, trellises, retorts, and tanks, thrown up bare, without walls, for the fumes from the Saturn-Apollo rocket engines on the test blocks make the ventilation problem enormous.

The electric power need is so enormous that it affects the civilian supply throughout north central Tennessee. Therefore, the large-scale Apollo tests were run after 10 o'clock at night when the outside power load was less and the drain not so disturbing.

Most of this electric power is needed to move water—the fantastic millions of gallons of cooling-water for propulsion-system test cells and the wind tunnels. However, conservation be praised, little water is diverted or consumed. An artificial lake was built at Tullahoma. It has a 75-mile, man-made shoreline. The water is circulated back into this lake—a recreation paradise in the lovely trees, a beautiful by-product of the moon-shot here.

RADIO STATION WHN, NEW YORK CITY, HAS DISCOVERED BRILLIANT AND CREATIVE NEWSMAN IN JOSEPH BRAGG

**HON. FRANK J. BRASCO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, many of the radio and television stations throughout our Nation have opened the doors of opportunity to minority members. They have devised training programs. They have given a chance for advancement to literally hundreds of young men and

women in the communications industry. I would like to call attention to the superb efforts of radio station WHN in New York City.

The station offered an opportunity to Joseph Bragg, a brilliant and creative individual. Mr. Bragg rose rapidly through the ranks at the station and today is one of the city's most outstanding newsmen. His incisive questioning and perceptive reporting have added much to the New York scene.

I want to compliment Mr. Bragg for his objective efforts and the station for providing the opportunity for men such as he in one of our most important industries.

## THE WORK OF UNESCO

**HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most effective organ of the United Nations in terms of its outreach to people is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO. The activities of UNESCO touch upon virtually every interest relating to the economic and social needs of mankind. As such, UNESCO has been above the turmoil of the world political arena. In all truth, its appeal is to the universal aspects of our daily lives. An editorial depicting the work of UNESCO was recently published in the publication of the Modern Language Association. It was written by George Winchester Stone, Jr., the distinguished dean of New York University's Graduate School of Arts and Science. I am pleased to bring Dean Stone's editorial to the attention of the House as follows:

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO is charged by Congress to act in an advisory capacity to the United States government and to serve as liaison with the American people in matters pertaining to UNESCO. The challenges of our time are too vast and acute to be met successfully by any one organization; they require the cooperative efforts of nations, of organizations, and of individuals. UNESCO, an organization which was regarded frankly as an experiment when founded in 1946, now evokes the frequent exclamation: "If UNESCO did not exist, it would have to be created!" Two decades of growth and experience have turned it into a dynamic organization closely attuned to the educational, scientific, and cultural interests of the world's nations. What was once a limited instrument of 42 nations—mostly those of Western Europe and the Americas—now consists of 122 independent member states. The minuscule budgets of the early years have been replaced with more substantial funding which, though not yet adequate to all the tasks at hand, enables UNESCO to work productively on some of them. Most recently, a new dimension has been added to UNESCO's work, injecting a greater sense of immediacy and purposefulness. UNESCO has now moved extensively into the field of educational, scientific, and cultural development to the benefit of the less developed nations of Asia,

Africa, and Latin America. The U.S. National Commission has welcomed and encouraged this extension of UNESCO activities. U.S. interests, both immediate and long-term have repeatedly been enhanced in recent years by UNESCO's significant contribution to a long list of international undertakings: oceanographic research, educational planning, teacher training, preservation of cultural heritages, and the free flow of information.

The main purpose of UNESCO is to help to create in all parts of the world the conditions for peace—conditions which will be crushed by rising tides of illiteracy, poverty, disease, and alienation of man from his fellow man. The gap in economic and social development continues to widen between the advanced and the developing nations, constantly eroding the opportunities for productive cooperation. The accelerated pace of urbanization is outstripping man's efforts to attain a tolerable quality of life and contributes unceasingly to the growth of the phenomenon of alienation. Proportionately, the rapid pace of scientific discovery, the development of modern communications media and their possible application to educational and social development, and other advances in man's knowledge of man now make it possible for the first time in history actually to set as a meaningful and obtainable goal the satisfaction of basic human needs for food and shelter, for education, and for good health. Given these facts, UNESCO's role must be that of a catalyst, innovator, communicator, and energizer. The responsibility for action continues to rest squarely on the member states of UNESCO.

The Modern Language Association has long been a member among the sixty national nongovernmental organizations active in the U.S. National Commission. It has received from and given aid to UNESCO and the U.S. National Commission by emphasizing the national interest and foreign languages, not only in the publication and various revisions of Professor William Riley Parker's book, but by the whole scope of the Foreign Language Program, which has been actively in progress in the MLA since 1952. The MLA has provided in the past kits of information for Citizens Consultation Groups on the matter of the spread of the teaching of modern foreign languages in the elementary schools, insistence upon a continuing escalator of these studies throughout the secondary schools, and the validity of new approaches toward the teaching of language. It has also, through a contract with the former Associate Secretary and Treasurer, George Anderson, produced a valuable booklet, *Great Literature East and West*, which examines and annotates the significant books in the UNESCO translation series dealing with matter in the MLA field. It has also contributed six full-page statements in *PMLA*, "UNESCO MUSTS," reviewing many of the significant publications which UNESCO has put forth pertinent to the MLA field.

The National Commission, however, in its recent assessment of its usefulness toward interpreting UNESCO to the U.S., has encountered great vacuums of information regarding UNESCO, tempered only by understanding of the closer relationship which ought to be created to convert general good will into specific action programs. The Commission intends to intensify its liaison not only with the 140 national organizations which are now or have been represented on the Commission, but to extend this liaison to all interested organizations. To do so will require substantial strengthening of the staff and resources of the Commission.

A key to productive participation, however, by all organizations in UNESCO affairs, is effective communication between the organizations and the National Commission—hence, this editorial comment on the nature of the Commission and its plea for each member's interpreting to his colleagues and

communities the usefulness not only of the Commission, but of UNESCO in general.

UNESCO's constitution stresses among other things the rule of law as a basic goal, but UNESCO's present program scarcely reflects that purpose. In a special effort to fill the gap, the National Commission convened a meeting of twenty distinguished Americans concerned with international law. Altogether the substance and proceedings of international law are work for highly trained professionals outside the scope of UNESCO programs, the seminar participants recommended that UNESCO should use its influence to increase awareness among all peoples of the principles of international law and the value of widespread application of its process.

Should any member feel disposed to promulgate the idea of UNESCO, a 30-minute film, "The Minds of Men", was completed early in 1966, and is available. It portrays UNESCO's main purposes and activities. Two hundred prints are deposited in film libraries across the nation, where they are available on free loan to any interested group.

It seems to some of us that the next major productive phase of education must be international education, with a stepping up of international exchanges not only of scholars but of qualified students. We must keep alive, despite the apparent contemporary setbacks of national turmoils, the goals of free flow of ideas, materials, and people—qualified people. As Beowulf said to Hrothgar so many ages ago: "feorcyppes beop selran gesohte paem pe him selfa deah." The accomplishments of UNESCO's and of the U.S. National Commission, as well as other national commissions in this field, have been great, and should be made known to all groups with which individual MLA members come in touch. Pass the word in your community. Information on any items can be obtained by request to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, The Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520 (Geo. Winchester Stone, Jr., New York Univ.).

DR. JOHN S. FOSTER, JR., ON THE  
ABM

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, many statements have been made, by many people about the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system.

Many of this country's scientists have spoken out against the ABM, but even distinguished and learned scientists can do a disservice to the Nation when discussing a subject of this nature, when they do not have or allow a knowledgeable intelligence briefing to back them up.

A recent speech by Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, before the Aviation/Space Writers' Association, presents the views of a man not only of the scientific community, but deeply involved with the defense of this Nation as well. He is basically and technically well informed as well as thoroughly advised by highest intelligence sources.

In an effort to add more information and knowledge to this vital subject, I include this speech in the RECORD for all to read:

ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN S. FOSTER, JR., DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING, BEFORE THE AVIATION/SPACE WRITERS' ASSOCIATION, SHERATON-DAYTON HOTEL, DAYTON, OHIO, MONDAY, MAY 12, 1969, 8 P.M. (E.D.T.)

This evening I would like to discuss the Safeguard Ballistic Missile Defense System. My purpose is to describe briefly why we need it; the issue before Congress and what it turns on; and then to attempt to set the record straight on some of the technical questions that have tended to dominate public debate. I'm certain you have not failed to note the great number of writers that are now experts in your business.

First the "whys" of Safeguard. During the last four years we have observed a rapid growth in the Soviet Union's strategic forces. This growth has resulted in an improvement and expansion of their already massive anti-aircraft defenses, the deployment of a small ABM system, the start of more than 1000 ICBM launchers, and the rapid deployment of more advanced nuclear submarines—both attack and ballistic missile launching. The expansion is continuing.

As we have watched this expansion during the last few years, most of us assumed that the Soviet Union was attempting, locally, to gain strategic parity with the U.S. We, ourselves, have not significantly expanded our forces during this period.

However, more recently the character and number of Soviet offensive weapons have tended in directions which cause us now to doubt most seriously our previous less disturbing assumptions. A continuation of these trends could constitute a threat to our strategic forces—to our land-based ICBM's and to our strategic bombers. The phased deployment of Safeguard is intended to give us a minimum necessary "hedge" to protect against these contingencies.

Phase I of this deployment is limited to the location of Safeguard components at two Minuteman wings. Deployment of these two sites provides an opportunity to "shake-down" such a system—to find and remove those technical and operational bugs which are not likely to show up in research and development efforts. We will be prepared to move to Phase II should the threat continue to increase. We could move in the direction of giving greater coverage to the ICBM force, or to protect our alert B-52's against an SLBM attack, or to protect the National Command Authority or to protect our population against a Communist Chinese ICBM attack, or some combination of these options.

It is extremely important that we understand clearly the issue before the Congress, and the consequences of its decision one way or other.

The question of Phase I deployment rests on three key points. First, is the matter of incremental funds associated with deployment. We are requesting just under \$900 million in FY 1970 to continue development, test, and deployment. Of this, about half of the money is for development, test, and the necessary supervision; and the remainder for deployment. So the deployment decision involves the authorization and appropriation of an incremental, \$450 to \$500 million, less than 1% of the DoD's budget request. In fact, expenditures for FY 1970 would be reduced by only about \$250 million, but the ultimate over-all DoD cost for the completed Phase I would increase some \$250 million.

Second, it is important to maintain continuity of this hedge against the still evolving threats. You should realize that ever since the approval by Congress, and Secretary McNamara's decision in 1967, we have been building up our capability to produce and deploy these components. If authorization to continue deployment were delayed until next year, the current capability would decay, and we would lose not just one year but two or more years. Without authority for

production and deployment, we would have to close our developmental production lines, discharge our production personnel and cease our engineering on sites. Later, when authority was granted to reinstate production, site acquisition, and on-site engineering and construction, we would re-engage the necessary personnel and train them before productive work could be accomplished. This means that the first two sites could not be in operation until 1976 at the earliest, instead of 1974. If at the same time, the Soviets continue on their present course, they could have another hundred SS-9 missiles making a total perhaps of 600, with up to 1800 warheads to attack our 1000 Minuteman. We would then be defending with too little too late.

The third and final key point on which the ABM issue rests is our desire to negotiate with the Soviet Union and end the strategic nuclear arms race. President Nixon has been quite clear on this point. He said—"I have taken cognizance of the view that beginning construction of a U.S. ballistic missile defense would complicate an agreement on strategic arms with the Soviet Union.

"I do not believe that the evidence of the recent past bears out this contention. The Soviet interest in strategic talks was not deterred by the decision of the previous administration to deploy the Sentinel ABM system—in fact, it was formally announced shortly afterwards. I believe that the modifications we have made in the previous program will give the Soviet Union even less reason to view our defense effort as an obstacle to talks. Moreover, I wish to emphasize that in any arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union, the United States will be fully prepared to discuss limitations on defensive as well as offensive weapons systems."

In summary, then, the President has decided that we should take this minimum step consistent with preserving our security and enhancing the chances for meaningful negotiation with the Soviet Union. Failure to take the step could not only endanger our security in the mid-seventies, but also weaken our negotiation position in the immediate future.

The Safeguard issue is complicated by genuine uncertainties over Soviet intentions, and unnecessary confusion over technical and tactical problems. What is most remarkable in the public debate is the high level of confusion and misunderstanding which exists in the minds of some professionals as well as some non-professionals. For example, regarding the Soviet threat, the following quotation is from the recent book "ABM" edited by Professors Chayes and Wiesner.

"It is important to understand that these assertions by Secretary Laird are not based on any intelligence about new Soviet weapons systems. They represent his interpretation of facts that have, in the main, been known for some time, but have not been viewed heretofore by the responsible officials as signaling a Soviet attempt to attain a first-strike capability."

Secretary Clifford concluded in his January 1969 Posture Statement:

"It is quite apparent from the foregoing review of the threat that the Soviet Union is moving vigorously to catch up with the United States at least in numbers of strategic missiles—both land-based and sea-based."

Implicit in Secretary Clifford's conclusion is that the Soviets would level off when they "catch up." The subsequent evaluation of intelligence obtained earlier than his statement and intelligence received subsequently reveals both that the Soviets are moving even faster than anticipated and that, having passed the assumed leveling off point, their expansion programs are continuing unabated.

Mr. Laird's statements are based upon agreed intelligence data. I know of no disagreement on the approximate number of

SS-9's being built by the Soviet Union, nor of any significant issue in size of its payload. We all agree upon the existence of new submarines and upon their approximate rate of deployment. No person who has seen the data objects to the conclusion that the SS-9 has been tested with multiples and the community agrees upon an approximate weight of the RV's.

We do not know just how effectively these RV's could attack Minuteman silos since we do not know precisely their accuracy. Indeed, their testing is continuing.

Further we do not know how many SS-9's the Soviets will finally build. Perhaps the Soviets themselves haven't decided. But, we do have a good idea of the number they could build in any given time at the recent rate, and we do have a good idea of the accuracy they might achieve.

President Johnson and Secretary McNamara saw only the beginning of the SS-9 buildup when the Sentinel system was started 2 years ago, but even at that time the option to defend Minuteman was designed into that deployment. To quote Mr. McNamara in September 1967:

"Further, the Chinese-oriented ABM deployment would enable us to add—as a concurrent benefit—a further defense of our Minuteman sites against Soviet attack."

Mr. Clifford requested, and the Congress granted, funds to maintain that option.

Other statements in the ABM book seem to play a strange numbers game. At one point the book states:

"With our Minuteman in hardened silos, it would take at least two attacking ICBM's to be reasonably sure of destroying one Minuteman."

An ICBM with three independently aimed warheads can attack three silos. The U.S. has designed, but not deployed, a system which allows a missile to signal the launch-control point if it has launched its re-entry vehicle properly. With this system, the control point could reprogram another missile to make up for failures. For example, a missile system having a 20% failure rate and carrying 3 re-entry vehicles per missile, would require only 420 missiles to attack 1000 silos. If the yield of each re-entry vehicle was a reasonable 5 MT and the accuracy a reasonable 1/4 of a mile, about 95% of the silos could be destroyed. This would mean 50 of the 1000 Minutemen survive. It would be foolish to attack half of the silos twice as the book advised, rather than all of them once.

The same strange numbers game is played relative to defense. To quote again,

"It would take three missiles with 30 percent failure probability to destroy an incoming warhead with 97 percent certainty. Some such requirement must be incorporated into the firing doctrine for any ABM defense of cities, radars or bomber bases, and this uses up the defensive missiles at a fearsome rate."

Professor Weinberg indicates in his contribution to this book that sequential firing of the interceptors would eliminate this problem. He considers this very difficult. However, this is just the tactic which we will use and we have planned to use for many years. It is feasible. Furthermore, we expect missile failure rate considerably less than his assumed 30%, and results of firings to date support our expectation. Of those missiles that fail, almost all occur early in flight. Should one fail, we would fire another. Sufficient time is available.

We also find the statement:

"But that system (Sentinel) was designed for a wholly different purpose . . ."

This quotation is part of a much longer charge implying that the Safeguard components were not designed to defend Minuteman. This is just not true. The NIKE-X R&D program upon which both Sentinel and Safeguard were based, always had a Sprint missile for point defense of targets, spe-

cifically Minutemen and cities. We have, from time to time, examined specialized systems, designed only to hard point defense, with the hope that we could find something much cheaper or much better. But we haven't found it.

Another statement reads:

"It has been authoritatively suggested that it just may be impossible during the next years to write a computer program for dealing with the various forms of attack that can be anticipated."

Programming of large computer-controlled systems is difficult. We have had considerable relevant experience, and our experience shows us that it can be done. The systems cited as horrible examples were pioneering new ground, but they eventually worked quite well. A recent example is the Air Force Space Track radar recently completed. It is very similar to the PAR radar in its operation; it has one of the largest real time computer programs ever written and contains almost a million instructions. It was built on schedule and within cost estimates—including the computer programming. The radar and its computer program are now operational, and the system is being operated and maintained by Air Force crews. In the case of Safeguard, we are allowing a year for shake down of the Phase I installations.

The book in many spots also claims that the defense can be easily countered by simple penetration devices or by "blackout" attacks.

These "simple" devices simply are not simple. We know that the United States has attempted to field operational penetration aids for the last decade, and we are only now beginning to have workable ones in our forces. We use them to force the Soviets to install a complicated and more expensive defense—we do not depend on them to assure our penetration capability. The devices—and the tactics—will require more resources than the Communist Chinese will have available for a considerable time.

With regard to the Soviets, the penetration tactics are not very useful for an attack upon the Minuteman force, and for that reason the Soviets would be wasting their time with them. Light penetration aids and the extensive high altitude blackout do not have much effect on a Sprint defense which takes place in the atmosphere.

With regard to the Chinese, they have yet to achieve their first generation ICBM. They don't know and don't yet have what it takes to develop and deploy penetration aids and tactics against the Safeguard system.

Professor Panofsky has asked recently how many Minutemen could be saved by Phase I of Safeguard.

There are attacks for which Phase I will save a respectable number of missiles. The maximum number is associated with the number of interceptors—a number which is classified for obvious reasons. However, I think it is a mistake to consider Phase I in just such terms. Phase I has two basic functions. It is first a step which will prepare us to react rapidly to a further development of the threat. It prepares sites and production facilities for increasing the number of interceptors and possibly radars, if a threat continues to develop.

Secondly, it provides a checkout, a shake-down of an integrated ABM system. Our first opportunity for such experience. What we learn here will affect future improvements of the system.

Professor Panofsky recently inquired whether the Safeguard system forms an economically feasible defense against a heavy threat to the Minuteman force. Various estimates of the cost of an interceptor including its assigned fraction of the radar and other systems cost have varied between \$2.5M and \$7M. The present cost to the U.S. and probably the Soviet Union for an offensive R/V is in excess of \$10M. The advances which we

expect in our forces over the next few years may reduce these to about \$3M. There is little hope they will ever get as low as \$2M. In other words, the cost to attack and to defend in the 1970 time frame are roughly one to one. Whether or not it turns out in, say 1975, to favor the offense or the defense depends on just what improvements the Soviets achieve as well as our own experience with the actual production and operation of our defensive system.

The Safeguard system has been designed by competent people, and the best that are available. Its design has been reviewed by outside experts. Those who do, in fact, study the aspects of the system that are within their area of technical expertise are convinced it will do what it is designed to do. There are some eminent scientists who, for one reason or other claim it won't work. On that, I'd like to say, first, that they have offered no problem which we have not long since addressed and resolved. Second, I want to point out that one does not obtain a meaningful technical judgment by taking a vote of the scientific community or even of Nobel Laureates. This would go to the second warning against misplaced power mentioned by President Eisenhower in his often quoted Farewell message—

"Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

I have attempted to treat some technical objections which have been raised; I have not treated all of them. Perhaps you have found or read objections which you consider more serious. If so, I would welcome an opportunity to answer them here and now.

#### CHICAGO CITY COUNCIL DEMANDS END TO U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

#### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago the Chicago City Council took an action which I believe is significant both for the people of Chicago and for the Nation. In an unusual venture into the realm of foreign affairs, the council unanimously called on President Nixon "to take all extraordinary measures to deescalate and to quickly and drastically reduce American involvement in the war." In taking this action, the Chicago City Council has given voice to what millions of Americans—in Chicago and throughout the Nation—have begun to feel: that they were misled both as to the nature of our goals and our ability to accomplish them in Vietnam, that the overwhelming investment of American lives and material resources in the 4 years since American combat forces have been in Vietnam has simply been not worth the cost, that—in short—it is time for us to leave the military and political problems to be solved by the Vietnamese themselves.

I believe it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the Chicago City Council's action was both unanimous and bipartisan. I think this fact should have special significance in light of the assumption of responsibility by a new administration—a Republican administration. The alder-

man who introduced this Vietnam withdrawal resolution was a Republican. In introducing it he certainly spoke for many members of his own party who are weary of this war. I commend the Chicago City Council's action, and the following article describing it, to the attention of my colleagues, and to the attention of those whose responsibility it is to make the crucial decisions on continued U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 12, 1969]  
GET OUT OF VIETNAM, CITY COUNCIL DEMANDS—UNANIMOUS VOTE FOR RESOLUTION  
(By Jay McMullen)

The City Council Monday, in a rare display of nonpartisan agreement, unanimously called on President Richard M. Nixon "to drastically reduce American involvement in the war in Vietnam."

The Council Finance Committee, comprising all 50 aldermen, approved a resolution offered by Ald. Jack I. Sperling (50th), a Republican.

The resolution asked the President "to take all extraordinary measures to de-escalate and to quickly and drastically reduce American involvement in the war . . ."

The resolution also asks that Mr. Nixon "order an immediate, orderly and sizable withdrawal of major American forces in Vietnam."

It also requests that "Congress provide through "legislative and budgetary powers that President Nixon begin to extricate the United States from its disastrous and crushing involvement in Vietnam."

Sperling's resolution prompted a long debate, but only over whether the wording was strong enough.

"This resolution says we want out," Sperling said.

"It has been demonstrated very clearly by many people that the war is not winnable."

Ald. Seymour Simon (40th), an independent Democrat, joined Sperling in speaking for the resolution.

"The terrible things that are happening on the nation's campuses today wouldn't be happening but for Vietnam," Simon said.

"The war shows our young people we regard human life as having a cheap value. This was wrong from the beginning and in this resolution we say, 'Let's take our men out of Vietnam,'" Simon added.

Ald. A. A. (Sammy) Rayner Jr. (6th) complained that the resolution doesn't go far enough.

Rayner said he favors "total, unilateral withdrawal. We should bring our boys home as soon as possible."

The resolution said "there is a rising clamor throughout the nation by a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, or at the very least the cessation of American military involvement there."

Since the aldermen approved the resolution while sitting as the Finance Committee, they will vote on it again at Wednesday's Council meeting.

#### A BILL TO PREVENT THE LOSS OF MORE THAN ONE FAMILY MEM- BER IN VIETNAM

#### HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to reintroduce a bill to prohibit the assignment of a mem-

ber of the Armed Forces to combat area duty if certain relatives died while serving in Vietnam.

Over 34,000 American families have been touched by the loss of a member due to the conflict in Vietnam. From all indications the war in Vietnam will be continuing at essentially the present scale for many months to come. During the period of continued operations the tragedy of the loss of loved ones from families remains an ever-present concern to all Americans. The bill which I am reintroducing today would prevent the loss of more than one family member by permitting any serviceman to be assigned to another theater of operations if his family has suffered a loss of a daughter, son, or father in Vietnam. I think it would be completely reprehensible, considering the manpower pool that is available, to force another son, daughter, or father in the position of possibly losing his or her life in Vietnam. Since this bill would affect only a very few families, I do not see how it could affect the manpower needs. I hope that the Committee on Armed Services will give this matter their immediate attention and report the bill to the House floor within the near future.

#### ALABAMA CONGRESSMAN PRAISED BY NEWSPAPER

#### HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished colleagues, Hon. GEORGE W. ANDREWS, has been singled out for congratulations in a newspaper editorial because of his great and important work for water resources development in all of Alabama and throughout the Nation.

As the editorial comments, Congressman ANDREWS has taken on additional duties as a member of the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Public Works and will be in an even better position to advance this vital work for the improvement of our country.

I want to add my personal congratulations to our colleague from Alabama, and I include the editorial from the Decatur, Ala., Daily at this point as a part of my remarks so that all of my colleagues will know of this exceptional commendation:

[From the Decatur (Ala.) Daily,  
May 12, 1969]

CONGRESSMAN ANDREWS BIG AID FOR TVA,  
ALABAMA

For Alabama, one of the most fortunate arrangements to occur in the Congress this year is the placement of Rep. George Andrews of Union Springs on the Appropriations Subcommittee which deals with funding for public works projects.

Throughout his entire tenure in the House of Representatives, Congressman Andrews has worked faithfully and purposefully for water resources development. Add to this his great knowledge of fiscal affairs and the value of proper investment in our country's natural resources, and our state can take

pride in the record he will establish in his important new assignment.

As Congressman Andrews is an experienced legislator in the field of water resources development, lodging him on the Subcommittee for Public Works of the Appropriations Committee will bear the entire nation well for he will be in a position to be productive and influential.

No one outside our area is more familiar with TVA nor has anyone been a more constant and ardent supporter of its aims and welfare than George Andrews.

We of the Tennessee Valley are proud of this distinguished Alabama Congressman and are afforded comfort in knowing that he is equally as interested in North Alabama as in his own area.

He has proven time and time again that water resource developments such as the TVA are adding to the value of our nation and providing strength for our people.

Congressman Andrews is now in a position to do even more as a member of the Committee which passes on the funding for public works and capital improvements vitally necessary for our country.

SUCSESSES IN KOREAN AID PROGRAM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article pointing up some of the successes of the U.S. aid program in Korea.

The projects covered by the article represent only a small portion of the nationwide food-for-work program initiated by the Korean Government in 1964.

Since then, the total program has benefited some 600,000 Korean families whose members earned much-needed foodstuffs for their children and elders while working on community and agricultural improvement projects. There are 150,000 of these families now tilling land newly reclaimed by virtue of such projects. Each year, the Korean Government has assumed a greater share of the total cost of the food-for-work program, advancing from 24 percent in 1964 to 50 percent in 1968, with the ultimate goal of financing this program entirely as soon as its own resources are adequate to do so.

The article, in the March 31 edition of the Washington Daily News reads as follows:

U.S. AID: KOREA

(By Ray Cromley)

SEOUL, KOREA (NEA).—If President Nixon's men are weary-eyed from probing into the shortcomings of our domestic welfare programs, let them come to Korea.

Here they'll see a new twist in attacking poverty. Workers are enthused, the poor happy. The projects have been so successful, in fact, Washington is now using the plan in 75 countries—but not at home in the United States.

The aid is American food. It's given in payment to the poor for work. But the secret of success is that it is a particular kind of work—designed to help eliminate the poverty.

Back in 1958 and 1959, in return for American aid food, thousands of South Korean farmers began working 15 days a month at

building dams and dikes to reclaim thousands of acres of land along South Korea's long western seacoast, and bench terracing marginal lands in the highlands.

There were hundreds of such projects in the years that followed. As each was completed, the South Korean "poor" settled down on the land, producing rice, dry crops, salt.

Usually, not long after, the aid volunteer offices would begin receiving letters which read something like this: "As of next month, when our first crop comes in we will no longer need the gift food. Thank you."

Over the years other poverty-stricken South Koreans have built reservoirs, wells, public comfort stations, farm roads, co-operative pig sties, chicken and rabbit houses, facilities for raising silk worms, irrigation dams and canals, school playgrounds, sewage ditches, flood-prevention embankments.

Large numbers of the men and women who have worked on these projects are now self supporting.

At present, 30,000 people are working on 266 projects in programs supervised by religious groups working jointly in co-operation with the U.S. aid program and the South Korean government.

Only one member from each family is permitted to work. He may labor under this program only 15 days a month (as it is not intended to develop into a permanent way of life). For this 15 days he receives a month's basic food for himself and his family.

It was not always thus. At the start, the use of American gift food for work was against U.S. law. But the religious volunteer agencies working in the program found the Koreans were unhappy at receiving handouts. They kept asking for something to do. Thus, the work program.

The Agency for International Development in 1964 asked Congress to change the law so that aid to needy persons should where possible aim at community and other self help actions designed to lessen the need for assistance.

That set the ball rolling. A five-year conversion program was begun that year. The majority of food-for-aid projects in 75 countries were to come under the new concept by some time in 1969.

As one volunteer in the South Korean program puts it:

"The people show they like the program . . . They are doing things that are of their own choosing for which they feel the need . . . Their confidence has been built up for them to try themselves to do things they have wanted to do . . . Doing the work themselves and being paid for it takes away the feeling of dependency upon outside help and assistance."

It's pretty difficult to ask for more in a poverty program.

JOB CORPS THOUGHTS BEFORE IT PASSES ON

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, if the Nixon administration seeks an epitaph for the life it has drummed out of 59 Job Corps centers and from 17,000 youth, I respectfully submit the following tribute which appeared in the Washington Post Sunday edition, May 18, 1969. It is doubtful that the administration will agree with this portrayal of the life and death of the Job Corps—but those of us who can and

will support the account expressed by Colman McCarthy will surely agree we have rarely seen the case so well stated.

The article follows:

JOB CORPS THOUGHTS BEFORE IT PASSES ON

(By Colman McCarthy)

When he was still running OEO, Sargent Shriver, a user of metaphors, often referred to the Job Corps as "the Nation's dumping ground." Occasionally, the term would throw off or offend someone. "Go to a Job Corps center," Shriver would say, "and see for yourself. It'll be filled with kids this country has literally dumped."

Most were content to take Shriver's word for it. Besides, statistics soon began coming back on the dumppees, grim enough to convince anyone. Fifty per cent of the kids had never seen a dentist or doctor, 24 per cent had eye trouble, they averaged 9 years of schooling but only read at 5th grade level, 33 per cent had behavioral problems, 29 per cent of the Negro enrollees left school because they were bored, as did 56 per cent of the white enrollees.

In addition, there were curious little stories the statistics didn't tell. For example, a girl from Appalachia was being shown her room in the dormitory of an urban women's center. When showing her the bathroom, her guide flushed the toilet to be sure it worked. The Appalachian girl jumped back in horror. It was the first one she had ever seen and her comment was, "But I could fall into it."

Early reports also came back from many centers that homosexuality was going to be a problem. The judgment was based on the habits of enrollees who, during the middle of the night, would slip out of bed and into that of a companion. Psychiatrists discovered later that it was not homosexuality at all, but loneliness. The youths in question had never slept alone in a bed by themselves before, being forced by poverty to share a bed with one or more brothers and sisters.

Occasionally, outside observers complained that Job Corps officials often did not give out permanent clothing when new recruits arrived. What appeared as cruelty was really practicality; most of the enrollees had lived on such poor diets that it was better to hold off fitting them for clothes until they gained 10 or 20 pounds, usually a matter of weeks.

It was little wonder the country had no use for kids like this. They didn't even qualify for the dirty-work jobs that every well-run society, if it's going to be neat and clean, needs done.

Early in 1965, when Job Corps began, two things became immediately clear about the program. First, it was not going to be just another job-training program. Many of the youths were so physically, socially and psychologically shattered that training them for jobs right off was impossible. It accomplished little to take a young man into a mechanic shop and say, "Here, I'm going to make a mechanic out of you," when everything about the youth shouted back, "Please, make a human being out of me first."

Thus, Job Corps was basically a human reclamation program, reclaiming exactly the youths society made worthless and then damned because they were worthless. The situation was similar to Shaw's comment in the preface to *Man and Superman*: "The haughty American nation . . . makes the Negro clean its boots and then proves the moral and physical inferiority of the Negro by the fact that he is a bootblack."

The second fact immediately clear about Job Corps in its early days was that of all the poverty programs, it was destined to become the most picked on. Spending tax money on dropouts, punks, welfare cases and the hopeless was probably the subconscious reason why so many righteous Americans were re-

vulsed by the idea of Job Corps. Essentially, the same thing was being done in a program like Head Start, but here the kids were small and cute and cuddly and who but maybe Strom Thurmond would dare speak out against children?

A further reason to wax vehement against Job Corps was "the Harvard argument." Critics pulled out figures saying it cost \$10,000 a year to train a Job Corps enrollee—or about three times the cost of a year at Harvard. Few bothered to get the accurate cost of Job Corps—\$6,725 in 1968—or to consider that the program did a lot more than educate, or that Harvard, through alumni gifts, endowments and other contributions, subsidizes each student for \$7,570, which means a year at Harvard comes out to more than \$10,000. Ironically, the Harvard argument boomerangs in another, more topical way—no Job Corps enrollees, no matter how "disadvantaged," have yet rioted and shut down their center.

When Richard Nixon resurfaced on the national scene, he also picked on Job Corps. The night before he was elected president, he said on national television that the program was a failure, that it costs \$12,000 a year to train an enrollee (Mr. Nixon had been using the figure \$10,000, but on election eve it escalated to \$12,000) and that he planned to eliminate it.

Evidently candidate Nixon didn't know that many large corporations were running Job Corps centers: IBM, Litton, Westinghouse, Philco-Ford, Packard-Bell, Burroughs, IT&T. Nor did he know that about 123,000 of the 177,000 youth who enrolled since 1965 are either working, back in school or in military service. As president, Nixon has apparently heard from his businessmen friends that Job Corps isn't all bad: slander Job Corps and you slander us, their reasoning went. So instead of trying to eliminate Job Corps, the President is now merely going to emasculate it.

What it means is that for many of the dumped, they will get dumped again: into programs too narrow for them, or back into a society too uncaring. Either way the dumped feeling is nothing new.

**RESOLUTION URGING CONSTRUCTION OF A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN THE NORTH SHORE AREA OF ESSEX COUNTY, MASS. BY THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE**

**HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the resolution recently adopted by the Massachusetts Legislature urging the Congress to enact legislation for a Veterans' Administration hospital in the North Shore area of the county of Essex, Mass. In response to the increasing need for Veterans' Administration hospital facilities, I most earnestly urge and hope that my colleagues and the administration will heed and act in the language and the spirit of the resolution which follows:

**RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN THE NORTH SHORE AREA OF THE COUNTY OF ESSEX**

Whereas, There is an urgent need for the establishment of a two thousand bed Veterans' Administration hospital in the north

shore area of Essex county; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a two thousand bed Veterans' Administration hospital in the north shore area of Essex county; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to the members thereof from the Commonwealth and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Senate, adopted, April 28, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,

Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 30, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

**NORWEGIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS**

**HON. ALBERT H. QUIE**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the 17th of May provides a welcome opportunity to comment on some aspects of our current and always exemplary relations with Norway. It is Constitution Day, Norway's 155-year-old national holiday. It is a pleasure to pay respectful tribute.

For three historical reasons, I think it is particularly appropriate that we recognize this occasion here in the House of Representatives.

First, it marks the beginning of the Norwegian Legislature.

Second, it commemorates the world's second oldest Constitution still effective today. Only our own is older.

Third, that Constitution has a special kinship to our own.

The Norwegian "founding fathers" studied very closely the work of the men of Philadelphia. It is not just coincidental that the three central concepts agreed upon in Norway in 1814 were government by the people, separation of powers, and the guaranteeing of inalienable human rights. In an early draft they incorporated article XXX of the constitution of Massachusetts with its familiar conclusion that government "should be a government of laws and not of men."

It is in large part because we have stood on common constitutional ground that our relations with Norway have always been excellent. I do not want to examine the details of this very satisfactory history, but I do want to comment on our current cultural and economic relations.

Our cultural relations remain very good. Nearly 800 students from Norway were studying in the United States last year, bringing the total since World War II to approximately 10,000. If one includes those enrolled in the summer school in Oslo, students from the United States are the largest group of foreign students in Norway. Last year Norway

was visited by more than 120,000 Americans.

It is impressive that in 1968 Norway imported \$37 per capita of U.S. exports. Almost astounding is the extent to which Norway's merchant marine has contributed to U.S. trade with the rest of the world. Norwegian ships are second only to our own in visits to American ports. Approximately 17 to 18 percent of all ocean transport to and from the United States is by Norway's ships.

That fleet has helped us not only commercially, but also strategically. During World War II, Norwegian vessels served in all major theaters; half of all the Allied tankers carrying supplies across the Atlantic were Norwegian. Today's new 19-million-ton fleet is a major asset of NATO, in which Norway is a steadfast partner.

The excellent relations between the United States and Norway became firmly established in the last century, when Norwegians migrated to this country in proportions exceeded only by the Irish.

In the many American communities in which the 17th of May is celebrated, this day has come to symbolize the feelings of good will between the United States and Norway. These well-founded feelings have long been at the heart of this occasion in Minnesota, where so many of the sons and daughters of Norway established their homes and contributed so diversely to the progress of our State.

I wish to join in honoring this day by recording my own good wishes before the Congress.

**RURAL DEVELOPMENT OUTLOOK**

**HON. JOHN M. ZWACH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my belief that sometime our national leaders will finally be forced to place first things first in our unending, profitless pursuit of coping with urban problems. Each new urban program to rebuild, revitalize, and restore our blighted city area is equivalent to putting a most expensive bandaid on the symptom of our basic troubles.

Eventually, and hopefully, before our cities are all impoverished or become strangled in their own morass, we will decide to use the great resources of our Nation to balance population and economic opportunity.

I naturally am referring to the countryside—that part of America not included in metropolitan areas. This spacious area has 98 percent of our total acreage and about 30 percent of our people. It is this great area that I believe should be properly used as the balance once more for our great country. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 8041, to effectuate this move.

Recently, a new publication was released presenting vital information about the countryside. I am reproducing the preface of this study as I believe it most succinctly points out the possibilities of developing the countryside.

PREFACE

The second third of this century has been marked by extraordinary technological advances, industrial concentration, and massive influx of people into big cities. The social and economic impact on the lives of millions of people created some of the most serious problems the nation has ever faced—the urban problems and their side-effects.

Community structures that generations had built were shattered. In thousands of country towns, jobs and opportunities to make a living dried up. Millions of these people, black and white alike, headed for the big cities. Utterly unprepared by training or background to cope with these new conditions, they gravitated to the bottoms of poverty and despair. The cities became the breeding grounds for rebellion, murder, and rampant crime.

Countless programs have been launched to provide food and shelter for the poor, but little has been done to help a vast part of the American population to attain a more normal way of life. There should be no less concern about human ecology or congenial living conditions for people than for the environment of livestock, fish, and wild creatures. This must become our goal as we get into the last third of the century.

Technology and industrial enterprise can be reoriented to serve the largest number of people and the entire country. This is a great challenge for engineering.

There are now 130 million people living in big cities whose total area covers hardly more than one per cent of the United States. The rest of the country, with its vast natural resources, remains relatively under-populated and under-developed; and some of it has become poverty ridden from constant attrition.

This report outlines the need and the approach to bringing about a better balance between the big city and countryside economies. The countryside, with its 16,000 towns and small cities, is entirely different from what it was even a few years ago. Today it has modern highways, power, better educational and health facilities; and science has expanded its resources. There are thousands of small cities almost ideally situated to accommodate industry, business development and more people.

We need not spend untold billions of dollars to bring new life to America. What is needed is more information and a new kind of motivation. Only by taking into account the full potential of the countryside, which is 98 percent of the United States in area and natural resources, can we hope to bring better living conditions to the greatest number of people.

G. B. GUNLOGSON,  
Life Member American Society of Agricultural Engineering, Life Fellow American Association for the Advancement of Science.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE OF MOTION PICTURES AND TELEVISION PROGRAMS WHICH DEGRADE OR DEMEAN RACIAL, RELIGIOUS, OR ETHNIC GROUPS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Americans of Italian Descent, Inc.,

I was pleased today to submit a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the production and distribution in interstate and foreign commerce of motion pictures and television programs which degrade or demean racial, religious, or ethnic groups.

AID has for one of its purposes the combatting of defamation of Americans of Italian descent, as well as other ethnic groups, and it is felt that the adoption of the concurrent resolution will greatly help in its efforts to achieve its purpose.

OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues realize that a heavy majority of our educators appear to oppose our involvement in Vietnam. I call your attention to a particularly impressive letter from a California educator pointing out the reason for our involvement:

CAMBRIA, CALIF.,

May 13, 1969.

CHARLES M. TEAGUE,  
Member of Congress.

DEAR SIR: Division of American opinion as to a firm stand in Vietnam has surely weakened us, both in the field and at the peace-table.

It is horrible to see the Vietnamese people ground between the millstones of conflicting ideologies. But a Communist take-over would soon follow U.S. withdrawal; and the ruthless tactics of such take-over have again and again been announced by Marxist spokesmen, and illustrated by mass-murder and cruel punishment of "political unreliaables". We must count among the latter the millions who fled North Vietnam when the Geneva agreement for free elections was flouted, along with millions of others who have resisted Communism.

This confrontation, short of nuclear war, is between the bed-rock millstone of dictatorship and the unstable, revolving millstone of elective government. The old and thoroughly proven system of dictatorship is at great advantage in the newly-invented undeclared wars. Without declaration of war, a democracy is like a fighter with one hand tied. Communist spokesmen have urged frequent use of such wars. Should the Vietnam violence be settled, on any basis, Marxist policy forecasts new outbreaks elsewhere.

There is no evidence whatever that the American people or government has territorial aims in Asia. Loud popular protest may, I hope, assure the world that our nation has no imperialist aims. But our original assumption of a protective role has forced upon us a responsibility toward the millions of Vietnamese who favor elective government. Should we withdraw, we must provide asylum for the "political unreliable". This would be a massive and perhaps impossible task.

Our system of elective government is on trial for its life. In an important sense, we are the radicals who are fomenting dissent against dictatorship, which is the well-structured of society. We shall greatly weaken our relatively new experiment in elective government, if we back away from paying the high price of freedom in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, our academic communities seems to follow patterns of the nineteen twenties and thirties, when ruthless aims of

two or more dictators were brushed aside as idle threats, and reports of mass-murders and "liquidations" were dismissed as unlikely propaganda. Many teachers, in the comfort and safety of Christian democracy, discourage in their students any concern with loss of life and liberty in far-away Asia or Europe, much as they did thirty-five years ago, with appalling results. Many teachers equate our role in Vietnam with that of the French. Many point out that land-reform and honesty in government are badly needed; but they coolly suggest that Marxists can best carry out those reforms—no matter how frightful the cost in life and liberty.

Democracy is on trial to prove whether it can, by thoughtful dissemination of facts and by compassionate understanding of both friend and adversary, match the driving forces of dictatorship. If there are any valid thoughts in this letter, I beg you use them to fortify our own rather new and very hopeful experiment in free elections and free thought.

With all good wishes,

PAUL SQUIBB.

DISMAY AND DISCONTENT OVER THE CONDUCT OF OUR AFFAIRS IN VIETNAM

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this body has, I am confident, received numerous letters from families of servicemen and from servicemen themselves expressing their dismay and discontent over the conduct of our affairs in Vietnam.

The fact that these servicemen and their relatives have expressed their feelings forthrightly about how our Nation has fumbled its foreign policy should not take away from the sense of loyalty and duty that they have toward their country. Instead of demonstrating, refusing to serve, protesting, or growing beards and long hair, they are fulfilling their obligations as loyal Americans even though they have serious doubts about how our country is carrying on both its military campaign and its foreign diplomacy.

With the permission of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD today the complete text of one such letter I have received, having obtained the personal permission of the serviceman who wrote the letter. Some of the materials in his letter have already been checked into by me. The answers we received were perfunctory; the military appears to have explanations for almost every conceivable situation which many of our citizens are unable to understand.

I commend this letter to your attention because I conscientiously believe there are many Americans who share the feelings expressed in this letter, but who have not had the courage to speak out about it. I believe the author of the letter is to be commended for doing his duty and, at the same time, maintaining his American rights to disagree with the war in which he and other servicemen are being required to carry out their duties.

Mr. Speaker, his letter is submitted below:

ATLANTA, Ga.,  
January 3, 1969.

DEAR SIR: For the past two years I have served my country patriotically and honorably as both an enlisted man and as an officer in the United States Army Corps of Engineers. I am, and have for the past eighteen years, been a resident of Atlanta, Georgia. I strongly supported Barry Goldwater and worked many hours during his campaign to help him win the election. I also supported Richard Nixon in the past election. Needless to say, I very strongly supported you in both elections and was very happy that you were reelected. Because I have thoroughly enjoyed your periodic newsletters to the voters you represent, I feel rather easy about writing you this letter.

My chief reason for writing you is simple: You are my representative and I would like to express my opinion whether it means anything or not.

I am presently serving with the 36th Engineers Battalion located in Vinh Long in the Mekong Delta. My responsibilities are those of a platoon leader in an engineer construction company. I have been here in Viet Nam over five weeks and have visited many cities and areas north and south of Saigon. I am very disappointed and disgusted with the entire war effort and our government's positions and policies. Americans are dying over here while many politicians are very unconcerned or so it seems. This limited type of war is frustrating and somewhat demoralizing to the GI's here. When a GI works Christmas Eve and Day and also New Year's Eve and Day, he wonders what the U.S. Government is doing in Paris and the States. I can assure you, sir, that I support all government decisions although I may not agree with them. The facts are simple: we should either pull out of Viet Nam or end this Communist aggression with whatever force is necessary. This country is actually one of the poorest countries in the world, with the exception of American spending. There are no natural resources here and the only industry is fish, which is poor. The black market is, however, powerful and it seems the U.S. Government has let it get out of hand. It's ridiculous to see American products downtown, yet a soldier can't find them in the PX's. Vietnamese work in all PX's, snack bars, and in most units here. The Australian PX is well stocked and for good reason: Australians allow no Vietnamese to work in their facilities. Every city is full of bars and houses where GI's spend most of their money on women and booze (stolen from us) at prices exceeding those in many American cities.

Jeeps and 2½ ton trucks are issued to the Vietnamese soldiers before American soldiers. They have a priority. Why? I do not have a jeep for this reason and have to ride in a ¼ ton truck. There are many units still using the M14 rifle, but the Vietnamese soldiers are rapidly being issued M16's. Why? The entire supply system in Viet Nam is poor. Food in our mess halls is poor.

Sir, do you really think we can stay here forever?

As far as I'm concerned, these people are not worth American lives. But as I said earlier, I am a soldier and follow orders regardless of whether or not I agree.

It's time the U.S. took some definite steps in one direction or the other. Paris I hope and pray.

I am truly a disgusted soldier and citizen. Hope that my letter does not go unnoticed. Some politicians (especially you know who) would probably get down to business if they strapped on a pack and an M16 and came over here to help these people.

Thank you, sir, for your time and your past record as a fine representative for me and my family.

RONALD G. FINCH.

## JOB CORPS FAREWELL

### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on the day that the Nixon administration's economy ax fell on our Nation's conservation centers, I was in Redding, Calif., the location of one of the 59 Job Corps centers ordered closed in the name of economy.

My shock was shared by not only the trainees and their instructors at the Toyon Job Corps Center, but also by the people of all the community of Redding. As I have said on many occasions, this is a fine center, with solid community support, a minimum of problems, and doing a tremendous job in the field of natural and human resource conservation.

As soon as word of the impending closing reached Redding, the aggressive daily newspaper published there by Paul Bodenhamer, embarked upon a vigorous campaign to retain the Center as a vital part of our community.

Staff Reporter Dick Young has followed the Job Corps situation from that fateful day, and has done an excellent job of recording the fight to preserve the center.

With the decision of the U.S. Senate against the resolution which is sponsored by many of us in the House of Representatives, I fear that the story has become an obituary.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor has assured us that none of the boys who are in training will be abandoned. Dick Young has recorded what this means to three young Job Corpsmen and what the alternative is. His story speaks for itself. At this point I would like to share his story with my colleagues.

#### BARBED WIRE DASHED THEIR LAST HOPES FOR THE JOB CORPS

(By Dick Young)

Three teenage boys hitchhiked over 800 miles last week. They made the journey to regain hope that had been given to them at Toyon Job Corps Center.

Today they camp out under the stars in the back acres of a sympathetic Central Valley family's land.

With no money they are trying to find work.

They are part of a yet uncounted mass of displaced Job Corpsmen across the nation who must now find their way in a world that once offered them a plan for self-improvement only to jerk it away as political winds changed in Washington, D.C.

Mark Kent, Steve Berg and Charles Stewart were among the lucky ones. When Toyon began closing down along with 58 other conservation centers they were given a chance to transfer to another center in Clearfield, Utah.

Optimistically, they boarded the bus and left Shasta County. At Clearfield, they found their "second chance" was a hoax.

"It's like a big juvenile hall," says Steve, age 16, of San Francisco.

"It is. It's just like a reform school," adds Mark, also 16, of Reno.

Clearfield is a far cry from Toyon. Bigger—1,375 corpsmen compared to Toyon's 165—Clearfield is surrounded by a 10-foot high

chain link fence that is topped in some places by barbed wire. A staff of over 20 paid security officers patrol the camp with night sticks in addition to a 40-man "Corpsman Patrol."

Each gate is manned by two security men who monitor all persons entering or leaving the center.

Clearfield is one of three urban centers that have been maintained in the Nixon administration Job Corps cutback proposal now almost certain to be put in effect. It is absorbing corpsmen from camps slated for closure, including 20 who were transferred from Toyon.

"The other guys are waiting to see if we made it. They want to get out too," Steve says.

The trio did make it. They were stopped four times by police officers but were never detained. With \$5 between them they scaled the 10-foot fence and hit the road. Along the way a motorist gave them a ride and \$7. The driver of a potato chip truck threw them a large bag of chips at another point on the trek.

They arrived back in Central Valley a week ago today and then contacted friends who gave them something to eat and a place to spread their sleeping bags and blankets.

The boys have no shelter. During a rain one night, they took cover in an abandoned auto body.

They now are classified as AWOL from the Job Corps. In about 10 days they will be officially dropped from the Corps unless they report in at Toyon to formally resign.

Steve Berg and Mark Kent talked with the Record-Searchlight Wednesday. Charles Stewart could not be contacted at that time.

"It was kind of a raw deal," says Steve of the transfer.

They don't want to return home. They see no future in that.

Steve comes from a broken home and wants to be a burden on his mother no longer. He entered the Job Corps with her reluctant cooperation and with the understanding that after his Job Corps stint he "was on his own."

Mark's father was recently released from a hospital and Mark also shies away from going home. His father had told him to get out or he would have him sent to a reform school, he said. He chose the Job Corps and is now looking for some job to tide him over until he turns 17 and can join the Marines.

Steve wants to find work and attend night school in Central Valley or, if possible, find a lucrative enough job to allow him to work weekends and attend school full-time in this area.

Both Steve and Mark agreed that Clearfield was in no way similar to Toyon. The strict security coupled with racial tensions unknown at Toyon made the new center almost completely alien.

Toyon had no security police, no walls, and virtually no racial strife.

"At Toyon we had colored friends. Down there you couldn't even look at a black. 'White boys can't sit here' they would say."

Steve was hit in the face by a black corpsman just hours after arriving at Clearfield, for no apparent reason, he claims.

"I didn't hit him back because if I did I'd have to fight 1,000 of them. They run in packs. It just wasn't like that at Toyon."

Steve and Mark's allegations were confirmed by Walter Schwaar, deputy director of the Clearfield Center.

In a telephone interview, he told the Record-Searchlight of the fences, gates and security police. He also indicated there was tension between black and white students.

Schwaar said there might indeed be some barbed wire but not in all places.

"If I could have stayed at Toyon I would have finished two courses, auto mechanics and welding," Mark said wistfully.

"I came back because I know people here and I think I can get a job.

"We know we can make it in Central Valley," Steve said as he pattered about the small camp clearing in the brush-covered back lot.

"It probably won't rain much anymore," he said to Mark.

Mr. Speaker, on that same day, Publisher Paul Bodenhamer had this comment in the editorial section of the Redding Record Searchlight, which I would also like to share with you.

**JOB CORPS FAREWELL**

There was a graduation ceremony at Toyon Job Corps Center last night, and what is ordinarily a happy event was a bit sad because it was the final one. The center is soon to be closed, an unfortunate victim of "economy."

The Nixon administration has ordered 59 centers closed. Very likely when history weighs the good and bad of the administration's record, this will be one of the minuses.

The Job Corps program is expensive in dollars per youth or in personnel per youth. But it is a positive program to overcome the handicaps resulting from centuries of discrimination and neglect.

Boys come to the Job Corps with bad teeth, bad health, poor nutrition, little schooling and no work experience or work habits. They come from homes and surroundings in which there is little hope. At the center they get medical and dental care, good food, wholesome hours, useful work—and hope. They get formal classroom training in the three R's and other subjects. Then they get practical training in useful skills. They learn to weld, or drive trucks or do mechanical work. And most of them graduate to jobs—jobs they'd never have had a chance at without the Job Corps.

Well, what's the price of a life? What's it worth to turn one from hopelessness to hope and self-respect and a sense of security? It's worth something.

The young men at Toyon have done this area lots of good by their work on public projects. There are picnic and camping areas, trails, clean roadsides, etc. because of Job Corps projects. And the young men have proved to be good citizens and neighbors.

We're proud of them, grateful to them and sorry to see them leaving.

**PRESIDENT NIXON LAUNCHES NEW INITIATIVE IN EFFORT TO END VIETNAM CONFLICT**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recent nationally televised address on the Vietnam conflict represented a new initiative for an honorable peace by a new President.

The President laid it on the line to the Communists—if North Vietnam really wants peace, the United States stands ready to begin phased troop withdrawals.

The address was not new in substance but represented a reaffirmation of the policy of the United States—a policy keyed to mutual deescalation of the conflict and continued firmness and strength—and no surrender.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this

vital subject, I place in the RECORD here-with my newsletter, "Capitol Comments."

The newsletter follows:

**PRESIDENT NIXON LAUNCHES NEW INITIATIVES TO END VIETNAM WAR**

President Nixon in his report to the American people on the Vietnam War provided a helpful summary and analysis of the American policy and objectives in Vietnam. The general consensus in the Congress is that while the President's address did not contain any basically new proposals the speech represented a new initiative by a new President.

In other words the new President was laying it on the line to the Communists. He made it clear that there will be no pullout or surrender but that the United States stands ready to begin withdrawing its troops when the North Vietnamese begin withdrawing their forces. In one hand he tendered the olive branch of peace—in the other he grasped firmly the sword of strength and firmness.

The President outlined a timetable of withdrawal based on phased pullouts of troops on both sides over a 12-month period. At the end of that time the remaining troops on both sides would move into designated base areas and refrain from combat operations. The President emphasized the importance of assuring the South Vietnamese the right to govern themselves without outside interference. He explained that for the United States to pull out and surrender South Vietnam and permit the Communists to move in would result in a massacre of the South Vietnamese and damage our prestige, honor and power around the world.

"If we simply abandoned our effort in Vietnam," he said, "the cause of peace might not survive the damage that would be done to other nations' confidence in our reliability." This was not a new policy—but it was an eloquent and precise reaffirmation of our determination to achieve an honorable settlement without surrender. President Nixon was also following his policy of advising the American people on developments—in effect he was making a progress report, a summary of events, sharing his ideas, principles, plans, and hopes for ending the war.

The President was speaking at the bar of public opinion, attempting to make clear to the peace-loving nations and peoples of the world that the United States stands ready to negotiate realistically to end the conflict on an honorable basis for both sides. "We have ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield," he said, thus emphasizing his determination to achieve an honorable and peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam at the earliest time possible.

**WATER NEEDS OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN**

**HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, Raymond R. Rummonds, chairman of the Colorado River Board of California, presented a paper at the Western Water Congress in Wenatchee, Wash., on April 7, 1969, which outlines the water needs of the Colorado River Basin.

The problems are of interest to Members of many Western States and I submit the speech for inclusion in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD so that it would be available to interested Congressmen:

**THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN NEEDS WATER**  
(By Raymond R. Rummonds, chairman, Colorado River Board of California\*)

It is a pleasure to be here today and renew my acquaintance with many of the water leaders of the Pacific Northwest. All of you who made the "Survey '68" trip to Canada and Alaska remember the enjoyment we had in getting acquainted with each other.

As chairman of the Colorado River Board of California, I am pleased to appear before you and present to you some of the needs and goals of Colorado River water users. First, I would like to briefly describe the Colorado River Board which is an agency of the State of California. Its basic objective is to protect the rights and interests of the State to the waters of the Colorado River System. The Board's members are appointed by the Governor from those public agencies of the state that have contracts for Colorado River Water: Imperial Irrigation District, Palo Verde Irrigation District, Coachella Valley County Water District, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, City of Los Angeles, and San Diego County Water Authority. The former three districts distribute water primarily for irrigation purposes in the Colorado Desert Region of Southern California, while the latter three agencies are located on the south coastal plain of California and distribute water primarily for municipal and industrial purposes.

The waters of the Colorado River represent a significant contribution to the welfare of California. California applies about 35 million acre-feet of water a year for all purposes within the state, and consumptively uses about 70 percent of the applied water. Of the quantity consumptively used, roughly 20 percent of its originates from the Colorado River. This water is delivered both to a predominantly urban area of 10,000,000 people in the Southern California coastal plain and to 700,000 acres of highly developed irrigated acreage, mostly located in the fertile valleys of the Colorado desert.

As is well known, six states in addition to California and the Republic of Mexico are dependent upon the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries for all or a portion of their water supplies.

Mexico's share of the water was established by the United States' Treaty of 1944 as 1.5 million acre-feet per year; however, each of the states' share is not so easily established. The major effort to divide the Colorado's water was culminated in the Colorado River Compact of 1922, which apportioned the river's flows between the Upper Basin States and the Lower Basin States. The Compact set the stage for the construction of Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal Project. It is the first document of many comprising what is called the "Law of the River". But, even though 47 years old, it has not yet been fully interpreted. Significant progress has been made in resolving some major issues, but others are still unresolved.

Depending upon which period is used, the long-time average annual virgin flow of the Colorado River at Lee Ferry (the Compact division point) has been estimated to be between 13 and 15 maf/yr, with the three Lower Basin States of California, Arizona, and Nevada agreeing in testimony to Congress that the latter figure represents only a 50 percent probability of occurrence, and that the dependable yield is between 13.7 and 14.0 maf/yr. Below Lee Ferry, tributaries contribute approximately 800,000 af/yr, which is about equal to the estimated long-time annual evaporation loss from Lake

\*Presented at the Western Water Congress, Wenatchee, Washington, April 7, 1969.

Mead. At the current time, the total river depletions including net diversions, reservoir evaporation, river losses and deliveries to Mexico, are approximately 11.4 maf/yr. Since 1961 only insignificant amounts of highly saline water have reached the Gulf of California from the Colorado River.

Presently authorized projects in the Upper and Lower Basin, when constructed and in full operation, will increase demands on the river system to approximately 15.4 maf/yr. It is important to note that this figure includes a reduction in California uses from present levels of approximately 5 maf/yr to a ceiling of 4.4 maf/yr, and limits Arizona to 2.8 maf/yr, which quantities are less than the capacity of existing California and Arizona projects plus the authorized Central Arizona Project. Thus, the supply available from the river is inadequate to fully meet present uses plus future uses from authorized projects, to say nothing of water requirements from other projects required to meet additional needs of this growing area of the nation.

The basic questions facing the Colorado River Basin concerning augmentation of its water supply are when and how much.

Another problem related to water supply in the Colorado River is that of the increasing salinity of the river's water. At present, a major effort of the irrigators in California and Arizona has been to remove harmful salts from the soils irrigated by Colorado River water in order to maintain the soil fertility. At the present, average annual salinity levels of the river, in the vicinity of 800 to 900 parts per million, farmers are experiencing many crop problems due to this quantity of salt in the irrigation water. During some months of recent years, the average monthly salinity has exceeded 1000 parts per million. In addition, we know that with the continuing development of water-using projects in the upper reaches of the river system, the river's salinity will increase. Projections by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are that the river's salinity will be nearly 1300 ppm shortly after the turn of the century at Imperial Dam, the point on the river where most water is diverted for irrigation use in California and Arizona.

(Show slides of Colorado River Basin river works, water distribution, agricultural crops and saline salts.)

The only realistic solution to the major problems of the river is by augmentation—that is, the annual supply of fresh water must be increased. The high salinity flows should be diluted to a reasonable level of salinity, so that additional quantities may be made available for increased economic developments throughout the entire river basin. In stating this as being the only realistic solution, we recognize that any augmentation project should be economically justified and financially feasible under existing law. We in California believe that such an approach is reasonable.

As the states of the Pacific Southwest recognize the problems that arise from the inadequate flows of the Colorado River, many have turned to consideration of adjoining regions of the United States as potential sources of supplemental water. In so doing, I would like to emphasize that the Southwest is not interested in a "water grab". The Southwest is only interested in knowing if there are surplus quantities of waters which meet the needs of the adjoining states. Many proposals have been introduced but none of these have been made in sufficient depth or scope to warrant public support. I want to assure you now that no proposal will receive the support of the Colorado River Board of California that would take water from your area that is necessary for your economic well being.

In furtherance of this principle, we believe that a concept pioneered in California

to protect the water surplus regions of our State in the development of California's State Water Plan is fully applicable in trans-basin and interstate projects as well. This concept has achieved some publicity as the "area of origin" principle. This principle is that water diverted from an area of origin is subject to recapture by the area when it has an economic need for such waters. We believe this principle is reasonable and pledge ourselves to apply such a principle to all interstate water transfer projects.

At this time we do not know whether an importation project from another basin such as the Columbia Basin to the Colorado River Basin is feasible. We are not interested in obligating ourselves and our descendants to pay for projects that are more expensive than the most efficient and economical alternatives. To assure ourselves of this, we will be seeking the optimum project and will want to examine all possible alternatives, which include desalting ocean water and moving it to areas of need; modification of the weather, thereby increasing precipitation and streamflow, reuse of existing applied waters; and interbasin water transfers. One of our major problems is that the presently authorized federal studies either prohibit or place a ten-year moratorium on the study of interregional water transfers. These restrictions will result in delays which we do not believe are prudent. We feel a pressing need for comprehensive studies that will use a common yardstick to consider all possible means of meeting our deficits.

I believe that a properly planned export project from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest could prove advantageous to the Northwest under the following conditions:

1. The water diverted to the Pacific Southwest would be truly surplus to the needs of the Pacific Northwest at the point of diversion.

2. Any economic impact on the Pacific Northwest from such diversion would be fully compensated, such as in lieu payments for power generation foregone.

3. As the Pacific Southwest continues to grow it will need more food, material and other supplies from the Pacific Northwest as shown by the report entitled "Economic Inter-Dependence of the Western States" by Wilbur McCann. Copies of this report are available today.

4. Such a project could enable the delivery of supplemental water to regions of the Northwest at water priced so that the arid regions of the Northwest (Idaho and Oregon) would be able to purchase supplemental water that otherwise could not be delivered economically to that region.

5. Through investments in diversion facilities, substantial funds would be expended in the Northwest on construction payrolls and purchases of material and supplies.

6. There would be a permanent operation and maintenance function in the region, with salaries and supply purchases permanently benefiting the local economy.

Suggestions have been made that by not building water supply and other public works facilities for the fast growing areas of the Pacific Southwest people may move to areas of water abundance. There are undoubtedly many citizens of the Pacific Southwest who would be perfectly willing to reduce the population pressures on our areas as they believe that many of the amenities of life in the Pacific Southwest are being eroded by the tremendous influx in population. However, as responsible citizens, we recognize that any attempts to tell people where to live are improper and contrary to the ideals under which our country was founded. Accordingly, we can either receive the increasing population with deteriorating supplies of our basic resources and public works, or we can attempt to keep abreast of the influx. We choose the latter course.

At various times it has been suggested that the Pacific Southwest can avoid the necessity of importing additional water by increasing its efficiency in using water.

Efficiency in water use generally relates to minimizing losses in distributing water and in making the maximum possible reuse of water. We believe that we are meeting the goal of maximizing efficiency in use. A few examples will illustrate this fact: (1) the Gila River system, comprising the area of most water use in Arizona, drains central Arizona and western New Mexico. The system's water supplies are used and reused to the extent that the only water to leave the central Arizona area for downstream discharge is in infrequent flood flows. Further, in the lower river the only water discharged from the system consists of saline drainage waters of about 5000 ppm total dissolved solids; (2) in the great Central Valley of California, the area of most water used in the state, all return flows from both urban and agricultural uses are used and reused, with the outflow from the valley regulated primarily to repel ocean tides in the Sacramento Delta; (3) all waste flows from communities and drainage water from irrigation projects in the Colorado Basin return to the Colorado River and are diverted again for reuse; (4) the agricultural users in California, who divert Colorado River water of high salt content at Imperial Dam, discharge the highly saline drainage waters into the Salton Sea which serves the useful purpose of recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement.

As we have noted, economy with water had a long tradition in the Southwest. Ladies and gentlemen, as a farmer in the Coachella Valley County Water District, let me point out that in this District we meter to the farmers 94 percent of the Colorado River water we receive. Let me also point out that the District obligated itself to repay the federal government more than 27 million dollars for the All-American Canal and distribution system which has led to development of the Coachella Valley to an assessed valuation in excess of \$200,000,000 with the attendant thousands of jobs and other income oriented factors.

The record of the Pacific Northwest in getting congressional action to prohibit or delay the effect of analyses of the Pacific Northwest as a potential source of surplus water for interbasin diversions has been remarkable, to say the least. We recognize that the Pacific Northwest is concerned with premature action on studies of potential interbasin transfers. However, we believe that properly planned studies to determine if there are surpluses and ways to make use of those surpluses will benefit the Northwest.

As my comments have indicated, we in the Pacific Southwest sincerely believe that we have an impending shortage of water coming upon us. It requires that we must know soon the most economical way to overcome this shortage. We further believe that studies should be made of the importation of possible surpluses from the Pacific Northwest. Such studies should not be made under the assumption that this would be the only feasible source of water but with the understanding that all feasible supplies must be analyzed in order to arrive at a rational decision as to the optimum approach.

We believe that the studies must be undertaken with full protection and full rights accorded to the Pacific Northwest. This protection would include the "area of origin" protection, including those rights of recapture, that are now afforded to areas of origin within the State of California, and the right to make use of the facilities for the benefit of arid regions within the Pacific Northwest itself. We recognize that your steps to delay interbasin studies were taken because you thought it was the best way to protect your area. Now that you have pro-

tected yourself so well, perhaps we have reached the point where we can sit down and discuss our mutual problems without some of the emotional roadblocks that have been so prevalent in the past. After consideration of all factors, you may well discover that it will be in your best interests to have a carefully developed program to investigate the possibility of interbasin water transfers.

I thank you for inviting me to address you, and I would like to close by inviting all of my friends in the Pacific Northwest to plan to visit us in the Pacific Southwest to see our great water transportation and delivery projects.

**A BLOOD PROGRAM OF ACCOMPLISHMENT**

**HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Richard Watson Post 141 of the American Legion at Indiana, Pa., recently honored its members who have donated a total of 1,525 pints of blood to the Indiana County chapter of the American Red Cross.

I was privileged to speak at the dinner recently to pay tribute to the 78 donors who have given at least 1 gallon of blood. The large amount of blood donated by this group comprised over 76 percent of the 1,988 pints—248.5 gallons—donated by the post since the beginning of the program.

Ronald E. Fulton was cited at the dinner as the top blood donor with a total of 83 pints. Second was George E. Thompson with 63 pints. A list of other blood donors and the amounts they donated follow:

John E. Hoover and Joseph C. Lydic (49), David Mack Williams (48), E. Richard Lydic (46), William S. MacBlane (44), J. David Naylon (42), C. Ross Reed (39).

Bernard Q. Cunningham (37), Theodore S. Elias (35), Marlin D. Penrod (34), Salvatore Adornato (33), Phillip J. Recupero and Matthew J. Miconi (28), John G. Smith and Richard J. Kennedy (27).

Anthony Dellaflora (26), David J. Brown (25), Theodore W. Hurd and Alpert P. Mauro (24), Robert N. Sanford (23), Harold E. Little (21), Charles J. Lewis Jr. (20), Harry Young, Virgil G. Vaughn, Paul T. Allison and Nicholas M. Kopchick (19).

Burno J. Telk and John M. Hess (18), John Brain, William J. Peterson and James C. Hassinger (17), Craig Moore, Anthony F. Violi and Richard L. J. Burn (16).

Joseph Babco and Charles Gibbon Jr. (15), Peggy Good, Robert H. Little and Raymond J. Simpson (14), Nicholas G. Bonnarrigo, William G. Ferguson and Morris A. Mistretta (13), Harold M. Buchheit, the late James A. Vogel, Roy Vinton Jr., Alex Tait, Donald B. Shank, James W. Mack, Rudolph H. Haldin and Hubert W. Hamacher (12).

Robert V. Sell, James L. Boucher, John D. Buterbaugh and Gladys Good (11), Edwin F. Leone, Cameron Davis Jr., Charles E. Ruffner and James Shirley (10).

Francis M. Pallone, Maynard Decker, Ronald A. Johnston and Michael J. Busija (9), Joseph J. Mancuso, John Bracken, William F. Lambert, John E. Lambert, James A. Bugey, Arthur G. Carnahan, John T. Heverly, Jack White, John Lezanic, Richard M. Beatlie, Walter L. Cikowski, Anthony J. Clement, James D. Dickie and Robert Thayer (8).

Mr. Speaker, as you can well imagine, I am extremely proud to be representing people like those cited, who, without remuneration or thought of recognition, have given so extensively of themselves to help their fellow man.

**REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JACK WILLIAMS**

**HON. SAM STEIGER**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks by the Honorable Jack Williams, Governor of the State of Arizona, are so timely and appropriate I want to share them with all of you:

Thank you and hello again . . . It is not my practice to pontificate on international politics. I've frequently described myself as a parochial Governor . . . interested in the State I've lived in all of my early years and adult life. But when I read something such as a report released by the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower that reports the U.S. Navy has deteriorated into an aging collection of worn out ships . . . that the ships inherited today are rotting so badly that some crewmen work as much as 80 hours a week to fight rust and corrosion, I feel impelled to comment. In 1934 Churchill deplored the fact that the defenses of England were being allowed to deteriorate. His remarks then in the House of Commons could be paraphrased by any United States Senator or Congressman today. Said Churchill then:

"I am not to be understood to mean that the possibilities of a gigantic war are nearer, but the actual position of Great Britain is much less satisfactory than it was this time twenty years ago, for then at least we had a supreme fleet; nobody could get at us in this island; and we had powerful friends on the Continent of Europe, who were likely to be involved in any quarrel before we were; but today, with our aviation in its present condition, we are in a far worse position."

Then Churchill continued: "There is no greater danger than equal forces. If you wish to bring about war, you bring about such an equipoise that both sides think they have a chance of winning. If you want to stop war, you gather such an aggregation of force on the side of peace that the aggressor, whoever he may be, will not dare to challenge."

Three years later Churchill said: "When the situation was manageable it was neglected, and now that it is thoroughly out of hand, we apply too late the remedies which then might have effected a cure. There is nothing new in the story. It falls into that long, dismal catalogue of the fruitlessness of experience and the confirmed unteachability of mankind."

Two months later Churchill warned: "It would be folly for us to act as if we were swimming in a halcyon sea, as if nothing but balmy breezes and calm weather were to be expected and everything working in the most agreeable fashion. By all means follow your lines of hope and your paths of peace, but do not close your eyes to the fact that we are entering a corridor of deepening and darkening danger, and that we shall have to move along it for many months and possibly for years to come."

These were words spoken only shortly before Hitler began to move. But much earlier in 1931 Churchill warned: "The great liner is sinking in a calm sea. One bulkhead after another gives way; one compartment after another is bilged, the list increases; she is sinking, but the captains and the officers and

the crew are all in the saloon dancing to the jazz band. But wait until the passengers find out what is their position!"

Then in 1937 on April 14th Churchill warned: "We seem to be moving, drifting steadily, against our will, against the will of every race and every people and every class towards some hideous catastrophe. Everybody wishes to stop, but they do not know how!"

Again and again, his voice cried out in Commons. "Historians a thousand years hence will still be baffled by the mystery of our affairs. They will never understand how it was that a victorious nation with everything at hand suffered themselves to be brought low and to cast away all that they had gained by measureless sacrifice and absolute victory—gone with the wind."

All of this was inspired by a friend, Holmes Alexander, who opened his column recently with: "The awful truth about America's sickening plunge into military inferiority is politically untellable." So, I thought you might be interested that the story is not new, Churchill told it 30 years or so ago, and Cassandra long before that.

**STATEMENT OF CARL D. PERKINS**

**HON. JOHN C. WATTS**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, testified before the House Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD.

I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the text of Mr. PERKINS' statement for the information of all Members.

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN CARL D. PERKINS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, BEFORE THE LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1969

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished Subcommittee. A number of concerns prompt me to come before you.

Under the budget submission of the present Administration—

There is no appropriation request to fund Title V of the National Defense Education Act; yet there is \$40 million authorized.

There is no appropriation request to fund Title III of the National Defense Education Act; yet there is \$290 million authorized.

There is no appropriation request to fund Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; yet there is \$206 million authorized.

Only 14% of what is authorized for the pre-school and special education programs for handicapped children is being requested.

Less than 40% of what is authorized is being requested to fund programs for educationally deprived children.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of these statistics and others which I will discuss in my statement that I come before you.

In testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor early this year, the Superintendent of Schools for Fort Worth, Texas, said:

"I wish there were some way I could adequately tell you what ESEA funds mean to the public schools, and more than that, to the future of countless children, their opportunities, their ability to compete, their

responsible citizenship, and their success or failure in the American way of life. The ultimate value of ESEA funds in the lives of children is really beyond calculation.

"For these extra funds, we in the public schools are eternally grateful. I submit that reductions or cutbacks simply cannot even be considered. The question is not, 'Should these funds be increased?', but, 'How much should these funds be increased?'"

"Education is not expensive, it's priceless. 'Money isn't everything in education these days; but, gentlemen, it's way ahead of whatever is in second place.'"

William H. Moore of the Arkansas Department of Education, said:

"When Title I funds are cut back in Arkansas, it means children who are hungry must be cut off from Title I breakfasts and lunches, it means that some children must go without medical treatment and clothing, it means that other children will not have textbooks."

Mr. Chairman, it is because of statements like this which were repeated time and time again during our Committee hearings that I come before you today. I have prepared for your consideration and review a compilation of statements from our hearing record which relate to the financing of Federal aid programs. This is Attachment A of my statement.

In connection with our Committee survey of 20,000 school superintendents, the Superintendent of Schools for Louisville, Kentucky responded to the question, "Is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act underfunded?" as follows:

"For example, to provide the minimum recommended number of teacher aides alone in Louisville's Title I eligible elementary schools would require expenditure of approximately \$500,000 or five times the \$100,000 we are now able to spend . . . We would translate this underfunding into a figure of approximately ten million dollars."

Mr. Chairman, it is because of responses like this that I come before you today. In Attachment B of my statement, you will find abstracts from over 70 of the responses that we received. In Attachment C you will find the results of our tabulation of questions which relate to the financing of Federal education programs.

As I have studied our survey and listened to the testimony before our Committee, I have become convinced that virtually every education program with which we deal is related significantly to the major domestic issues confronting the American people. Recognizing this it is difficult to understand the unwillingness of the Executive Branch, and I speak of the previous Administration and the present Administration, to finance these programs at a level sufficient to meet the challenge.

We talk about and are rightfully alarmed about the increasing incidences of juvenile delinquency and youth crime, yet there is no pending appropriation request for Guidance and Counseling programs.

We know that we are reaching less than 40% of our young handicapped boys and girls who need and deserve special education programs, yet we are asked to fund the Title VI ESEA program of grants for special education at only 14% of what is authorized.

We know from repeated studies that one of the most urgent problems facing education today is the shortage of qualified teachers, yet it is proposed that we fund the Education Professions Development Act at the 25% level.

In the face of the "Youngstown phenomena" and the financial crises in both large and small school systems, we are told—

Do not fund the program to assist local school districts in the acquisition of needed instructional equipment;

Do not fund the program which provides boys and girls with library and textbooks; and

Do not fund work-study programs for vocational students and vocational education programs for students with special needs.

Though we know it is increasingly difficult to meet college expenses which are spiraling upward at a fantastic rate, we are urged to reduce the appropriation for the student loan program to the 1965 level—to provide a 1970 appropriation which is 18% below the level of last year's program and 44% below what is authorized. How does this relate to the determined and approved needs of institutions of higher education?

Mr. Chairman, colleges in South Dakota will receive 34.5% of their panel-approved requests; colleges in Illinois will receive 57% of their approved request; colleges in Alabama will receive 49% of their approved request; and colleges in Kansas will receive 55% of their approved request. The figures are presented in terms of colleges, but what we are really saying is that only 34% of the students in South Dakota, and 57% of the students in Illinois who need loans will receive them.

And, Mr. Chairman, we talk about youth unemployment and underemployment—and there is an authorization of \$822 million for Vocational Education Programs—yet we are asked to provide only 33.7% of that amount—\$277.5 million.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we talk about violence and riots in our cities—

Let me share with you the comments of the Superintendent of the St. Louis School System. He told our committee, "I think the difference in my community between riot and disruption has been Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act money. I think it has saved us from this."

In a similar vein, a member of a school board for Seattle, Washington, indicated, "I can tell you this: the crises in our city is much less than it would have been if you had not given us Title I funds. I don't know what we would have done without them."

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss on a program-by-program basis, some of my concerns and the concerns of educators and administrators across the country about the proposed levels of funding. I should like to begin with programs carried on under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the Act that was described by a school superintendent from Mississippi as "the most exciting thing that ever happened in education."

#### ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

My review of the budget submissions for FY 1970 indicates (1) that the total authorization for all programs carried on under the 1965 Act is \$4,288,500,000; (2) that pursuant to this authorization, the former Administration requests \$1,538,376,000, or 36% of the authorization; and (3) that the present Administration requests a total of \$1,410,000,000—that is 32% of the amount authorized.

Mr. Chairman, viewed in any way, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the major program of assistance to education. For FY 1970, we could and we should appropriate the full authorization of approximately \$3,142,000,000. I have already mentioned the Committee school superintendents survey which was sent to over 20,000 school superintendents around the country. In answer to all of the seven questions asked in the questionnaire, the hardships imposed by low funding levels—particularly for Title I—was consistently mentioned.

The first question, the most pertinent to our discussion of Federal financial assistance, asked if the Federal Government was doing its share in providing funds for elementary and secondary education. 65% of those responding indicated that the Federal Government was not doing its share. In very large school districts, over 80% felt the Federal Government was not doing its share. A great majority of those who responded that the Federal Government is doing its

share, conditioned their response to a full funding situation. Many of the superintendents offered suggestions, over 40% of which recommended that support be increased. In districts with enrollments of over 100,000 two-thirds of the responses asked for increased support.

Another question, which specifically dealt with the financial aspects of Federal education programs, asked to what extent the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was underfunded. Nearly 70% of the superintendents indicated that this legislation was underfunded and frequently commented that the programs financed by the ESEA are ones on which they rely heavily. In large school districts over 90% of the superintendents indicated that the program was underfunded.

Let me share with you just a few of the responses from local school superintendents which I believe illustrate clearly the adverse effects of curtailments and reduced levels of funding.

Argyle, Iowa: "ESEA is extremely underfunded. Our area has been cut from \$45,000 three years ago to \$19,000 next year. We have approximately 40% of our students identified as educationally deprived (see enclosed list), yet we have had to eliminate teacher aides, TVR equipment and instruction, summer school, and other items from our educational program, and cut or nurse to ½ time due to Title I budget cuts. I believe that someone in Washington should take a look at the small rural areas of our nation and see the problems we have here."

Cherryvale, Kans.: "In our particular school districts, we will be underfunded in the ESEA by approximately \$4,000. Due to the reductions in our entitlement we will have to cut off part of our summer program. In our summer program we work with our remedial students."

West Grove, Pa.: "Our school is located in a rural area with many low income families—therefore we have many children who are educationally deprived, some of whom we are unable to reach because of lack of funds. Each year of the ESEA program, the Title I funds have been reduced, thereby making it necessary to curtail our program."

Norfolk, Va.: "Although it is difficult to know just what the Federal Government's 'share' is in assisting to improve the quality of elementary and secondary schools, the Federal Government has failed to support fully its own appraisal and estimate of its obligation. The Congress has passed a volume of highly significant legislation authorizing financial support for schools in recent years, but the actual appropriation of funds seldom matches the authorization. Our first recommendation to strengthen the Federal Government's role in improving elementary and secondary education is to fully fund the authorizing legislation already in existence."

"The total allocation to the Norfolk School System for ESEA Titles I, II, III, and Central City Project, after reductions for the current year, amounts to approximately \$2.6 million. We estimate that there are in excess of 20,000 children enrolled in this school system in need of the educational services for which ESEA was created. It is clearly evident that the funds available are insufficient to achieve any substantial impact for more than a relatively small number of children. The full funding of ESEA would approximately double the funds available, and approximately double the potential impact of the Act."

Double Springs, Ala.: "Recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education has been great!! It has made a tremendous impact on our educational program. ESEA is at least 50% underfunded. Our need is great—even desperate."

As I have indicated previously, Mr. Chairman, Attachment B of my statement contains abstracts like these from over 70 of the

thousands of responses the Committee received.

The accomplishments of Title II of the ESEA have been impressive. Reports brought to my attention indicate that in 1966, 1967 and 1968, the program was touching an estimated 44 million students and 1.8 million teachers. Even under the reduced appropriation in 1969, it was estimated that 9 million books and film strips were acquired with Title II.

Mr. Chairman, to appropriate only \$42 million as was requested by the former Administration would work a severe hardship. To totally deny funds for this program as is recommended by the present Administration would be catastrophic.

I must point out to you that termination of funds for this program and for Title III and V of NDEA as is suggested poses serious administrative problems for state and local educational agencies. For state departments of education, it will mean a net loss of an estimated \$11.3 million in administrative funds and a loss of more than 900 state department personnel and the leadership and supervisory services provided by them to local school districts.

Supervision or termination of the three programs would cause particular hardships for local educational agencies. Commitments have been made by local school districts for the employment of personnel for their administration. Since district school boards have not made provisions from local funds for these salaries for fiscal year 1970, the following are examples of emergencies which local school districts would face:

A. Under NDEA Title V-A, one counselor out of ten is paid from Title V-A funds. These salaries would no longer be available.

B. Under ESEA Title II, particularly in large urban areas, school districts have received administrative funds from State departments to provide staff and services for the complex administrative tasks involved in the purchase and loan of materials to public and private school pupils and teachers. This staff would be required to liquidate approved projects and dispose of materials during the ensuing fiscal year.

In the face of increasing costs, increasing enrollments, and demands for higher salaries, it is proposed that we decrease our efforts under Title III of the Act. The previous Administration asked that it be funded at 30% of the authorization, the present Administration reducing it still further so that it would be funded at the 20% level. If this Administration's request is approved—we would have a level of appropriations that is 30% less than the appropriation last year. I should point out that next year for the first time the program will be an entirely State administered program, a change which was mandated by the 1967 Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments.

As was the case last year, only \$29.7 million is being requested for state departments of education. This is in contrast with an \$80 million authorization.

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, there are just under 6,000,000 handicapped children in the school population. Only 35%—that is 2.1 million—are receiving appropriate special education services. The remaining 3.8 million handicapped young boys and girls are not.

The full funding of programs we have authorized, all of the programs in the education for the improvement of the handicapped budget item, would amount to only a little more than \$300,000,000. If we were to fully fund these programs with 6,000,000 handicapped children, we would be talking about \$50 per child. It is hard for me to believe that \$50 per child, as compared with \$14 per child we are currently spending, is too much to expect us to pay for helping handicapped children. This is particularly so when we know of the extreme costs for the institu-

tionalization of these children, or for keeping them on welfare.

Even later vocational rehabilitation services are more costly. We are providing the states, through the Vocational Rehabilitation Program, about \$400,000,000 a year to work with handicapped adults, but only \$29.25 million dollars to work with children in the schools, at a time when rehabilitation is more likely to occur.

Don't mistake my purpose—the vocational rehabilitation money is well spent—it is a profitable investment. But what logic is there in waiting for the child to be fullgrown for the Federal Government to respond to his handicap in a meaningful fashion?

Let us ask ourselves what might be possible if the \$206,000,000 authorization of Part A of Title VI were appropriated.

There are 1.5 million mentally retarded children in the school population. Of these, only 700,000, or 46%, are receiving special education services. The remaining 800,000 are either at home or sitting in regular education classes without particular attention or response to their condition of retardation. If Title VI were fully funded, 425,000 more retarded children could be receiving services and we could cut in half the number of unserved children.

The average cost of educating a retarded child in a state residential school is almost \$3,000 per child—more than seven times as great as if the child were educated in a public school.

Each day that we delay in developing preschool programs and special education programs in the public school makes it more likely that a retarded child ultimately becomes a ward of a state and will have to be institutionalized at a tremendously increased cost to the taxpayer.

In the 1967-68 school year, approximately 224,000 deaf and hard of hearing children do not receive needed service in the public school. If Part A of Title VI were fully funded, an additional 148,000 deaf children would be provided service. Again, we should know that the education of the deaf child in a state residential school is three times as much as the expenditure necessary in the public day school. Thus the lack of sufficient programs in our public schools will cause taxpayers to spend three dollars for every one, if we are to educate these children in state residential schools.

There are approximately 1,100,000 children with speech handicaps who are not now receiving services in the public schools. The cost for serving these children is modest, approximately \$100 dollars per child for the year because speech therapists supplement the regular teaching situation rather than having full-time responsibility for each child. If Title VI were fully funded, every child with a speech problem in the United States could be receiving supplementary services that would allow him to participate more fully in the regular school program.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Programs carried on under the National Defense Education Act under the most recent budget submissions will be funded at the 26.7% level.

No request is made for the programs of grants to acquire equipment carried on under Parts A and B of Title III of the Act. Based on my review of the responses to our Committee questionnaire, I am convinced of two things with respect to this program—

- (1) Title III has been one of the most effective Federal aids for local school systems. Time and time again it was cited in our superintendent's survey as a model federal program—one which through the years has made a substantial contribution in the national effort to expand and improve educational opportunities; and

- (2) The need for assistance to acquire instructional equipment continues and is today cited frequently as one of the most

pressing needs in the educational community. In responding to our question which asked "What are your greatest needs?", over a thousand superintendents identified instructional equipment and supplies.

As with the facilities program, a failure to purchase equipment now or to construct facilities now will in the long run prove to be the most expensive alternative because of inflationary trends. This is to say nothing of the impact reductions will have on the quality of educational offerings next year in individual school systems across the country.

The recommendation that we not fund the Title V program of guidance and counseling must be viewed in a similar vein. To not fund this program will be disastrous. One counselor out of every ten is paid from Title V funds. Over 4,000 school counselors will be affected by the action we take with respect to the funding of Title V, not to mention the many hundreds of thousands of students who would be adversely affected if we do not provide money for these necessary services.

Turning to Title IV of the NDEA and the college teacher fellowship program, we again must contend with an appropriation request which is below—\$8,500,000 below, or 12% below—the level of funding last year. During the current year, 15,270 fellows are being supported. Under the pending appropriation request, only 10,900—that is 4,200 less—will receive support next year. And in order to support even this small number—stipends and education allowances must be held at current levels—totally unrealistic levels, both in terms of the increased cost of living fellowship holders must contend with and the increased cost of education which universities must face. These trends in and of themselves suggest a greater appropriation than that which is being requested. When viewed with the projections which indicated that to meet the staffing needs which will be required in 1974 to serve college enrollments of 8.7 million students, it seems to me that we have no alternative but to increase the appropriation. Information brought to my attention indicates that to meet the enrollment increase by 1974, over 600,000 new fulltime professional staff members will be needed on college and university campuses. Projections also indicate, however, that only slightly over 300,000 doctorates will be produced by that time and that half, or perhaps less than half of these, will go into college teaching.

#### STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Chairman, under the budget submissions, funds for three major institutionally based Federal student aid programs in the coming 1969-70 academic year amount to only 67% of the approved requests from colleges and universities. During the current academic year, available funds met 80% of approved requests, and for the preceding year, met 85%.

An estimated total \$461 million will be available in the coming academic year for the three programs—the National Defense Student Loan (NDSL), College Work-Study (CWS), and Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG) programs. This compares with \$682 million in approved requests from higher education institutions. Colleges and universities originally asked for \$814 million.

I have already mentioned Title II of NDEA and the unbelievable suggestion that only \$155 million be appropriated for a program which was supported at a level last year of \$190 million—and that did not meet the need. The estimated funds for the NDSL program will provide loans for about 398,000 students compared with 442,000 in the current academic year. I understand it is the feeling of some that the Guaranteed Student Loan Program will be available for those students who are unable to obtain NDSL loans because of the decreased appropriation. I wish this were the case, Mr. Chairman. However, increasing interest rates will, I am

afraid, curtail the effectiveness of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

We are just now beginning to get back information on the borrowing pattern for the next academic year. Sufficient evidence has not been obtained as yet to justify the revision of the basic Act, but in all candor, I must say to you, that I am not optimistic, and that I am convinced we will be doing a real injustice if we do not, at a bare minimum, fund the NDEA Student Loan Program at the \$190 million level.

Let me share with you a letter I received recently from the President of one of the colleges in my Congressional District. It will illustrate dramatically the severe impact inadequately funded student assistance programs have on some of our institutions and the necessity for full funding of all student aid programs.

President Hayes, of Alice Lloyd College, wrote:

"There may be some colleges in America, without commitment to needy students, that can absorb the major cuts in federal student aids of the past 2 years without disastrous results. These would be institutions with a small percentage of students requiring these aids.

"But for Alice Lloyd College and other colleges of Appalachia, these cuts are ruinous. Alice Lloyd College cannot sustain an Educational Opportunity Grants allocation for fiscal 1970 which is only 42% of its fiscal 1968 application. Our commitments to needy students are to great.

"For many years, Alice Lloyd College has had to produce \$90 from developed sources, private and public, for each \$10 that students can pay. Average family income is \$3,100 for our total enrollments. Many have large families. Inadequate financial assistance can be found at best for this large percentage of financially needy students. Over the past three years Alice Lloyd College has enrolled 92 of Kentucky's 700 Higher Education Project students from welfare families. ALC's Upward Bound graduates will number 70 in the college program by Fall 1969. Educational costs have sky-rocketed for the quality teaching program that is provided. . . .

"There is something wrong in the priorities of our nation's administration when the great provisions of education opportunity are undercut and ruined as they are when fiscal 1970 allocations are cut back below the level of Alice Lloyd College survival. . . ."

Turning to the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, I cannot come before you today without registering my deep concern about the appropriation for this program in FY 1969. Two simple figures will illustrate the basis of my concern. With the FY 1968 appropriation, funds were available to make 144,600 initial year EOG Grants. The reduced appropriation in FY 1969 has the potential of reducing the new student input in one year from the 144,000 level to 31,700. I am pleased to see that both the former Administration and the present Administration have proposed to substantially increase the level of funding for the EOG Program. But at the same time, let me say that even with an appropriation of \$175 million, there will be less available for initial year EOG Grants than was available under the FY 1968 appropriation and that the request is still substantially below, by approximately \$35 million, the FY 1970 authorization for initial year grants.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, may I share with you some of the statistics from the most recent Manpower Report of the President that relates to the employment of young adults:

The unemployment rates for teenagers have remained at an unsatisfactory high level throughout the current period of sustained economic growth.

The unemployment rate for teenagers in 1968 was still in excess of 12% as compared with the overall unemployment rate of less than 4%.

In 1968, an average of 1.4 million 16-24 year olds were unemployed, including almost 850,000 teenagers.

While the unemployment rate for Negro workers has decreased markedly, Negro teenagers failed to share in this improvement. Their unemployment rate remains disturbingly high—about 25%.

We must, and we can, end this severe waste of manpower and remove this source of actual and potential social unrest.

Last year, by unanimous vote, and I repeat unanimous, we expanded and improved Federal programs which support vocational education. We authorized a greatly improved vocational education program for 1970 which totals \$322,650,000—yet we are urged this year to provide only \$277 million pursuant to that authorization.

Mr. Chairman, if we are really concerned about social unrest, if we are really concerned about the problems of the cities, if we are really concerned about documented manpower shortages of qualified personnel—it seems to me that we must make more than the token effort in vocational education suggested by the appropriation request.

There is a great deal of talk about mini centers and residential training centers, yet—

There is no appropriation request for Part E of the Vocational Education Act which provides support for residential vocational schools.

There is no request to fund the special vocational program for disadvantaged young men and women.

Only 22% of what is authorized is being requested for development of exemplary vocational programs which could serve as models for occupational education courses.

And, less than 50% of what is authorized for the basic vocational education program is being requested.

#### EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT

A February release of the U.S. Office of Education reads: "The Nation's most critical education problem is the recruitment, preparation, retraining and retention of quality personnel to staff its schools and colleges. This is the chief finding of the first federal assessment of education manpower needs."

In response to this finding, we are urged to fund the Education Professions Development Act at 25% of what is authorized.

Though there is a \$5,000,000 authorization for programs to attract and encourage qualified individuals to the field of education, we are advised by one Administration not to implement the program and by the other to fund it at 10% of what is authorized.

Though we need preservice and inservice training programs for well over 100,000 persons, we are urged to fund that program at a level which will only provide training for slightly over 35,000 educational personnel.

Though we are in desperate need of additional college teachers and administrative personnel because of the rapidly growing numbers of junior colleges and ever increasing college enrollments, we are urged to fund institutes and training programs for higher education personnel at only 27% of what is authorized.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

Mr. Chairman, the shortage of adequate academic facilities continues to be a major problem confronting colleges and universities.

According to studies of the U.S. Office of Education, institutions face a facilities gap of 135.9 million square feet at the beginning of this Fall's academic semester. In terms of student space, it is expected that the short-

age will be 23 gross square feet per fulltime student.

Even with an appropriation at the meager level suggested by the previous Administration, there will exist in 1973-74, a total shortage of academic space of 106,075,000 square feet.

An appropriation at the level suggested by the present Administration—an amount which is substantially below the request of the former Administration—will result in still a greater shortage of needed space.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to fund a facilities program at 4% of what is authorized as is suggested by the present Administration, or at 11% of what is authorized, as suggested by the former Administration.

The 1968 Higher Education Amendments contain a number of provisions making improvements in the Facilities Act, one of which provides for a maximum federal share of up to 50% on Title I and Title II Facilities Grants, as contrasted to the previous ceiling of 33 1/3%.

The increase in the ceiling on the federal share was based on the unanimous view of higher education representatives that such an increase was necessary.

I hope that you will take this recent improvement in the law into consideration in providing an appropriation for the Facilities Act, as the higher Federal share may result in a reduction in the number of colleges to be assisted if the appropriation is not adequate.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

During the last Congress, by a vote of 389 to 15, the House passed the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, as a result of which we proposed significant refinements and additions to the basic Act of 1965. With the Congressional intent so overwhelmingly stated, it is impossible for me to reconcile the budget submissions with the authorizations we established.

For Public Service Education we authorized \$5 million—the former administration requests \$3 million—the present Administration requests that the program not be funded.

For grants to improve graduate education we authorized \$5 million, the former Administration requests \$750,000—the present Administration requests that the program not be funded.

For Law School Clinical Experience Programs, we authorized \$7.5 million—both Administrations request that the program not be funded.

For Networks for Knowledge we authorized \$4 million—the former Administration requests \$750,000—the present Administration requests that the program not be funded.

For Cooperative Education we authorized \$8,750,000—the former Administration requests \$1 million—the present Administration requests that the program not be funded.

When one views the request for programs established in 1965 the picture is just as distressing.

\$70 million is authorized for the College Equipment Program, yet both Administrations request that the program not be funded.

It is proposed that we fund the program to strengthen developing colleges at only 50% of its authorization and that we fund the program of grants to assist college libraries at 16% of its authorization.

#### REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES

Mr. Chairman, I view with great alarm the recent Office of Education announcement that five regional educational laboratories established and supported under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be closed. It is my understanding that this decision was based on budgetary considerations. The labs to be closed are: Central Atlantic Regional Educational Lab-

oratory, Washington, D.C.; Cooperative Education Research Laboratory, Northfield, Illinois; Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory, Detroit, Michigan; Rocky Mountain Educational Laboratory, Greeley, Colorado; South Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Little Rock, Arkansas.

At a time when research and development work in education is more necessary than ever before, we are urged to terminate facilities and resources which the Congress just four years ago established. In so doing, we will literally be throwing away the more than eight million dollars which has been invested in these five labs.

I understand that the pending budget submissions provide for a small increase over the FY 1969 appropriation for educational laboratories. The level suggested is not sufficient, however, to continue support of the five labs I have mentioned. This Congress made a firm commitment four years ago, and it is incumbent upon us to fulfill our obligation.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious from my remarks that I am convinced we must make a much greater effort with respect to the financing of Federal education programs. Even if we were to fully fund all education programs, I feel that we would be making a minimal effort when viewed against the well-documented needs. I am also convinced that the Congress will support recommendations from this Subcommittee which provide funds over and above the amounts requested. The basis for this feeling is the overwhelming votes of the Congress in the last few years in establishing and expanding Federal aid to education programs.

I have said already that the Vocational Education Act of 1968, providing authorizations for vocational programs next year of over \$800 million, passed without a dissenting vote.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 were approved in the House by a vote of 389 to 15.

Just a few weeks ago the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was extended in the House by a vote of 400 to 17.

These are indications, I feel, that the Congress is willing at this time to have the Federal Government play a substantial role in financing American education. A commitment has been made, and I am sure that Congress will fully support an appropriation which will give life to the commitment rather than make it a token or virtually empty commitment which the budget submissions represent.

#### FORTAS OFTEN STOOD LONELY FOR RIGHT

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent column by Drew Pearson on Abe Fortas. With so much emotionalism and sensationalism surrounding Mr. Fortas recently, I think Drew Pearson should be commended for speaking out in a dispassionate, objective way on this case. He clearly puts the issue in its true perspective.

Without condoning or pardoning Mr. Fortas for his actions, I believe he has made a great record during his career which somehow seems to have been forgotten. Drew Pearson's column in the May 17, 1969 issue of the Washington

Post reminds us of Mr. Fortas' outstanding record of defending the underdog and the unpopular cause. This is truly a mark of a dedicated and compassionate lawyer.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this column points out the hypocrisy of others in Government or public service who may also have committed indiscretions or improprieties; too often they are the first to leap upon the other fellow when he is down. This is one of the reasons why our young people are so upset at the "system" or "establishment" because of this double standard; it is all right for the legislative branch or the executive branch but not the judicial branch. This is hypocrisy at its worst.

This is one reason why I favor a full disclosure of all sources of income for all public officials. Senator TYDINGS, for example, has recently proposed a bill which would require financial disclosure by all Federal judges. I believe this is a good bill, but should be extended to include all Federal officials.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this column in the RECORD today not because Mr. Fortas was right, because I do not think he was, but only to present the other side of this distinguished man's career, one that the public has not been told by the press or the politicians:

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1969]

#### FORTAS OFTEN STOOD LONELY FOR RIGHT

(By Drew Pearson)

When a man is down, everyone rushes in to kick him. It is the popular and cowardly thing to do.

So, in the case of Justice Abe Fortas, there has been a bandwagon rush of vituperation, some of it by members of Congress who have taken fees from questionable sources and by an Attorney General who still has not given a clear explanation of why he blessed the dismissal of the El Paso Natural Gas case after the Nixon law firm, of which he and the President were senior partners, received \$771,129.83 from El Paso, a long-time client.

When a man's down, he's down. But I for one do not intend to be part of the Fortas-kicking brigade.

For a man's life should be judged not by one act alone. And mistaken as Fortas was in temporarily taking a fee from Lou Wolfson, I recall some other instances when Abe stood up to be counted at a time when few others stood with him.

There was the case of Dorothy Bailey, the lowly civil service worker in the Department of Commerce who was attacked by the Senator from Wisconsin, Joe McCarthy, as a Communist and was not given a chance to face her accusers. It was not a popular case. No one had ever heard of Dorothy Bailey. No one cared very much about her. But an important issue was involved—namely, the right to face those who accuse you.

And Abe Fortas, with his partners, engaged in a long, expensive, time-consuming battle to defend this obscure civil servant. They took no fee and paid for all expenses out of their pockets. In the end, they won.

It was a vitally important landmark case involving the rights of all Americans. But those who now rush in to kick the prostrate figure of Abe Fortas did not lift a finger to help in those days. In fact, the present President of the United States was one of the enthusiastic applauders of the late Senator from Wisconsin and even went to his defense when the Eisenhower Administration promoted the Army McCarthy investigation and when the Senate moved toward censure.

There was another instance when Abe Fortas stood up to be counted, when Dr.

Owen Lattimore, a Johns Hopkins professor, was singled out by Joe McCarthy as a Communist. Lattimore was an expert on Mongolian and Chinese relations, had been a history teacher of oriental affairs. However, McCarthy, in his desperate determination to find someone connected with the State Department who was a Communist, jumped on Lattimore as hard as the critics are jumping on Fortas today.

Once again Fortas and his law firm defended a man unjustly accused, did it with their own money, their own time, and won. It took five years to fight the Lattimore battle. He had been indicted for allegedly perjuring himself about using Laughlin Currie's office ten years before. No other law firm in Washington had the guts to stand up and defend Owen Lattimore against the savagery of the all-powerful Joe McCarthy at that time.

There have been other contributions to mankind in Abe Fortas's life. He did not rise to fame and eminence overnight. There were many years of unnoticed drudgery in the Interior Department under Harold Ickes, defending Indians, reclaiming Western land, developing parks, constructing some of the great power projects of the Nation.

All this cannot be washed down the drain of man's fickle memory overnight, thanks to one ill-considered fee.

True, Abe lived high on the hog. In his latter years, he bought a big house on R Street from Betsy Burden and had to meet payments on a sizable mortgage. He redecorated the house and built a swimming pool—all of which cost money. And he got involved in a real estate deal which went sour. Interest rates escalated. He had a hard time meeting payments.

This is no excuse. I offer it as no alibi. But the score should be balanced. The past should not be forgotten.

Justice Fortas has not appeared on television and told of his little dog and his wife's cloth coat and the drain on his finances, as did another public figure to explain why he took—and kept—\$18,000, which was highly unethical and probably illegal.

Nor did Fortas let his brother secure a \$205,000 loan from a defense contractor, as in the case of Don Nixon—a loan, incidentally, which Howard Hughes has now wiped off as a bad debt.

Nor did Fortas operate a famous farm at Gettysburg where three oil men paid the salaries of the farm hands, the farm manager, the cost of feeding the prize Black Angus, all to the tune of around \$2000 a month.

Fortas was wrong. But in tabulating the score of life and politics it should be noted that he did some great things for humanity and that others who are now throwing stones have been wrong on occasion.

#### PARENTS VISIT WOUNDED GI SON IN JAPAN

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post-Times Star, Apr. 30, 1969]

#### LOCAL PARENTS VISIT WOUNDED GI SON IN JAPAN

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Zugelter of 901 Ohio Pike, Withamsville, know what a military casualty is. They visited their wounded son, Sp. 4C Eugene Zugelter, 21, at an Army hospital at Kishine, Japan.

A jeep in which Gene was riding hit a land mine in Vietnam March 26. Through the Red Cross, Mr. and Mrs. Zugelter obtained permission to visit their son in the hospital. They flew to Japan Easter Sunday.

In a letter to her brother, Jack Whitehead, operator of the Window Garden Tea Room, 3077 Harrison avenue, Mrs. Zugelter describes what she found at the hospital:

"There are 12 beds in his room all amputees. It is unbelievable. All the men in this ward are ones who have been hit by mines or booby traps.

"In fact, all four floors of this building are such cases.

"Next to Gene—two legs, one eye gone; next bed, two legs, one arm, hearing gone; next bed, two legs and one huge gaping stomach. Next bed—one leg, one whole buttocks and so on and on.

"All day long the trucks and helicopters keep bringing in the wounded and take out the one who can be moved. As I write this, not two feet from me lie a row of stretchers—one after the other, being checked in.

"Average age—19-23, Average talk—the horrors of what they've been through. It is truly a living hell."

Mrs. Zugelter described Gene's wounds, writing, "He is going to live and looking at him, I feel that is a real miracle. He will be paralyzed in the right leg. How he even has a right leg is a miracle.

"There is not much left that has not been shot away.

"The bottom part is in a cast with a steel pin through the leg. This leg will necessitate many skin grafts, but the doctors feel it can be done."

Mrs. Zugelter describes other body wounds, including a jaw fracture:

"His jaws are wired with steel—then bamboo over that. But he talks through a tube in his throat.

"His face, thank God, has only fragment cuts, with only one that will require skin graft. His whole right arm is fragmented and broken with a steel rod running through. It is very bad, but they hope to save that.

"Most of the tips of his fingers are gone, but they talk about skin grafts there. His concussion is healing well, and most of the time he talks sensibly."

Mrs. Zugelter says the doctor had hoped to move Gene soon, but since the letter was written, Whitehead telephoned his sister and learned Gene had developed pneumonia.

Mr. and Mrs. Zugelter, who have been helping at the hospital since they arrived will accompany their son, probably to Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington.

"He is, of course, immobile and they have him in one of those 'circle electric' beds.

"He cannot be lifted or moved, but three times a day they clamp a board over his face and body, then turn the motor on and the entire bed goes upside down, leaving Gene on his face and stomach while they dress his back and change his bed.

"His suffering is terrible, but he is a wonderful patient, doing everything he is told.

"Just pray for him and all these boys."

Whitehead says Mr. and Mrs. Zugelter had no difficulties arranging the trip to Japan to see their son. The only requirement was that they pay their own way.

Gene had been in Vietnam since December. He has been in the Army more than a year.

Office of Economic Opportunity, testified before the ad hoc task force on poverty of the Education and Labor Committee today. His testimony is outstanding. During the last Congress, I did not support the Green amendment; however, I strongly supported one part of it. In fact, since its inception, I have believed that the Office of Economic Opportunity should have administered community action through State economic opportunity offices. While the Green amendment may have permitted the Office of Economic Opportunity to find sufficient loopholes to deny the State the right to be a community action agency, I believe it was clearly the intention of Congress to permit any State that desired to be a community action agency. It was clearly in violation of this that certain States were denied that opportunity. The State of Arizona was one of these. I commend for the reading of my colleagues, Mr. Marin's explanation of the problems together with his recommendations:

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY EUGENE A. MARIN, STATE DIRECTOR, ARIZONA OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS, AD HOC TASK FORCE ON POVERTY, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C., MONDAY, MAY 19, 1969

OEO was born when the cry of many voices, from urban and rural areas throughout the Country, became the goad which reached the conscience of America. It had long since been clear that where the term "land of contrast" could well depict a country like Mexico or India, sociologically and economically, that phrase does not fit the scheme of our system as we understand it from reading the great documents of our Republic, mainly the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and its appended Bill of Rights. The cry was an insistence that we read again the intent of the 13th, 14th, 15th and 19th Amendments and come to terms with ourselves and the fact that the United States is made entirely of colored people: Red, Brown, White, Black, Yellow, and all the tones and shades in between.

OEO was born on paper it is great. Few can quarrel with its intent or objectives. But in the reality and practicality of its implementation, there are countless examples which can easily make one forget Miguel Cervantes and Don Quixote. In my two and one-half years experience with OEO I have gathered enough material to write a commentary that, I think, would easily become a best seller. OEO, in those aspects which can be termed negative by anyone's system of evaluation, has all the trappings of a three ring circus. This makes it the tragedy-comedy of our time.

No one of average intelligence will dispute the need to train or re-train people whose former jobs have been rendered obsolete by modern technology. That was the purpose of the Manpower Development Training Act and the Migrant Opportunity Programs. Therefore, no one can strongly make an argument against Adult Basic Education. The adults in this group are the children who couldn't even start twenty-five or more years ago and who our educational system denied, or completely missed, in the intervening years. Now we are attempting to give them a lift, near the end of the road, after they have, for all practical purposes, lost the race. Yet, even though this start is late for them, hopefully we can make literates of this group and prepare them for something other than an out-right dole from welfare assistance programs.

Head Start, likewise, is no more than a common sense educational effort which our professorial brain trust could have suggested and implemented generations ago. Even so,

for all that is being done in this regard today, it is but a pittance when compared to the actual existing needs.

In the same instance we can think of the Upward Bound Programs, Tutorial Programs, NYC and Job Corps. These are the best examples, besides the already mentioned Adult Basic Education, which point up the failures of our educational system. The need of an OEO is evident, therefore, as an effort to attempt to repair the damage which has obviously been incurred and which continues on to this very day.

(I digress momentarily to remind you that within the last 12 months there came forth another great cry from our society asking that Congress look into the automotive industry on the question: Why does it take \$20 to \$25 billion a year to repair the cars we buy? The Congress diligently made its investigation. I suggest that that \$20 billion cost figure is but an insignificant sum when compared to the total damage done to those millions of individuals who are short-changed for life in their educational and corresponding economic opportunity, if that damage could be accurately assessed.

At this juncture, also, I wish to say that I am an American of Mexican descent, and underscore that I am not one who is concerned with the plight of my people in the Southwest because it is currently in vogue to appear concerned, as if it were a fad of the time. I am a student of their problems and have been an active participant in an variety of programs to help them since many years before the Economic Opportunity Act was a reality in our Congress or in the Executive Office of the President. I know, too, the problems faced by other minority groups, especially our Negro and Indian populations. Therefore, nothing which I say here (and intend as constructive criticism of OEO) must be construed as disparaging to the needs of the needy. On the contrary, I shall criticize precisely for the purpose of hoping to make available to all disadvantaged groups better and more effective services.)

It has been my purpose, thus far, to indicate the need of an OEO type effort as I see it. Now let us go to the *whys* of OEO's relative lack of success, and to the errors which this administration hopes to correct.

I shall start by paraphrasing some of the remarks made by Governor Jack Williams when he introduced me as the State Director of the Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity.

He said, "The United States is involved in the greatest human experiment which this nation has ever attempted. It is an experiment intended to help solve some of the many problems which plague our urban and rural areas—problems which increase and multiply from the effects of poverty.

"The Economic Opportunity Act is the mechanism created by our Congress to help alleviate the plight of this group, which unfortunately makes up a significant portion of our population.

"The obligation to help in this effort is as much the duty of the indigent as it is for us, the more fortunate, to help them raise themselves out of their situation.

"Twenty or twenty-five years from now society will look back on history to assess or evaluate the success or failure of the opportunity which has been given to us to help.

"The burden, then, is on us today. The responsibility rests with the elected officials, the professional poverty warriors, including the staffs and the Community Action Agency Boards. We must accept this responsibility and put every available resource to work on this very real 'War on Poverty'. We must coordinate every training facility, every related governmental agency, and the private sector because it is our war and not an indefinite 'their war.'"

I doubt that at that time (February 1967) Governor Williams was fully acquainted with the phrase "maximum feasible participa-

#### STATE OEO AGENCIES MUST BE GIVEN AUTHORITY

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eugene A. Marin, State director of the Arizona Of-

tion". Yet he had fairly well described his concept in those introductory remarks. I know that he did not realize that the title "State Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity" was a complete misnomer. I am also sure that, being a newly elected governor, and at that time having only a cursory knowledge of the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, for example, that our function was mainly to approve, veto, and coordinate programs and to provide technical assistance to the local CAAs, he thought that some powers went along with those responsibilities.

The high hopes and enthusiasm which Governor Williams showed were soon to be dashed, and our bewilderment has not ceased to grow as we repeatedly ask ourselves, can this truly be the intent of Congress?

"Confusion" does not adequately describe the problems of OEO. "Few know what is going on" may be an overstatement. We see what is going on, but I can confess to you publicly that we cannot really know all that is happening to your programs, even at the state level.

We are ready to admit that either the State be given the power to be fully involved in this effort or it should be completely removed from the War on Poverty. Our experience tells us that our participation as a state government is almost a total waste of time and tax dollars and that the Governors' powers of approval are little more than wasted words in the federal law.

The truth of this single observation destroys the whole intent of the "maximum feasible participation" theory and begins the sham and the tragedy to which I alluded above.

(1) When the Congress authorized its first OEO appropriation, effective at the beginning of 1965, do-gooders and self proclaimed leaders immediately, if not prematurely, swarmed the land like harbingers of the Lord proclaiming that there was money for one and all. The Congress, they said, has appropriated money to start a (War on Poverty!) and by next year all poor people would be trained, working and out of the welfare rolls! All you have to do is form a non-profit corporation and "you're in". Thousands of non-profit corporations sprang up all over the country.

(2) If you were already a non-profit corporation, they said, you've got it made! All you have to do is write a proposal and apply for some of that money. You can train people to change from menial to skilled trades almost over night; change illiterates to read almost over night; migrant field workers, to become skilled craftsmen almost over night; etc., etc., *ad infinitum*.

(3) OEO is like "manna from heaven" the people were told. The sophisticated and the unsophisticated now become equals. The professional administrator became a CAA Director and the untrained also became a CAA Director. The former asked for five million and the latter asked for six million, just to catch up. One was an expert in all the facets of business management, the other may have never had the opportunity to know what a bank account or a check book looked like. Yet, the EOA now afforded almost anybody an opportunity to handle millions of tax dollars.

(4) VISTA, Job Corps, NYC, Mainstream, Project FIND, TLC (Tender Loving Care), CEP, SER, OIC, Operation Green Thumb, MOP, Self-help Housing, Legal Aid, Head Start, Adult Basic Education, Grass Roots . . . Conduct and Administration, Demonstration Projects, Summer Youth Programs, etc., etc., etc. These became the new jargon of the land among the disadvantaged. Relatively few knew what a program was, but all talked the lingo like experts with expertise. \$75,000 for this component and only \$875,000 for that one; \$195,000 for this one and only \$2.5 million for that one. Today one hears thousands

and millions slung back and forth like we used to think of quarters and six-bits in my time. The sophisticated CAP Director and the unsophisticated CAP Director became alike over night with this new jargonese and deftness in grantsmanship.

It is not unfair to say that many CAP Boards and Directors, who for the first time would deal in problems of administration, personnel management, evaluations, audits, research and planning, public affairs, and the gamut of important incidentals such as human relations, public relations, and social and political pressures, simply were not equipped with the wherewithal to do the job. And with all due respects to the sincerity of most poverty workers, the wonder is not in the chaotic results that evaluations and audits have uncovered, but that all of OEO has not turned out to be a total and absolute failure. Thanks to those programs whose success can be traced to truly responsible leadership.

"There is money for all", but today's riots, demonstrations, pickets, and boycotts do not indicate that we have resolved the problem or are reaching the target group too successfully.

The EOA provided for no tooling-up period or even for a look-before-you-jump period. It only provided for a crash program which said "let's get it done even if nobody fully understands what it is they want done".

It is our opinion that confusion will continue to reign in OEO programs until the State is recognized as a full partner in this effort. The Congress must impose whatever guidelines and requirements it deems necessary for the effective operation of federal programs at the local level, but it must take into consideration the four years experience which thus far have proved that neither national OEO nor the regional offices can adequately monitor or oversee the operation at the local level before costly mistakes are committed. Only the States, following the necessary revised national guidelines, are close enough to the problems of their people, to be able to more equitably distribute the funds where they are most needed.

Furthermore, we feel that Advisory Boards and Coordinating Committees now established for OEO purposes, are largely an ineffective effort, if there is no compelling legislation or provisions to force cooperation, communication and coordination by related agencies. The nature of our bureaucracy almost preempts this ideal. Therefore, we suggest that the State be made the arm to function in behalf of National OEO to assure real linkages between programs that dovetail into local, county, state, and federal agencies.

The theory of "maximum feasible participation" breaks down when the Congress and national OEO apparently overlook the fact that the funds coming to our individual states originally came from there in the form of taxes. So it is not logical when one hears the rationalization that state governors, especially Republican governors, will destroy the programs. Nonsense! Governors of whatever political suasion only want to see a reasonable return for every tax dollar spent especially when they have asked for more matching tax funds from their state legislatures. Perhaps a requirement along these lines should be carefully studied and made a part of the federal law.

It is not outside the realm of possibility that a governor, here and there, might not be in full sympathy with the spirit and intent of OEO legislation. You already have the necessary provisions in the law to adequately take care of such cases.

(Parenthetically, I might add, it is difficult for a state office to coordinate and solicit the cooperation of other state agencies when it is so evident that one is merely asking them to join us in our trouble. It is an old adage that "misery loves company" and state agencies understandably stand-off when they

know that our Governors do not have the power through OEO to veto even an illegal grant and make it stick. Thus, the education departments, employment services, health and welfare agencies and other related social agencies are willing to give little more than moral support, if they can even give that.)

Moreover, the current argument that some cities want to by-pass the State for political reasons is interesting. No city should forget that it is created by the authority of that State. Yet, as it is with the local CAAs which are non-profit corporations, the farther they are from the direct supervision and accountability which should be provided simply as a matter of good business practices, the freer they feel when such controls are so remote. It is true that, with a stronger political voice, cities have established a pattern of out-doing their rural counterparts. Therefore, the "holier than thou" attitude taken by some may be but too obvious a rationalization inspired by some advocates of a modern version of the Golden Rule: "Do unto others before they do unto you."

This is best illustrated by the treatment received by the EOA Amendments of 1967 and particularly the famous Green Amendment made infamous by the local CAPs, the OEO Regional Offices and National OEO itself through its Task Force which interpreted the changes. If in the judgment of the Congress, the approval of a grant which obviously violates both the federal and a state's law, is in keeping with the intent of Congress, then it has made permissible government of men instead of laws. We doubt that there is a case in any other state which more clearly points this out.

I have with me a sheaf of materials which prove that OEO, and the Congress by inference, have contributed to highly questionable, if not extra-legal, procedures in the matter of funding grants. Perhaps the real purpose was to prove that a governor's veto was worthless, or that the laws of a State are not to be respected by OEO employees at any level—federal, state, or local. Whatever the reason, however, it is clear that who ever was ultimately responsible, is also responsible thereby, for changing the concept of "maximum feasible participation" to "maximum feasible confusion" as was so aptly said by Professor Moynihan.

Thus the missing link to OEO's success is clear to us. Do whatever you must to remove the politics from OEO, which appears to be the main hang-up. But be assured that the results will not be more rewarding in the next four years unless authority is given to the State governments and other state governmental agencies to participate as full allies in behalf of their indigent constituencies.

#### COLLEGE AUTHORITIES HAVE DEFAULTED

HON. O. C. FISHER  
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the long series of college disruptions on scores of campuses throughout the country have shocked the American people beyond description. It is simply incredible, in this civilized and enlightened Nation, that a minority of extremists who have infiltrated our schools have been permitted, with hardly a rap on the knuckles, to wreck campus buildings, imprison school officials, steal official files, disrupt classes, and engage in riots and anarchy.

People are asking: If these dissidents are not willing to conform with the rules of the schools and the laws of the land, why should their presence be tolerated?

Either through cowardice, timidity, or ignorance of elementary techniques which must be employed to maintain discipline, school officials have allowed these hooligans to run rampant, spewing defiance, engaging in blackmail, and hampering the efforts of others to gain a college education. The excuse often advanced by responsible authorities that the right of dissent must be protected is, of course, nothing short of unadulterated hokum.

Those few schools which have not tolerated have had little difficulty in maintaining discipline.

How do they do this? It is very simple. They dismiss or expel the culprits. They maintain law and order. They make appropriate use of the injunctive power of the courts. They call the police and have the hooligans taken to jail where they belong. They know, as all police know in dealing effectively with the criminal element, that pampering and coddling simply does not work.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article written by Max Lerner, which appeared in the April 23 issue of the New York Post. It reveals a remarkably clear insight into this problem.

The article follows:

RANSOMING THE COLLEGES  
(By Max Lerner)

What happened at Cornell was the ghastliest of a series of ghastly recent incidents on American campuses. Students taking over a university guest building, driving out a number of parents who were in it; the same students with shotguns standing guard over the building, reinforced by a car full of weapons; two college officials compelled to sign a seven-point agreement, sitting on the steps of the building as the students stand over them. Whether this happens with black or white students—at Cornell it was blacks—it is intolerable in any University.

The other incidents fit into an almost equally intolerable violence pattern: At Atlanta, a group of college trustees held captive until they agreed to the rebel student demands; at Harvard, an administration building seized by the extreme leftist faction of the SDS; at Columbia, news picture of two professors climbing out of philosophy hall by a window because the building had been taken over for a time by a student faction.

There have been others, there will be still others. The nation has been patient and tolerant of these disruptions. The time has come to place limits around them, to isolate those who engineer them, to take prudent but effective action to end them. The agenda for making students part of a better system of college decision-making is still there, to be worked on and completed. But while that is happening the seizures and disruptions, the kidnaping, the gun-toting must all end. The overwhelming majority of Americans, including students and faculty, have had it—and don't want any more.

Part of the problem rests with faculty members so ridden by guilt or so ready for a vicarious violence thrill that they sit by while their university lies a helpless victim. Part of it rests with university officials who are so worried about their public image and about violence headlines that they buckle under blackmailing pressures and sign what is put before them. Whatever else these de-

mands include, they always include the demand for amnesty from either university or court sanctions. For the whole logic of risking violence is that you will be able, through the same violence, to get absolved from paying any penalties for it.

What is clearly happening is a process of paying off the terrorists, as in a kidnaping of a rich man's child, when the parent can't risk anything happening to his loved one. We are watching the dangerous, humiliating and self-defeating spectacle of the ransoming of American colleges.

The notion some professors have recently advanced—that we shall have to get used to college strikes and violence for many years to come, just as we have had to accept labor strikes and violence—has an element of nonsense in it. Students are not workers, colleges are not commercially run factories, college administrations are not corporate barons, students are not getting wages nor are college presidents making profits. The whole analogy is cockeyed. So is the notion of some black power far-out students that college campuses are black ghettos where riots, arson and shotguns must decide the issues.

Going to college is neither a way of making a living nor a way of overturning a society. It is a civil function, a privilege that the community gives its young people if they show promise and preparation and if they are ready to use it with civility. A college is a delicate organism, and everyone who is part of it must operate under the rules of the organism. If you are bent on ripping it to pieces, you don't belong as part of it and you had better take your intensities and violence elsewhere.

Students with shotguns, whether they are black or white, don't belong on any college campus. Any society that allows private armies to operate is doomed to end in the bloodshed of opposing private armies. If antiwhite Negro students take arms, it is inevitable that they will be followed by anti-Negro whites taking arms. Both are intolerable.

The burden rests on the university primarily to employ its power of suspension and expulsion. Beyond what the police may have to do to maintain order, on the campus as elsewhere, it is the university that must be responsible for its own membership. From this point on any university official who signs away the university's power of discipline by agreeing to "demands" of amnesty must be considered as having betrayed his university's survival.

CRIME STILL PLAGUING AMERICA

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, early this month the U.S. House of Representatives created a special committee, authorized to take an in-depth look into the problem of crime in our country, and shortly, hearings will be held around the Nation in an effort to determine possible solutions to halt the continued increase in crime.

The committee need not look far to find that crime rose 17 percent last year over 1967 and that the total number of serious crimes reported in 1968 will be about 4.6 million, a three-quarter increase over 1967.

At the present rate of increase, one out of every 50 citizens will be a victim of a

crime in 1969. Juvenile crime is increasing 300 percent faster than the increase in the juvenile population, and at this rate one out of every 20 juveniles will acquire a criminal record this year.

Estimates for the future are bleak.

The National Commission on Crime has predicted that in the next 10 years, crime will increase more rapidly than our population. In 1967, criminal activity amounted to \$27 billion and in 1968 increased to an astounding \$31 billion.

Yet these figures fail to reflect the pain and suffering inflicted on victims of crime or on the families.

Such patterns in crime certainly put a blight on our American way of life. The American housewives can no longer safely walk to a grocery store at night; no longer can certain businesses safely remain open after dark; no longer can some of our institutions, such as churches and museums remain open to the public without armed guards being in attendance.

To say it bluntly, Americans are not safe today either at home, at work, or at play.

I am sure that the committee will find what is also apparent is that the shameful narcotics traffic in this country, which is handled solely by the organized crime syndicate outlets is one of the major causes for the staggering increase of many of our vicious crimes today.

Statistics bear out that more and more young people, after once becoming addicted to dope, start a life of crime and become involved in first petty crimes and then crimes such as robbery, prostitution, and even murder in order to find money to buy dope and support their habit.

I am sure that the committee will find that some of the cause lies in our courts. A just and speedy trial is necessary so as to put the criminals behind bars and to allow those innocent to be returned to their rightful place in our society.

I am certain that the committee will find that it is going to take large expenditures of money to fight crime. Too often today, our criminals are set free because of the lack of prison space, crowded court dockets, or lack of court facilities to handle the trials, and because of the huge backlog of cases that are often on the judge's docket.

I am sure the committee will find that there will need to be a greater expenditure to hire more policemen in order to protect our citizens.

The Congress last year passed a bill intended to fight crime and I am happy to note that President Nixon has indicated in his program for action against crime that he will ask the Congress to provide additional funds to State government on a block grant basis as provided in the law to train and provide more police officers to bolster the local police forces.

The Congress must look into any legislation which will tighten court procedures and thereby prevent the release of hardened criminals because of some legal technicality, to prowl the streets once again to the detriment of our citizens. Congress must also pass legislation which will provide for stronger witness im-

munity for police informers who are acquainted with and have knowledge of criminal activities and to authorize the police full surveillance of criminals through sophisticated wiretapping procedures under the authority of a court order.

I am sure the committee will find that it is necessary that we take a hard, strong look at the criminal for what he is and the dangerous potential that he possesses against society, and the need to blind our eyes to the "sob sisters" and the "bleeding hearts" who presume that environmental and sociological factors are the sole causes of crime.

I am sure that the committee will find each individual must also share the responsibility in this war and recognize that tax money must be diverted from some projects to the upgrading of court procedures and strengthening those in our judiciary who are honestly dedicated to the principles of equal justice under the law, but who are aware also that equal justice means protection of the citizen as well as the criminal.

**INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKE-SHORE: TO DEFINE OR TO DESTROY?**

**HON. ABNER J. MIKVA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those supporters of the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore who was taken a little by surprise by the proposal on May 8 by my distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) to "define the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore." Those who followed the course of the Dunes National Lakeshore through the Congress and who watched the heroic efforts of Senator Paul Douglas and others, were certainly under the impression that the boundaries of the Dunes National Lakeshore had been defined. I hope that what we are witnessing is not a belated challenge to the decision made by Congress in 1966 to establish the Dunes National Lakeshore. I hope, in short, that H.R. 11084 is an effort to define the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and not to destroy it.

Several points should be made about H.R. 11084. First, such action is not really necessary. The legislation which established the lakeshore, Public Law 89-761, defined the boundaries of the lakeshore in the same fashion that the boundaries of countless other national parks, national seashores, and national recreation areas, have been defined—by reference to a public map or drawing in the possession of the Secretary of the Interior. The reference to a designated map or drawing in the possession of the Secretary of the Interior is a standard, permanent, legal means for defining a national park boundary. As evidence of this fact, I list the following areas under the administration of the National Park Service, which are now defined in law

only by reference to such a map or drawing. I emphasize that all of these areas were established before the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, yet none of them has had to be defined or redefined:

Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Pub. L. No. 89-667, Oct. 15, 1966, 16 U.S.C.A. § 283.  
Assateague Island National Seashore, Pub. L. No. 86-195, Sept. 21, 1965, 16 U.S.C.A. § 459f.  
Cape Lookout National Seashore, Pub. L. No. 89-336, March 10, 1966, 16 U.S.C.A. § 459g.  
Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Pub. L. No. 88-492, August 27, 1966, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460m.

Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Pub. L. No. 88-639, October 8, 1964, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460n-1.

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Pub. L. No. 89-158, September 1, 1965, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460o-1.

Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, Pub. L. No. 89-207, Sept. 28, 1965, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460p-1.

Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, Pub. L. No. 89-336, Nov. 8, 1965, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460q.

Mount Rogers National Recreation Area, Pub. L. No. 89-438, May 31, 1966, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460r-1.

Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Pub. L. No. 89-668, October 15, 1966, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460s.

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Pub. L. No. 89-664, October 15, 1966, 16 U.S.C.A. § 460t.

A second point which should be made with respect to H.R. 11084 is that it does not merely define more clearly the existing boundaries—it substantially reduces the size of the national lakeshore area which Congress authorized in 1966. H.R. 11084 would provide approximately 3 square miles of new Federal land to add to the existing Indiana Dunes State Park. But the amount of land originally authorized by Congress was over 13 square miles—8,721 acres to be exact according to figures from the National Park Service. Thus H.R. 11084 would not "define" the existing boundaries, it would reduce the size of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore by over three-fourths of its presently authorized size. I reiterate my fear that H.R. 11084 would not define the park, but would destroy it.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the point should be made that H.R. 11084 is supported by no argument which has not already been considered by Congress and rejected. If it is true that the present boundaries of the park include private homes—which I do not know of my own knowledge—then that fact was certainly considered by Congress when it established the Dunes National Lakeshore. That consideration was certainly balanced against the tremendous recreational benefit to millions—literally millions—of persons within a 2-hour drive of the dunes. Likewise the tax-exempt status of the dunes parkland was balanced against the benefit to all taxpayers of the dunes park. I do know that there are several commercial and industrial interests which would like to get their hands on land now designated for the future national lakeshore. I know, for example, that the Chicago, South Shore & South Bend Railroad at one point wanted to build a railroad marshaling yard on such land. I know that some interests would like to build a jetport on such land. I know that some people still think longingly of building a

harbor facility on dunes land. I suggest that railroad yards and jetports are not much of a heritage for our posterity.

Finally, I submit that the amount of land owned by the Federal Government is not really relevant to the desirability of having a national recreational site at the Indiana Dunes. The point is that the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is potentially the most popular national park in the country, located as it is only a short driving distance from several well-developed urban areas. We would be doing both ourselves and our children a grave injustice to try to undo the magnificent work which Paul Douglas and others labored so long and hard to accomplish. The Indiana Dunes should continue in its present form and the money requested for additional land acquisition should be appropriated this year. Only in this way can we assure that the Indiana Dunes will be what Congress intended they should be—an unspoiled recreation area for all the people to enjoy.

The concern about our national debt and our serious domestic problems and the war in Vietnam—all are legitimate concerns. Those concerns, however, cannot be alleviated by a landgrab assault on the Dunes National Lakeshore. Maybe the way to solve those other concerns is to cut down on the Federal funds available for the harbor in Indiana. I do not happen to think so, but it is no more illogical than H.R. 11084.

**COLLEGE TURMOIL MUST CEASE**

**HON. ROBERT E. JONES**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the continuing turmoil and disorder at many of the Nation's colleges and universities is a disgrace which educational authorities have too long endured. It is time for those who value the independence and traditions of freedom in the college community to move promptly and forcefully to restore reason and order to the campus scene.

In spite of the daily harassment of the reports of disorder, the fact remains that the vast majority of students are eager, dedicated, and disciplined scholars who are pursuing an education and change within the framework of reality. These serious students are to be commended for their devotion to studies and to the orderly change which can be achieved through reason and consideration of all interests. These students are often forgotten in face of the inflammatory acts of the minority.

The seizure of buildings, holding of hostages, theft of records, arson, and other destructions by small groups of students, nonstudents, or others can be regarded only as criminal acts and should be handled as such.

It makes no difference whether the perpetrator is a Ph.D. candidate or a fifth-grade dropout, violations of criminal law must be firmly and promptly dealt with through due process.

College administrators who fail to act forcefully with law violations invite immediate escalation of violence and destruction. In the long run, this weakens the foundations of our educational system through erosion of public confidence and support essential for widespread availability of education.

A false notion is growing that college administrators have a right to indulge people on campus in criminal violations. No university official has authority to suspend or excuse punishment for criminal acts of students or others.

If the law is to have any meaning, it must be exercised in the universities as elsewhere. Administrators owe a duty to society to manifest an obedience to the criminal statutes of the community.

Change, of course, is rather constant in our society. The most meaningful changes result from reasonable and orderly discussion with consideration of divergent points of view. Where relevant differences exist, open-mindedness and prompt discussion are required of all the principals.

The claim by student radicals that discussion is impossible seems to evolve from the fact that the radicals themselves term the demands nonnegotiable and refuse to explore the real or imaginary grievances. In many cases, the grievances themselves are irrelevant to the protest and beyond the control of the individual institution to which directed.

Notwithstanding these claims by the student radicals, the discussions are needed. The radicals themselves edit demands which are nonnegotiable and a constant review is needed to explore real or imaginary grievances.

Should students, or any other group, have legitimate complaints or grievances, ample means exist for redress through orderly and reasonable discussions if directed to the proper forum.

Our educational system and traditions are too valuable to allow destruction by a small number of radicals who seek to polarize the Nation into hostile camps for selfish motives and impose totalitarian restrictions on any who fail to accept their inflexible doctrine.

Each institution of higher learning has ample means to deal with those students who fracture the institutionally-ordained discipline necessary to the orderly and reasonable pursuit of education. To the serious students who honestly seek an education, the institution owes the expulsion of those who disrupt campus life.

Likewise, adequate laws exist for dealing with students, nonstudents, and others who violate the criminal laws of the community through trespass, seizure and destruction of property, intimidation, coercion, or illegal restraint of officials, students, and others, and more serious crimes.

The answer lies in the prompt and deliberate enforcement of the criminal laws through apprehension and prosecution of any person who breaks the law.

If the institutions of higher learning are to remain free for scholarly endeavors and advancement of education, the answers to the turmoil and violence must commence at the colleges and universities themselves.

## ARTHUR BURNS—COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS COUNSEL

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are unable to comprehend our national policies because our goals and aims cannot be reconciled with America's own best interests.

Perhaps one of the reasons is that the President's two closest personal confidants: Dr. Arthur F. Burns, counselor to the President and Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs are neither American-born. A unique form of discrimination against the native born American, especially in highly sensitive Government positions which affect the lives of our people and safety of our Nation.

For anyone thinking that Burns is influential, I recommend an article from the Washingtonian for May 1969, entitled, "When Arthur Burns Talks, President Nixon Listens," by Bruce Agnew, with a letter from Mr. Burns, praising his membership in the Council on Foreign Relations and the Pilgrim Society.

The material follows:

[From the Washingtonian magazine, May 19, 1969]

WHEN ARTHUR BURNS TALKS, PRESIDENT NIXON LISTENS

(By Bruce Agnew)

His shaggy grey head of hair is parted straight down the middle, over a pair of gold-rimmed spectacles. Puffing an old pipe, he makes ponderous pronouncements that sound like they are being read off tablets sent down from Mount Sinai. He admits he is "half-stunned" by what is going on across the country. Yet this curiously old-fashioned man has emerged as the most powerful domestic policy adviser in an Administration trying very hard to appear crisp and modern.

Richard M. Nixon learned the hard way to respect the advice of professor-economist Arthur F. Burns. In March 1960, as Nixon was gearing up his first Presidential campaign, Burns came to Washington to tell him a recession was developing. A political realist, Burns knew what steadily climbing summer and fall unemployment would do to Nixon's candidacy. Increase Government spending or cut taxes, Burns told Nixon.

Nixon couldn't get the message through to President Eisenhower, the recession came, and Nixon narrowly lost the election. "It seems entirely plausible to me," Burns says, that things would have turned out differently in 1960 had the advice been taken.

President Nixon now listens. The sixty-five-year-old Burns is Counsellor to the President, a specially-created post with Cabinet rank. His perfectionist temperament is being brought to bear on the full sweep of domestic policy. He is turning up everywhere in the White House—on the Cabinet, on the new Council on Urban Affairs, and on another Nixon innovation—the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy, a mechanism first recommended by Burns when he was chairman of Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisors from 1953 to 1956.

Before the inauguration, tucked away on the eighth floor of New York's Delmonico's Hotel, Burns sifted through twenty-one task force reports, analyzed Nixon's campaign rhetoric, looked at GOP platform and Congressional policy positions, stirred in ideas of his own, and handed Nixon an encyclo-

pedic report suggesting which ideas were worth adopting, what needed to be thought through again, and which would be best forgotten. So far, Nixon has been sticking closely to the Burns blueprint. And Burns, with virtually the same small staff that made up the "Delmonico Group," has been putting all new policy proposals through the same analytic fire.

His specific assignment is as broad as can be. As Nixon described it: "He will head up a small group whose prime responsibility will be the coordination of the development of my domestic programs and policies."

It seems an odd role for Burns, and it surprised many of his close associates. Burns has a towering reputation as an economist. His 1946 book, *Measuring Business Cycles*, is still the standard work in its field. But few thought his meticulous attention to detail would be applied to anything very far beyond classical economics.

Burns shakes his head at the typecasting. "What can I do about it?" he asks. "Since I was ten, I read everything I could put my fingers on. In college (at Columbia University), I started out as an architect and then became interested in law. Before I left the university, I got involved in economics and I have been with that specialty ever since. In the meantime, I have learned a little about government as well."

When he was ten, what Burns was reading wasn't written in English. He was born in Stanislau, Austria in 1904, and his parents emigrated to this country in 1914, settling down not far from the Port of Entry in Bayonne, New Jersey. His father, a merchant in Austria, became a house painter in New Jersey.

"That's something he could not have done in Europe," Burns says, "because that would have been a disgrace. But here, in those days, manual labor was a position of honor. Now, everyone needs a college education."

Burns helped his father at painting, and went to school with other immigrant children. "In those days, we had something we need now. We had special classes for foreigners." Children from six to eighteen would go to Americanization classes during the day, and their parents would go at night. He remembers that the classes were light on standard school subjects, but the children were taught about dress, about government, about life in the city. They were, in short, taught about life in America, "and with remarkable speed and efficiency."

"Now we have all kinds of Federal programs, and we do not have a system of classes in urbanization" for today's immigrants—the poor, most of them black, who are moving into the cities from the rural south. He believes such classes would be successful because "kids want to be like other kids."

"My sons went to school in New York." Pipe in mouth, he begins to smile. "A private school. A progressive school. A very progressive school. An ultraprogressive school. By Jove, when I saw what was going on, I pulled them out."

"The students there were largely Jewish. But with the customary compassion of the Jewish people, they started bringing in others." One night at a PTA meeting, a Negro mother lamented that her little daughter had come home from school crying. "Why can't I be Jewish like the other children?"

"Kids," Burns says, "want to be like other kids."

Burns had more going for him than just a desire to be like other kids. He was very bright. He had a photographic memory; he read everything he could get his hands on, and remembered it all. By the time he was through high school, his grades easily won him a scholarship to a small college in Bayonne. But Burns wanted to see what Columbia University, across the river, had to offer. Not to see whether Columbia might take him; to see whether he might want Columbia.

He did want Columbia, but he was too late. Scholarship applications were already in. Even so, university officials agreed to talk with him, and they quickly decided to make an exception. In a day when scholarships were hard to come by, Burns got one that covered all but \$10 of his \$260 annual tuition.

It didn't cover everything; Burns still had to support himself. "I had a variety of jobs," and he recalls them as if savoring each one: "I worked as a waiter, as a theater usher, as a shoe salesman, as a real estate salesman, as a postal clerk, in a can factory, as a sailor, as an inventory clerk" and, finally, as a research assistant. By then he was deep in his specialty of economics.

In 1930, as a young graduate assistant, he joined the prestigious National Bureau of Economic Research, a nonpartisan analyzer of economic activity. At the request of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the bureau in the late nineteen-thirties began a study of that mysterious phenomenon called the business cycle; at that stage in economic history, upturns and downturns seemed as baffling as any other act of God such as a forest fire or hurricane.

The result was the book, *Measuring Business Cycles*, by Burns and the bureau's president, Wesley C. Mitchell. That same year, Burns produced a definitive attack on the growing tendency to rely too rigidly on Keynesian economic theory: *Economic Research and the Keynesian Thinking of Our Times*.

Both books demonstrated a tendency which still runs through Burns' thinking; he is not a man to let a facile theory, no matter how attractive, get in the way of facts. He believes in facts and figures. The first Nixon Administration action publicly acknowledged as his idea was an order that all Government agencies speed up release of the statistics they gather. A small thing, some might say. But to Burns these measurements of economic activity, many of which he devised, are the essential raw material of economic judgments.

Burns came to Washington to work for President Eisenhower in 1953. Once a Democrat, he switched parties, although he stresses, "I am not a Republican economist. I am a Republican and an economist."

As chairman of Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, Burns was out of step with more conservative policymakers who had greater influence with the President. In 1956, he argued for a tax cut to offset the developing economic slump. He lost, just as four years later Vice President Nixon was to unsuccessfully advocate similar action.

When, later in 1956, Burns got the chance to return to the lecture hall at Columbia and to the National Bureau of Economic Research as its president, he took it.

In recent years, Burns' prominence in the pantheon of economists had seemed to decline. The mantle as preeminent critic of Keynesian thought passed from Burns to the University of Chicago's Milton Friedman, a close friend who has a summer home not far from Burns' two-hundred-year-old farmhouse in Vermont. And the pro-Keynesian "New Economists," most notably Kennedy economic adviser Walter W. Heller, seemed to be working miracles in the early nineteen-sixties with their "fine tuning" policies which stressed quick reactions against economic jolts.

But Burns, who was warning as early as 1965 that inflationary clouds were gathering, thinks the "fine tuning" theorists replied too rapidly to minor squiggles on the economic charts and paid too little attention to realities. "Fine tuning," Burns intones, "is self-destructive in fiscal policy, and that's something my good friend Walter Heller hasn't discovered. But he will. Everybody learns."

Economics is still a blend of science and art, and its practitioners sometimes display

the same jealousies that nag the other arts. Perhaps that is why, when Burns was named honorary chairman of the National Bureau of Economic Research early in 1968, many economists interpreted it as a sign he had been kicked upstairs. There was talk that Burns had fallen behind the times; that he was not successful in wooing grants out of foundations; that he was a hard man to work for. There is no doubt the last is true. He has given many subordinates the impression that he thinks he can do any job better than the man who is doing it. Probably he does think that, and probably he can.

"He's a tough boss," says a close admirer. "Perfect is okay. Anything less than perfect—no. If your work isn't up to his standards, it just comes back, comes back, comes back."

Burns does propound his views in very strong terms. "But," one friend adds, "he's one of those rare people who, when he's challenged, will say, 'Well, now, I hadn't thought of it that way. You may have something there. I'll have to think it over.'"

In Washington now, Burns and his wife live at the Sheraton Park annex. During the Eisenhower years, when their two sons were growing up, the family lived in Chevy Chase, a long way from the office through the confusing streets of Washington. The White House used to be the center of his "map"; when he wanted to get from one part of town to another, he had to go to the White House first to orient himself. One day back in 1953 he got so lost that he finally hired a taxi to show him the way home. He still despairs over the street patterns of Washington.

During the summer, he will try to get back to his Vermont farmhouse, which boasts "the most palatial garage in the United States." He designed it himself: Cape Cod style, he guesses, in keeping with the comfortable Colonial style of the main house. Burns says it is a combination garage-playroom-studio-living room. He adds, "My wife calls it 'Arthur's Folly.'"

Away in the woods, he has a cabin where he secludes himself for serious work. He designed that, too. More important, he selected the site for it. "When the kids were small," he explains, "I didn't want to tyrannize them and I didn't want them to tyrannize me. So I told Helen to stand on the lawn with them and they shouted as loud as they could. I started walking." When he could no longer hear them, there he built his cabin. The voices had driven him three-eighths of a mile.

There is no telephone in the cabin, and his wife has strict orders not to disturb him while he is there. Perhaps twice a summer, she has decided a phone call was important enough that the rule should be broken. There will be many more interruptions now—if, indeed, Burns gets away to Vermont at all.

Burns does not have quite the position of a domestic policy Sherman Adams, with the power to keep other officials' ideas from the President's desk. Nixon has made a deliberate point of not building any aide up to the "Assistant President" status that Adams enjoyed under Eisenhower, but Nixon is clearly asking Burns' advice on every major point of domestic policy. One prominent adviser during last year's campaign admits he knew full well Nixon wasn't stopping with him. "Nixon listens to what I have to say," the adviser said, "and he listens to what other people say. Then he calls up Arthur Burns and says, 'Arthur, what do you think?'"

Nixon expects Burns to question every recommendation, and question it deeply. Even now this is threatening to create rivalries and hard feelings in the new Administration. Burns dismisses the possibility. "If this is happening," he says, "I'm either too blind or too dumb to see it. I'm not interested in power and influence. I'm interested in doing a job."

His view of his job is that the Nixon Administration faces challenges that make economic problems seem "trivial."

Burns says: "I think that a great sickness has gripped our society. I think that a great many of our citizens have lost faith in our basic institutions. They have lost faith in our churches. They have lost faith in our schools. They have lost faith in family life. They have lost faith in the processes of government itself."

"The President keeps scratching his head—and I as his adviser keep scratching my head—trying to know how to build new institutions . . . to restore enough to know how to do this properly."

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, April 19, 1969.

DEAR MRS. —: Thank you for your recent correspondence: your interest is appreciated. First of all, let me wish for your son a safe return.

The Council on Foreign Relations is comprised of persons with special knowledge and interest in international affairs. Its purpose is to study the international aspects of American political, economic, and strategic problems.

The Pilgrim Society was founded to promote fellowship between the United States and England. It is in no sense a secret society.

I am a member of both organizations. They are serving our country well.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR F. BURNS,  
Counsellor to the President.

## DEATH FOR THE GOLDEN RULE?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, what does the Golden Rule provide for situations like that described in the following newspaper accounts of the tragic death of a young man who stopped to help a stranger in distress? The deliberate premeditation with which the death of this innocent "good Samaritan" was planned should impel any jury considering the fate of the murderer to recommend capital punishment. In fact capital punishment should be required for such an awful, deliberately premeditated, slaying, yet there are always the shortsighted few who say the supreme penalty even in such circumstances is unwarranted. What if their wife, mother, father, girl or boy friend was to undertake the role of good Samaritan only to suffer such a planned killing? How would they feel then?

I hope citizens will reflect thoughtfully on the tragic indifference to the most basic social values reflected in this newspaper story:

GOOD SAMARITAN SLAIN BY MAN HE TRIED  
TO AID

A 22-year-old Northwest man was shot to death Friday night in an apartment house in the 2200 block of N Street n.w. by a man he had found moaning on the sidewalk and helped to the N Street address, police said.

The victim, Donald C. Schreiber, of the 2200 block of Hall Place n.w. was killed by a single shot in the chest about 11:45 p.m. after the man he sought to aid tried to rob him, police said.

This is the account police gave:

Schreiber and a girl friend were walking in the 2500 block of M Street late Friday when they came upon a man lying on the sidewalk, moaning and asking for help.

The man said he was ill and asked Schreiber to take him to the N Street address. At this point, another man arrived, ostensibly in response to the calls for help. All four went to the N Street address.

On the stairway leading to the third floor of the apartment building, the man who had asked Schreiber's aid pulled out a pistol and tried to rob Schreiber.

A struggle followed. Schreiber was shot and the two men ran away. No money was taken from Schreiber, police said. He was pronounced dead on arrival at D.C. General Hospital.

#### MAN LURED INTO BUILDING AND SLAIN

A 22-year-old man who police said stopped with his date to help a man in apparent trouble was later slain by him.

He was the 56th homicide victim this year in the city.

According to police, Donald Schreiber, 22, of the 2200 block of Hall Place NW, was walking his date home from a movie around midnight when they encountered a man at 25th and M Streets NW. The man was bent over and appeared to be either intoxicated or sick. The man asked for help, police recounted.

When the couple said they would help, he mumbled and gestured in the direction he wanted to go, police said.

They accompanied him, and were joined on the way by a second man who appeared to know the first.

Arriving at a building in the 2200 block of N Street NW, they went to the second floor where the man "recovered" and produced a pistol in an apparent holdup attempt, police said.

Before any robbery could occur, police said, he fired the gun at Schreiber's chest and both men fled. The girl, who then notified police, was unharmed. Schreiber was pronounced dead at D.C. General Hospital.

Police described the man with the gun as a Negro, 25 to 30 years old, 5 feet 6 inches tall, of slight build and neatly dressed. His companion was also described as a Negro. Schreiber was white, as is the girl.

#### BUCHWALD STRIKES AGAIN

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, without unnecessary comment, I insert this Buchwald column for the attention of my colleagues in case they may have missed it elsewhere:

[From the New York Post, May 17, 1969]

THAT'S USING THE OLD WARHEAD

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—You can talk about the Anti-Ballistic Missile System from now until doomsday (I'm sorry I had to use that word), but you still go around in circles.

One of the strongest proponents of the ABM system is a friend of mine who has been assigned by the Pentagon to convince skeptics like myself that we really need an ABM system. Since they have no funds yet, I bought him a drink.

"I don't think I could make a stronger argument for the ABM," he said, "than the fact that Secretary Laird has revealed the Soviets will have a first strike nuclear capability by 1975."

"That's pretty strong," I admitted. "But how come Secretary Laird found out about

this first strike Soviet capability and Secretaries McNamara and Clifford knew nothing about it?"

"Laird reads more."

"Look, a few months ago you told me that the reason we needed an ABM system was to protect our cities from Soviet missiles. Then you said it was to protect our cities from Red Chinese missiles. After that, you said it was impossible to protect the cities so we had to protect our missile launching sites. Now you say we need it because the Soviets are building new first strike missiles. Why don't you make up your mind?"

"Actually it's a little of this and a little of that," he said, unperturbed. "We know we need the system, but we're still not quite sure what we need it for. It has many uses."

"For example, the Soviets are building an ABM system around Moscow. Now we know it doesn't work, but we're not certain the Soviets know it doesn't work. So if we build an ABM system, they'll find out ours doesn't work, and then they'll have to assume their system doesn't work either."

"I get it," I said excitedly. "If we didn't have an ABM system the Soviets might put too much value on the one they have."

"Right. Now we also have to think in terms of disarmament. When we have a disarmament meeting with the Soviets we're going to have to give up something, right?"

"Of course. That is what disarmament is all about."

"We don't want to give up something that could endanger the security of the country, so, if we have the ABM system, we can give that up instead. Of course, if we didn't have an ABM system for disarmament purposes, we'd have to invent one."

He continued:

"I know there are many scientists and Nobel Prize winners who are attacking the system but what they don't realize is that if they say the system won't work, the Soviets will be encouraged to go ahead with their offensive missiles and the more missiles they stockpile the more they will be encouraged to try a first strike."

"But why?"

"Because Secretary Laird says so."

"What about the cost?"

"That's all anyone ever thinks about when you mention the ABM in this country—money," my friend said in disgust. "Instead of worrying what it's going to cost you should get down on your knees and say 'thank God I can live in a country that can afford an Anti-Ballistic Missile system.'"

"Sometimes," I said ashamedly, "Americans don't know how lucky they really are."

#### SUBURBAN AIRLIFT

### HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY), brought to our attention the other day the fact that Pan American Airways has gone pioneering again.

For years we have been wrestling with the problem of rapid transportation. Today, we find ourselves in many cases spending more time on the ground than in the air. With the advent of supersonic air transports we are on the threshold of an 8-hour world. A world we will only be able to enjoy if first we can manage to solve our ground congestion problems in the major metropolitan areas.

Under the leadership of Najeeb Hal-

aby, a man who perhaps has more experience in this area than anyone in aviation today, Pan Am has come up with an inexpensive method of combating the airport congestion problem. By bringing the terminal to the passengers, Pan Am hopes to improve passenger handling in the New York area. Check-in facilities are already planned for Greenwich, White Plains, Westchester County Airport, Roosevelt Field, and locations in the Bronx and Brooklyn.

Once again Pan Am has challenged the airline industry to follow its leadership.

The New York Times in its editorial of April 16, "Suburban Airlift," brings home forcefully the possibilities of this innovation.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1969]

#### SUBURBAN AIRLIFT

Pan American's plan to pick up and check in passengers and their luggage at a half dozen airline bus subterminals around New York could become one of the most constructive programs to relieve congestion—both at the airports and on the jammed highways. More than smiling hostesses and sliding snacks, this is a step that could really help to make the going great.

The airlines and ground transportation carriers have been slow to realize that more than 50 per cent of the travelers start out for Kennedy and La Guardia from suburban locations. Air shuttlers often climb into cars that clog highways and contribute to parking problems; many long-distance passengers leave the city and go home before heading for the airports. Once they get there, traffic, ticket and baggage lines contribute to flight delays.

Under Pan Am's plan, passengers for Kennedy will do everything at the suburban terminal—from checking in to selecting their seats. Then the buses will take them directly to their flights without all the counter rigamarole. The planned subterminals are in White Plains and the Westchester County Airport; near Roosevelt Field in Nassau County; in Greenwich, Conn., and within the city in the Hunts Point section of the Bronx and the Williamsburgh section of Brooklyn.

We see no reason why this should be a Pan Am exclusive. The airlines ought to get together and establish central check-in and bus facilities throughout the suburbs. And we hope that, during this planning stage, the operators of existing bus and limousine services throw up no roadblocks. Congestion on the ground and in the air must be relieved even before the missing fourth jetport is found.

#### HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS' FEDERATION

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been directed to a recent analysis published by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation regarding the development in Czechoslovakia in which the Russian oppressors of that nation manipulated government leadership.

The officials of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation are constant

and penetrating observers of the developments in Eastern Europe and their communication merits thoughtful review:

The replacement of Alexander Dubcek as the first secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party by Dr. Gustav Husak should not be considered as unexpected, sudden and surprising result of Soviet policies in Eastern and Central Europe.

In the recent past the peoples of the Heart of Europe have displayed continuing, stubborn and near unanimous resistance to Soviet aims. The Kremlin to atomize any massive resistance cropping up anywhere in the Soviet orbit, is reintroducing the centuries-old principle of divide and rule.

The distinguished Hungarian-born historian, Dr. Francis S. Wagner, with exceptional qualifications in Czech and Slovak contemporary history, observed as early as September 20, 1968 in an article titled "The Nationality Problem in Czechoslovakia After World War II" and published in "Studies for a New Central Europe": An indication that the time has become ripe for applying divide and impera tactics may be the assumption of a key role by Dr. Gustav Husak, an experienced Slovak opportunist known for his anti-Czech and anti-Semitic views. The divisive role designated for Dr. Husak is all the more likely because his loyalty to the Soviet Union is the only feature of his personality which has never changed and has never been questioned. . . . Undoubtedly, Dr. Husak is well equipped to execute the new, as of yet partly known dictates of the USSR. Already in the spring of 1945 he eloquently expressed his unchanging views of the Soviet Union: "Let no one be mistaken in one thing: no one and nothing can change the eastern orientation of the Slovak nation, and its Slavic and Sovietophilic conception."

Dr. Husak's past views and efforts concerning the establishment of a Slovak Soviet Socialist Republic as a member state of the Soviet Union are also well known. Mr. Dubcek's replacement with a man of such background may be indicative of a new Soviet policy towards the traditionally independent minded, freedom loving peoples of Central Europe. With China, representing a growing threat in the East, the total control over the rebellious satellites in the European buffer zone is considered essential by the Kremlin. Nothing can assure this total control more effectively than the inclusion of all or some of the countries in that area into the USSR as member states. Mr. Husak can be the tool to manufacture the atmosphere in Central Europe which will provide the reasons, justifications and means for such expansion.

We, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A. concerned over the fate of our people call the attention of policy-makers, legislators, columnists, scientists and common citizens to this possibility in order to create an awareness in the free world that is mandatory to prevent the fall of Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia by following the example of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

I would like to include as a continuation of this insert, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' statement condemning the Brezhnev doctrine, which follows:

**CONDEMNATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF LIMITED SOVEREIGNTY**

After the invasion of Czechoslovakia by troops of the Soviet Union and its puppet satellites, the Soviet Union found necessary to create a retroactive explanation for its action, which in itself was a blunt disregard for the established principles of international law. Mr. Brezhnev, by stating his justification of armed Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia, established the sinister party doctrine of "limited sovereignty": Marxist-

Leninists believe that whenever there is a threat to the revolutionary gains of the people of any country, and hence a threat to the sovereignty of a Socialist country and a threat to the fraternal community, it is the international duty of Socialist states to do everything in their power to remove this threat and insure the progress of socialism and strengthen the sovereignty of all Socialist countries."

This stupefying ideological acrobatics, referred to as the Brezhnev Doctrine, has been reaffirmed many times by the leaders of the Kremlin, by Communist Parties completely under the control of Moscow and by the organs of the Soviet press.

The Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A. is compelled to express its concern over the proposed Brezhnev Doctrine for the following reasons:

1. The sovereignty of the Eastern European countries was guaranteed in Potsdam, in the peace treaties of Paris, and in the charter of the United Nations, to which organization all of the concerned countries belong.

2. This Doctrine is obviously motivated by political expediency in order that the colonial exploitation of the East-Central European countries may be maintained and promoted by the Soviet Union.

3. Acceptance of the Brezhnev Doctrine would be a "de jure" acknowledgement of the puppet status of the satellite countries and would provide the Soviet Union with the "legal" excuse for further armed intervention.

We, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A., on behalf of the Hungarian people who are silenced by their Communist-Russian oppressor, refute the Brezhnev Doctrine as illegal and cynical.

We call upon the Government of the United States and upon the Governments of all free nations to publicly repudiate the Brezhnev Doctrine as illegal and unacceptable.

This public repudiation is necessary to eliminate false impressions that the Governments of the Free World tacitly accept this latest anachronistic attempt of the Kremlin to prolong and extend its rule over Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia.

We call upon the communications media of the United States and of the Free World also, to face the well presented arguments on behalf of this "Doctrine" by illuminating the words, phrased by psychological warfare experts and used by ruthless party officials and naive follow travelers, with the lights of truth and facts.

**RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS CIVIL DEFENSE DIRECTORS**

**HON. SILVIO O. CONTE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, region 1 of the Massachusetts Civil Defense Directors has recently written me concerning the commendable effort of the Federal Government in reducing or alleviating the threatened flood damage expected as a result of heavy snow accumulation this past winter.

We in Massachusetts are most appreciative of this assistance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following resolution by region No. 1 of the Massachusetts Civil Defense Directors be included in the RECORD at this time:

**RESOLUTION OF THE STATE CIVIL DEFENSE DIRECTORS, FIRST REGION**

Whereas President Nixon on March 1, 1969 instructed George A. Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness to coordinate an extraordinary Federal Planning and Operational effort supplementing State and Local Resources to undertake all feasible preparations to reduce or alleviate the threatened flood damage expected as a result of heavy snow accumulation in the northern tier of States and

Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers moved promptly to alleviate this condition and

Whereas this prompt action resulted in prevention of untold personal suffering and in the saving of countless thousands of dollars in property damage: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the State Civil Defense Directors, First Region, meeting in Maynard, Massachusetts on the fourteenth day of May 1969, express our deep appreciation for this assistance to President Nixon, the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Chief, United States Army Corps of Engineers and to the Commanding Officer, New England Division, United States Army Corps of Engineers. And be it further

*Resolved*, a copy of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Chief, United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Commanding Officer, New England Division, United States Army Corps of Engineers.

**TAX REFORM**

**HON. JACOB H. GILBERT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, wage and salary earners are particularly calling for tax reform. They believe that they are the ones who suffer the most from our inequitable tax system.

An example of the sharp cries for the changes in our tax structure is the policy statement voted by the executive board of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen—AFL-CIO. This 500,000-member food industry labor union has its headquarters in Chicago.

The executive board is to be congratulated for its deep concern with tax reform and its effort to organize union activity to seek its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, having received permission, I insert the policy statement of the executive board of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen—AFL-CIO—concerning tax reform in the RECORD:

**POLICY STATEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN, AFL-CIO, CONCERNING TAX REFORM, APRIL 29, 1969**

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO) has long called for actions to correct the inequities and injustices of the existing federal, state and local tax systems. We have long urged (1) the closing of loopholes, which allow the rich to escape their fair share of payments, and (2) the reduction of low and middle income rates, which impose special hardships on wage earners.

At long last, the nation is aroused about tax inequities. A "taxpayer's revolt" is in

progress. Increasingly, a large number of Americans are seeking tax reform.

We are delighted with these developments. We fully support the hard-hitting letter which our Union's Executive Officers, President Thomas J. Lloyd and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman, sent to Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee. It is an important and forthright statement of the views of our Union. We urge the Committee to heed the proposals of the letter.

The present tax system represents nothing short of robbery of wage and salary earners. It asks sacrifice of those Americans least able to provide it. It bestows tax benefits and credits upon those Americans who have the greatest means to meet their tax responsibilities.

It literally undermines other national policies established by the President and Congress concerning the economy, agriculture, poverty and urban reconstruction. It undermines the citizen's belief in justice and his adherence to law and order.

The time for change is now.

We urge Congress to overhaul completely the tax system by eliminating every single loophole which distorts the tax structure in favor of corporations and the upper income brackets. This includes the investment credit, oil and resource depletion, hobby farms, capital gains, real estate, and other gimmicks.

We urge Congress to reduce the tax burden shouldered by lower and middle income families.

We urge Congress not to renew the surtax unless tax reform legislation is previously enacted.

We urge state and local governments to reconsider their tax laws and to make them just and equitable. (In many cases, these tax structures are even worse than the federal one. Some states and communities, in fact, depend largely on the tremendously retrogressive sales tax.)

The Amalgamated recognizes that wishing changes will not make them come about. Action is necessary. Our Union has worked and will continue to work to make tax reform a reality.

## RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD will find most interesting the results of my 1969 questionnaire, which I recently sent to all boxholders in my district in a special report from Washington.

I insert herewith a tabulation of the results:

CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. QUILLEN REPORTS  
FROM WASHINGTON

MAY 1969.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am happy to send you this Report from Washington on the results of my 1969 Questionnaire.

29,850 returns were received out of 150,000—or 19.90%—of the Questionnaires mailed out.

This is the highest percentage of returns I have received of any Questionnaire sent out to the residents of the First District. Last year's percentage of returns was 15%.

The expulsion of students who violently disrupt the academic life of colleges and universities was strongly favored. The overwhelming majority (90.57%) expressed this desire, while a mere 7.43% did not favor such action, and 1.68% were undecided.

Those who answered were very much in favor of abolishing the Electoral College and electing the President solely by the direct vote of the people. 80.25% answered yes, while only 13.91% answered no, with 5.45% undecided.

The response to renewing the 10% income surtax was that three times as many individuals were against doing so as those who voted to renew it—67.74% against, 23.50% in favor, and 8.46% undecided. Hundreds of letters sent along with the Questionnaires urged that this not be done, as the American people are already overburdened with taxation.

It is not felt by the majority of the First District participants that the Paris peace talks will result in a conclusive settlement of the Vietnam War; only 14.68% felt that they would end the war, while 67.48% felt they would not. 17.33% of the people were undecided on this issue.

Accordingly, more people (45.35%) felt that the Paris peace talks are not the best

means of terminating the war—36.50% felt the peace talks are the best means, and 17.59% remained undecided.

56.04% of the people who responded feel that a voluntary army should be established to replace the draft system after Vietnam, and 33.40% feel it should not. However, 10.13% are undecided at the present time.

A vast majority (64.78%) of the people are in favor of curbing the President's power to commit American troops to combat without the specific approval of Congress—27.88% do not favor this move, while 7.01% are undecided.

The general consensus is that the Post Office should be converted into a government-owned corporation on a self-supporting basis. 63.45% are in favor, 22.48% against, and 13.70% undecided.

Finally, on the question regarding lowering the minimum voting age to 18, 55.84% were in favor of doing so, while 40.20% were not, 3.68% remained undecided.

## OVERALL DISTRICT RESULTS

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Viewing the economy as it stands today, would you favor renewing the 10-percent income surtax when it expires on June 30?	23.50	67.74	8.46
2. Do you feel that the Paris peace talks will result in a conclusive settlement of the Vietnam war?	14.68	67.48	17.33
3. Regardless of how you answered the previous question, do you consider the Paris peace talks to be the best means of terminating the Vietnam war?	36.50	45.35	17.59
4. Do you favor lowering the minimum voting age to 18?	55.84	40.20	3.68
5. Should the electoral college be abolished and the President elected solely by the direct vote of the people?	80.25	13.91	5.45
6. Do you favor expulsion of students who violently disrupt the academic life of colleges and universities?	90.57	7.43	1.68
7. Do you believe a voluntary Army should be established to replace the draft system after Vietnam?	56.04	33.40	10.13
8. Should the power of the President to commit American troops to combat without the specific approval of Congress be curbed?	64.78	27.88	7.01
9. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a Government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?	63.45	22.48	13.70

I want to extend my sincere thanks to each and every one who responded to my Questionnaire. I am also grateful for the hundreds of letters that I received in which many clarified and expanded their views on the questions, as well as on many of the other vitally important issues facing the Nation today.

It is true that an informed public is the best safeguard of democracy, and it is my deep hope that our people will continue to take such a concerned interest in the affairs of our national government. Your opinion and the views of the other citizens in the First District are of great value to me in representing you.

Again, many thanks for your cooperation in participating in my 1969 Questionnaire.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

## THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Military Order of the World Wars is, of course, well known to the Members of the Congress because of its principles of patriotism, dedication to country, and loyalty to the flag. However, I do not recall that I have seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a digest of its principles and its accomplishments. I have asked its chief of staff, Brig. Gen. Stephen O. Fuqua, Jr., to make such a document available,

and through his cooperation, I now submit a summary on the organization, "The Military Order of the World Wars," for reprinting in the RECORD:

#### THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

The Military Order of the World Wars is a prestige patriotic, nonpartisan organization of male commissioned officers, active, reserve, emergency and retired who have demonstrated, or who are demonstrating their love of country by full time active duty in the armed forces during a period of hostilities. It is also a hereditary society open to male descendants of members or deceased officers who were eligible for membership. The Order was founded originally in 1919 by dedicated men of arms who, the following year, formally adopted a Constitution whose Preamble sets forth the Order's ideals and principles:

#### THE PREAMBLE TO THE ORDER'S CONSTITUTION

To cherish the memories and associations of the World Wars waged for humanity;

To inculcate and stimulate love of our Country and the Flag;

To promote and further patriotic education in our Nation;

Ever to maintain law and order, and to defend the honor, integrity, and supremacy of our National Government and the Constitution of the United States;

To foster fraternal relations among all branches of the Armed Forces;

To promote the cultivation of Military, Naval and Air Science and the adoption of a consistent and suitable policy of National Security for the United States of America;

To acquire and preserve records of individual services;

To encourage and assist in the holding of commemorations and the establishment of Memorials of the World Wars;

And to transmit all these ideals to pos-

terity; under God and for our Country, we unite to establish "The Military Order of the World Wars."

The Order holds that it is nobler to serve than to be served; it has therefore been established for the welfare of our Nation as a whole rather than for individual benefits for its members.

The Order provides an opportunity for commissioned officers of all Services to unite in a strong and unanimous program for National Security and good citizenship. It calls for conscientious fulfillment of the responsibilities of being Americans by all who enjoy the benefits thereof.

The Order has been described as a bridge between the military and civilian community over which its members convey the thoughts and needs of the Armed Forces to the civilian population and the interpretation of civilian sentiments to the Congress and to the leaders of the Armed Forces.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Throughout its history, the Order has continuously and unselfishly served the Nation in observance of the principles enunciated in the Preamble to its Constitution. The Order's Chapters, its national officers, its nationally oriented committees and its individual members as well, have been the instrument of this long and dedicated service. It is an interesting fact that some of the Nation's greatest military and civic leaders have been attracted to membership.

That the Order has been worthy of its calling over the years, is attested to by statements of approbation by all U.S. Presidents since Harding as well as many of our senior military leaders. Prominent among the foregoing who hold or who have held membership in the Order are former Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson; Adms. William H. Standley and Ernest J. King; Generals George C. Marshall and Douglas MacArthur; and the current Army Chief of Staff, Gen. W. C. Westmoreland. President Richard M. Nixon has been a member for the past fourteen years.

Notable among the Order's past and current achievements are the following:

Originated Army Day; it continues the tradition by observing Armed Forces Day with appropriate ceremonies and programs; it publishes the Armed Forces Day Review, an annual magazine which enjoys wide circulation among the Order's national officers as well as throughout the Department of Defense and industry.

Originated and continues to sponsor throughout the Nation, the Massing of the Colors, an annual ceremony of remembrance.

Was instrumental, through its past Commander-in-Chief, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, in reviving the long dormant award of the Purple Heart Medal.

Supports, nationally and locally, regular military and ROTC units as well as the Service academies, and offers appropriate awards for exceptional accomplishments on the part of the personnel of such organizations.

Promotes strong patriotic educational programs in the Nation's schools and communities and furnishes guidance for the implementation of such programs.

Publishes The World Wars Officers Review, a bi-monthly national magazine which it circulates among the membership as well as certain selected agencies and individuals.

Each year as a highlight of its National Convention, the Order presents its Distinguished Service Award to an "American citizen who has made a notable contribution to national defense or the preservation of our constitutional liberties." Past recipients have been Senator Barry Goldwater (Phoenix Chapter, MOWW); Senator Strom Thurmond (D.C. Chapter, MOWW); Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey (D.C. Chapter, MOWW); His Emi-

nence Francis Cardinal Spellman; and Senator John C. Stennis.

#### ORGANIZATION

The Order is composed of some 12,000 members belonging to 116 Chapters which are organized on a nationwide basis into sixteen geographical regions and with National Headquarters in Washington, D.C. The basic unit is the Chapter which, together with its important activities, is the lifeblood of the Order. Every October the Order conducts its annual business at a National Convention held in some prominent locality of the country. Between Conventions a General Staff composed of elected and emeritus members guides the functions of the Order on all matters of other than established policy. The current Commander-in-Chief of the Order is Major Thomas F. Faures, AUS (Ret), of Memphis, Tennessee.

#### MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Active membership is open to male U.S. citizens of good repute who have served honorably on active duty as commissioned officers in World War I or since 16 September 1940. Male descendants of such officers are eligible for hereditary membership and enjoy the same rights and privileges.

### FIND FORTAS AFFAIR IS ONLY THE OPENER

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. Speaker, the Daily Calumet of Chicago is one community newspaper which keeps its eye on national issues while reporting from day to day the latest developments on the local scene. On March 27, I inserted in the RECORD an article on the power of national political reporters which was first called to my attention by a William Rentschler column in the Calumet. The Saturday, May 17, issue of the Calumet again covered a subject of national importance; namely, the Albert Parvin Foundation and the possibility of more judicial involvement in conflict-of-interest manipulations such as are currently making headlines in the Justice Fortas case. The Parvin Foundation, it will be remembered, has had for a number of years Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas as its president, in which office he has been receiving a sum of \$12,000 annually.

According to Bob Seltzner in his regular Calumet column, the foundation's purpose, to provide scholarships to young people from underdeveloped countries to Princeton and UCLA, appears to have been somewhat broadened:

The United States Internal Revenue Service has indicated it no longer believes this to be the foundation's purpose; that in fact the Albert Parvin Foundation might possibly be a screen for vast money-manipulation and influence-peddling in the high places.

The Parvin Foundation case should be given the widest dissemination, and for this reason I include the column, "Find Fortas Affair Is Only the Opener," by Bob Seltzner, in the May 17, 1969, issue of the Daily Calumet in the RECORD at this point:

#### FIND FORTAS AFFAIR IS ONLY THE OPENER

(By Bob Seltzner)

Ever heard of the Albert Parvin Foundation? It's been in the news lately as a side-light to the Abe Fortas affair. Carolyn Agger, the wife of just-resigned Associate Justice Fortas, is an attorney for the foundation.

The Albert Parvin Foundation is the brain-child of millionaire Albert Parvin, the former Chicagoan who broadened his fortune in the hotel and night club furnishings business. The foundation was set up to provide scholarships to young people from underdeveloped countries to Princeton and UCLA.

The United States Internal Revenue Service has indicated it no longer believes this to be the foundation's purpose; that in fact the Albert Parvin Foundation might possibly be a screen for vast money-manipulation and influence-peddling in the high places.

The Albert Parvin Foundation, it has been learned, derives its primary income through a first mortgage in trust with the Bank of America, holding the Flamingo Hotel and gambling casino in Las Vegas. Another income source is the Fremont Hotel, also in Vegas.

Though Parvin now lives in Beverly Hills, California, and the Fortas family in the East, there are strong connections in Chicago. Chicago city treasurer Marshall Korshak (also Democratic Party committeeman of the 5th Ward), and his attorney brother, Sidney R. Korshak, own a total of 11,000 shares in Parvin-Dohrmann Company, one of the three Parvin hotel and night club furnishings firms. Chief Judge William J. Campbell, of the U.S. District Court for northern Illinois, has been a director of the Parvin Foundation since its formation in 1960—though he recently claimed that he has resigned. There has been no official announcement by the foundation of this resignation.

Also involved with the Parvin Foundation is Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who has served as the foundation's president, receiving \$12,000 annually.

Tied in with the Albert Parvin Foundation, are the following firms in addition to the Parvin Dohrmann Company: The Dohrmann Company, which supplies restaurants, hotels, motels, and institutions with commercial food-serving and preparation equipment, headquarters at Brisbane, Calif.; and Albert Parvin and Company (Illinois), of Chicago. The Parvin Dohrmann Company operates the Fremont Hotel and gambling casino, acquired June 30, 1966.

In a suit filed with the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday by a student of the law in Chicago, Sherman Skolnick, it is alleged that one man in particular—in addition to the Parvin family—ties all the Parvin operations together. He is alleged to be Harry A. Goldman of Los Angeles, described in the suit as a "gangster." Goldman is president of the Albert Parvin and Company (Illinois), was executive vice president of the Parvin Dohrmann Company and is now chairman, and is a director of the Dohrmann Company.

Skolnick, a paraplegic invalid who lives with his family on Chicago's southeast side, is Chicago and Illinois' layman petitioner of the courts, seeking to correct malapportioned political districts. They range from congressional and general assembly districts to city wards and county government. In recent years he has repeatedly confronted Judge Campbell in the federal court over these and other taxpayer suits. In January of 1967, long before Abe Fortas gained national prominence, Skolnick demanded Judge Campbell's removal from his cases because of the Judge's Parvin connections.

In his suit Skolnick declared, "It is unconscionable for respondent Campbell to proceed any further in (this) case. His connection with the Albert Parvin Foundation has

brought, and is bringing, the judicial proceedings in said case into suspicion and disrepute."

When Judge Campbell said he was no longer connected with the foundation, Skolnick retorted in his suit: "Campbell's published and circulated disclaimers and denials about himself and his relation to the Albert Parvin Foundation exceed the credibility gap. On the one hand, he says that he did not consider himself a director of the Parvin Foundation after the initial meeting. On the other hand, he says he resigned as a director purportedly in October, 1966. If he was not a director, why did he 'resign'?"

Skolnick continued: "... Campbell, as chief judge of the Northern District of Illinois, knows, or should know, that a director of a corporation remains liable for his wrongful acts, up to the statute of limitations . . ."

One must consider that the date of this particular suit is two and one half years ago. Skolnick received some local press for his efforts, but when it was over Judge Campbell was successful in quashing the matter, both in the press and in the courts. After all, he was both the chief judge and presiding judge in his own case. How far ahead of the national scene Skolnick was, is well illustrated in the following excerpt from the January 1967 suit: "According to the published figures, Campbell as a director (of Parvin) has allowed, permitted, and condoned that a fellow judge, Justice William O. Douglas, as president of the Parvin Foundation, be paid \$12,000 per year, which appears to be an exorbitant amount in comparison to the charitable disbursements of the Parvin Foundation. Approximately \$80,000 per year is disbursed for charitable purposes, leaving what appears to be overhead expenses, or an unexplained gap, of approximately \$57,000. Gross income of the foundation in 1963 (while Judge Campbell was still a director) was reported to total \$137,257 (See U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 31, 1966)."

Skolnick in the suit then spotlighted the current Fortas scandal, noting: "Whether federal judges can also be 'moonlighters' such as corporation officers or bank officers, is a grave national question."

While Judge Campbell was explaining through "press releases" to Chicago newspapers that he had attended only one meeting of the Parvin Foundation, and had never even seen a foundation statement through the seven years he was a director, Skolnick in his suit charged, "Campbell had a duty as a director to be informed, and his published and circulated statements that he has not seen a financial sheet or investment sheet for the Parvin Foundation, and did not know what they own exceeds credibility. Notices of directors' meetings and other data are sent out as a matter of course."

Skolnick in his suit demanded: "Did director-judge Campbell ever communicate with Foundation President Justice Douglas? It would appear logical to suppose that they would have been in touch with one another."

Skolnick in his suit described Albert Parvin as an "unsavory" character, who had what Skolnick described as a "criminal record" in Chicago. He documented four cases involving Parvin and members of the Parvin family ranging from 1925 through 1959, in which Albert, Jack and Bernard Parvin were charged with being receivers of stolen property—Albert Parvin on two occasions. They were never convicted.

Skolnick alleged and detailed that Judge Campbell in 1959, "rendered . . . a questionable judgement to the benefit of a relative of Albert Parvin."

Skolnick in his suit filed yesterday alleged of the Albert Parvin Foundation, that "it is further a matter of undisputed court record that the said Albert Parvin Foundation is a hoodlum front organization."

He listed "among the hoodlums connected with the . . . foundation":

(1) Marcus Lipsky, a "gangster and specialist in multiple murders. He masterminded the Capone mob's post-war invasion of the \$18 million dollar-a-year Dallas, Texas rackets."

(2) Edward Levinson, "who has a contract with Parvin Dohrmann Company, interlocked company connected with Parvin Foundation, and who is connected with (3) John (Jack) Pullman, crime syndicate 'banker.'"

And, (4) Harry A. Goldman, noted earlier.

The extent of Korshak's involvement with Parvin was revealed in the New York Times of May 9. The information was part of a Times report of the Securities and Exchange Commission permitting trading to resume in the shares of the Parvin Dohrmann Company on the American Stock Exchange. Trading had been halted for the second time within a few months because "of what they (the SEC) called inadequate information concerning a change in control of the company last October, the company's acquisition program and other factors."

The Times' story said, "Parvin Dohrmann operates three casinos in Las Vegas and is headed by Delbert W. Coleman, former president of the Seeburg Corporation. He purchased control of Parvin Dohrmann last October and now is the concern's chairman."

Then yesterday, in the midst of steadily increasing publicity concerning all aspects of the Parvin operations, the Times reported that National General Corporation was discussing "the feasibility" of acquiring Parvin Dohrmann.

The Times reported: "The company's stock (Parvin-Dohrmann) has been one of the most spectacular performers on the American Stock Exchange in that period, moving from a 1968 low of 14 and one-quarter to a close yesterday at 119, down a point."

Korshak, regarded as probably the second most powerful Democratic Party official in Chicago behind Mayor Daley, was a state senator from Hyde Park before appointed by then Governor Otto Kerner as state revenue director. In 1966 Korshak was slated by the Democrats to run for Cook County treasurer, a race in which he was opposed by Edmund Kucharski, the undersheriff under then sheriff Richard Ogilvie—now the governor, succeeding Kerner.

A week before the election in November, Kucharski, after two attempts to get Korshak on areawide television to debate, issued a statement in which he alleged that Korshak was the "fixer" in the New York liquor license bribery scandal involving a new Playboy Club there.

Not only did Korshak refuse to confront Kucharski on television in the closing days of the campaign, but following The (Chicago) Daily Calumet's exclusive reporting on the Kucharski charges on Nov. 4, 1966, Korshak (The Daily Calumet, Nov. 7, 1966) would reply only that the Kucharski charges were "mischievous, irresponsible libel." That brief statement was issued through Korshak's office.

Kucharski charged, "Is it not a fact that it was Marshall Korshak who was contacted initially by Playboy to arrange for taking care of the New York liquor license?"

He continued: "Did he (Korshak) or did he not list as an employee a top syndicate gangster when this hoodlum made application for rental of an exclusive Lake Shore Drive apartment?"

Kucharski based his charges on a May 6, 1966 by-lined story by reporter Charles Grutzner in the New York Times, which declared: "In testifying about his own dealings with the Playboy group, Berger (Ralph Berger, 66, of Chicago, sentenced to prison for conspiracy to bribe) said they first agreed to pay him \$5,000 for making the contact with (Martin) Epstein (New York state liquor au-

thority chairman). After they delayed giving him any money, he said, he went to see a friend, Marshall Korshak, who called someone in the Playboy organization, and he soon received \$5,000."

The Playboy club in New York finally opened, however, and it has since been learned that one of Parvin's hotel and night club furnishings companies received the lucrative contract to furnish the establishment!

In Chicago, Korshak's control of top city patronage jobs is regarded as absolute. The stories of his influence in a broad range of matters, from banking and investments, to land development and real estate, are legend.

The city-wide group of plain, every-day citizens which works with Skolnick in his seemingly never-ending drive to call attention to what he believes are the questionable activities of, particularly, federal-level judges, has given no indication it is running out of gas. Skolnick began his project a half dozen years ago, and has centered on his drive for apportionment of Illinois Congressional and General Assembly districts and Chicago ward boundaries, among others. It has become the man's life's work, and he seldom deviates from it through 80-hour weeks.

He has researched and opened up on the Parvin Foundation long before it and the Louis Wolfson Foundation became common household words. He said yesterday that he is "astounded" to think that judges in two of the three most powerful courts in the United States—U.S. Supreme Court, and the federal court for Northern Illinois, second only in importance to the federal court for southern New York—are deeply involved and linked together with outside interests through questionable operations such as the Parvin Foundation and the Wolfson Foundation.

And, Skolnick observed, "From what we have learned by our studies and investigations all these years, we have only scratched the surface of judicial influence-peddling and special interest decisions."

Skolnick has been one of many, including The Daily Calumet, which has continued to urge publication of the Johnson Administration-banned Blakey Report, the document which its author C. Robert Blakey, under hire of the government, has acknowledged, cites at least six high ranking judges in Chicago for extreme conflict of interest involvements, and in several cases crime syndicate ties.

To these people, the Fortas scandal is not shocking, but only the first public indication of a situation which they call a national tragedy of unmatched proportions.

#### RESOLUTION BY THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the resolution recently adopted by the Massachusetts Legislature urging the amendment of the Constitution of the United States by providing for the abolition of the electoral college system and establishing the direct popular election of the President and the Vice President of the United States. As

the Congress moves toward reform of the electoral college system, I most earnestly urge and hope that my colleagues and the administration will heed and act in the language and the spirit of this timely resolution which follows:

**RESOLUTION BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States by providing for the abolition of the electoral college system and establishing the direct popular election of the President and the Vice President of the United States

*Whereas*, The national election of nineteen hundred and sixty-eight has once again demonstrated the dangerous potentialities for deadlock inherent in the Electoral College system; and

*Whereas*, The Electoral College system is archaic, obsolete and undemocratic; and

*Whereas*, The Electoral College system does not offer full realization of the one-man, one-vote doctrine in national elections; and

*Whereas*, The abolition of the Electoral College system will result in bringing the voters, the ultimate source of all electoral power, directly into the process of electing a President and Vice President of the United States; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to support an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will provide for the abolition of the Electoral College system and its replacement by the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, April 28, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,  
Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 30, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,  
Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,  
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

**MARTIN STONE: OUTSTANDING YOUNG BUSINESSMAN INVOLVED IN TODAY'S PROBLEMS**

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, most often when liberals rise to speak about American industry and businessmen, their tone gets demeaning and critical. The liberal tends to view the private sector as among his key opponents, and great rhetoric is expended attacking ethics of free enterprise and profit maximization.

Of course, at times such criticism is valid. The corporate ethic can stand in the way of overall solutions to pressing national problems, profit maximization may be opposed to overall public interest.

Yet, over the past few years, I have been encouraged by the increasing involvement of the private sector into heretofore untouched areas of national con-

cern. I am delighted to learn about—and to work with—groups of businessmen taking stands on such issues as Vietnam, and the military establishment, the ABM. And I do not praise here only those businessmen who agree with my views on these important questions; I believe involvement itself deserves encouragement because only from such involvement can we be assured of a continuing participatory democracy.

Certainly the business community has assumed a major role in attacking the problems of poverty and unrest in the Nation's pockets of poverty. A new creative relationship is being forged between Government and the private sector, a relationship based on a mutual belief that priority be given to these urgent problems.

Today I would like to single out and salute a young businessman from the Los Angeles area as a fine example of the new "involved" breed. Martin Stone, president and chairman of Monogram Industries, is involved; he heads the Los Angeles Urban Coalition, he has set up a job program for ghetto youth, last year he was cochairman of the California McCarthy campaign. And he runs a multimillion-dollar corporation at the same time.

Martin Stone does not hesitate in speaking out in matters which concern him not only as leader of a major business, but also as a citizen dealing with problems at a local and national scope. In the current issue of Social Service Outlook, a valuable publication put out monthly by the New York State Department of Social Services, Mr. Stone presents a perceptive analysis of employment opportunities for disadvantaged persons. I recommend this article to my colleagues as an excellent example of the type of "involvement" now being undertaken by dynamic young businessmen such as Martin Stone.

I now would like to insert Mr. Stone's article into the RECORD along with a story done last year by Business Week which highlights the work and philosophy of this talented man:

[From Social Service Outlook, May 1969]

**How To FILL 1½ MILLION JOBS**

(By Martin Stone)

Solely by virtue of the fact of permanent residence in the United States a man who is willing to work has a right to a decent job at a decent rate of pay and every person who is unable to work has a right to a minimum level of annual income which will enable that person to live in respect and decency and without the necessity of having to be subjected to the humiliation of begging a welfare system for the opportunity to live.

The major portion of the solution to the problem of unemployment is training. I would divide the training problem into two stages: the first stage being the development of entry level or prevocational skills and the second stage being the development of specific job skills. To pass through stage one, a man must be able to communicate satisfactorily and he must have a receptive attitude towards the disciplines and expectations of job performance.

The second stage of the job training problem is that which entails the development of specific job skills. Here is where private industry must play the decisive role. Actually, over the past two years, there has been a strongly increased awareness of the problem

by the business community. More and more firms are setting up programs for job trainees from the ranks of the unemployed and the so-called hard-core unemployables. These are being set up both under existing federal programs and independently of federal support.

Setting up and administering a successful job training program isn't easy. It is difficult. It requires considerable foresight, on-the-spot judgment, flexibility, patience and understanding. To build a successful training program requires the same kind of executive and middle management skills as are needed in achieving that most basic of corporate objectives: the earning of a satisfactory profit. And profit growth does not come easy. It takes skill and effort. Why expect less of a challenge from a pioneering effort in the field of job training?

The kinds of problems we have encountered in training programs at the various divisions of Monogram Industries start with the finding of prospective trainees and run all the way from the employment application itself through the potential for advancement that exists throughout an entire organization.

**GET THEM FROM THE GHETTOS**

In many instances it will be necessary to go directly to the ghettos to recruit trainees. It is not easy to reach people who have previously found it almost impossible to get a job with a convincing message that someone seriously intends to give them a job and train them.

A great many existing employment requirements exclude people who have been arrested for, or convicted of, criminal offenses. In a number of Negro ghettos over 50 percent of all adult males have criminal arrest records. Employers who have dropped the criminal arrest, and to some extent the criminal conviction, bars to employment have found no difference in the eventual results between employes with or without criminal records.

Another limiting factor in employment procedures is the psychological testing procedure a number of companies follow. Recent results have shown that most of these tests are programmed around a person who comes from a typical white, middle-class environment and are particularly difficult for people from strikingly different environmental backgrounds. In this consideration of trainee problems, I will focus primarily on the problems of Negro or Latin-American trainees who have the problems of cultural or environmental difference to overcome in addition to the lack of job skills.

Another problem relates to the filling out of the employment application. To avoid embarrassment and confusion, it is better to have the job interviewer fill out the application for the prospective employe.

**HOW TO GET TO WORK**

In many cities, particularly Los Angeles, lack of adequate sources of public transportation to the job sites is a difficult problem. At Monogram our primary answer has been a system of car-pooling.

Lack of fluency with the English language is a serious problem for people from Latin-American backgrounds. The best answer to this problem is to have some Spanish-speaking leadmen or supervisors.

Another major problem for trainees is the attitude of fellow workers and supervisors around them in the shop. There is often a problem of resistance to the trainees by co-workers. In our situation, we have an employe profit-sharing bonus plan in several of our shops that has become quite meaningful. Certain amounts of friction are created by any action which reduces the productivity of the shop. We have simply taken the position that fairly rapidly the trainees will become as productive as other workers, and in the meantime this is a social obligation that simply must be shouldered by all segments of our society.

The tendency on the part of supervisory personnel to use the trainees for menial work which does not contribute towards the training process must constantly be watched. This is a natural inclination in virtually any shop because, when occasional menial tasks arise, they are usually assigned to those worker lowest on the totem pole. A certain amount of this sort of thing is probably unavoidable, but if such assignments are too numerous, they cut into the valid training activities, slowing down trainee progress and creating a sense of discouragement on the part of the trainee.

Problems will arise relating to union discrimination against minority group employees. In addition, trainees will sometimes find it difficult to understand why, after they become reasonably skilled at a particular task, they will be working alongside older workers doing the same work who receive considerably more pay. People who have never worked in the framework of industry don't immediately understand the build-up of wage differentials as a result of long employment and the value of general employee shop versatility.

#### PERSONAL PROBLEMS

At times the company finds itself highly involved in the personal problems of the trainees. They have an extraordinary fear of failure based largely upon repeated failures to fit within the framework of our existing institutions and rejections by these institutions. A company becomes involved with getting the trainees into hospitals and out of jail. It must deal with the problem of getting gas and electricity turned back on, fighting off finance companies, getting cars towed off freeways and many other annoyances that it normally wouldn't put up with. But bear in mind the company is likely to be the only real link these people have with "the establishment" and the company may represent their only real way of coping with it until they have built up some kind of a "stake."

There are a great many other problems which come up in programs of this sort, not the least of which are the twin problems of tardiness and absenteeism. These two have been our most difficult problems at Monogram and I have come to the conclusion that a sense of employment discipline is therefore an important part of any prevocational training program and can be accomplished better at that stage than during the actual on-the-job training period.

One approach which will help make a success of training programs is the use of the "buddy system" where a trainee is linked with an older employee who can give him considerable individual attention, particularly in the discussion of specific problems. It also helps considerably if companies have qualified Negroes or other minority group people in supervisory or managerial jobs.

Last but not least, trainees must see the opportunity to advance within the organization and to achieve increasingly better levels of pay.

#### REAL PROBLEM IS TRAINING

The real unemployment problem consists of training approximately 1.5 million people to handle presently unfilled job openings.

To provide meaningful starting jobs at \$2.00 per hour for 1.5 million people would cost approximately \$4,400 per person per year or approximately \$6.6 billion per year. The problem with our present anti-poverty efforts is that they have created a vast federal overhead structure to administer the programs so that a small proportion of the funds allocated actually reaches the intended beneficiaries or is brought to bear on the real problems of poverty.

It is essential that we develop a program which permits a maximum amount of federal funds to be applied to the development of solutions to the problems of poverty, rather

er than the creation of additional federal bureaucracy. To this end, I propose that the bulk of the job training portion of the anti-poverty effort be put into the hands of private industry. Business corporations in the United States in 1967 made a combined profit of over \$85 billion. Profits of unincorporated business organizations probably brought this total up close to \$100 billion. If the Federal Government, as an incentive to business, granted a credit of approximately 7½ percent against federal income taxes for amounts paid to certified "trainees" for the first 12 months of employment, it would create a pool of approximately \$7½ billion which businesses could, at their election, either pay in taxes to the Federal Government or to training the presently unemployed.

For example, if a business had a tax bill of \$1,000,000, it could elect to pay out \$75,000 as wages to certified trainees and \$925,000 in taxes to the Federal Government. As an incentive to business to train these people, I would recommend that they could apply the entire wage paid to these trainees during the first year plus an additional 10 percent profit. Thus, in the example given approximately 15 trainees could be hired at \$2.00 per hour or a total of \$66,000 in wages plus \$6,600 profit for the year. The total of \$72,600 could be shown as a reduction against a tax bill of \$1,000,000 and a total of \$927,400 paid in taxes. In this way, 1,500,000 additional people could be hired and trained by private business organizations at a total cost to the Federal Government of \$7,300,000,000 in the first year. Thereafter, annual training subsidies would be far less each year as original trainees were built into the permanent work force and the number of unemployed was drastically reduced.

It would, of course, be necessary to have the Federal Government set up procedures to prevent abuse of the economic incentive program and to see that the training being given was of real value. This could be carried out by a program of quarterly interviews with the trainee and a recertification of trainees every three months.

As a final overriding factor in the question of providing jobs for anyone able to work, the government should recognize its obligation as an employer of last resort to provide work for those unable to obtain work in the private sector of the economy. This point will take considerable further development but I include it here as part of the over-all problem.

The second part of the problem relates primarily to those people who are unable to work. It is in this area that our present multi-faceted welfare programs are highly inadequate and completely degrading. Our society is wealthy enough to see that these people need not live in poverty, humiliation, and despair.

If we assume that we want to eliminate poverty in this country, how do we spend the money without dramatically increasing the costs through inevitably expensive federal administrative programs? The best answer I have seen is the negative income tax. This is simply a means of implementing the idea of a guaranteed annual income with minimum administrative cost.

The programs I have advocated involve a partnership of participation between the government and the business community. Although they contemplate economic incentives to industry for the retaining of the unemployed, the business community will, along with all other taxpayers, bear the additional (perhaps temporary) burden of the higher tax rates necessary to support the training expense contributions and the payments under the guaranteed annual income plan to those unable to work.

For years, I have heard the old adage that the purpose of business is the earning of maximum profits for the stockholders. On

this basis, the argument has been made that it is somehow wasteful of the corporate assets to devote any portion of them to social or community activities. As operators of businesses, businessmen have a large stake in the existence of a healthy social environment in which to operate and in preserving and strengthening the free enterprise system of economics.

The Negroes and other minorities have realized the failure of the so-called liberals who have stolen their decency, self-respect, and manhood by clinging to old-fashioned ideas of patronizing charity. The black man wants decency, self-respect and the right to earn his way. He wants an equal shot at earning his share of the benefits of an affluent, color-blind society. Businessmen are a major component of "the Establishment." They have the most to protect in this system and society. Let them be the progressives of the future. It is high time that businessmen developed a clear-cut and forthrightly announced "business social conscience"—a social conscience which is in tune with the needs of the times and which can be applied first and foremost to the achievement of a major social revolution in America which will, for the first time in our history, give all Americans true equality of participation in every aspect of our economy and our society.

#### MR. AND MRS. AMERICA: WHO

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—When statistics go into a computer, all manner of facts and figures and generalizations come out of it. When the U.S. Census Bureau puts all its knows about Americans into its computer, a "Mr. and Mrs. Typical American" emerge. This dispatch, putting some breath of life into these American "types," is based on interviews United Press International reporters throughout the country had with men and women who fit the Census Bureau's "typical" description. By weight of numbers—more than 180 million whites to about 20 million Negroes—the typical American under examination becomes white.)

(By Harry Ferguson)

Meet Mr. A—the typical American.

He is 26 years and 10 months old, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. He has been married for a little more than four years and had one child.

There are some other things the U.S. Census Bureau can tell us about Mr. A. He went to school for 12.3 years. He owns a television set and an automobile and lives in a mortgaged house. He earns a bit more than \$7,000 a year.

But the Census Bureau provides us only with a sort of skeleton of Mr. A and what we are going to try to do now is to find out what kind of man he is—what he thinks about all sorts of subjects, what his hopes and ambitions are, what he fears, what he talks about, how he votes and what he does in his leisure time. To get this composite, UPI reporters interviewed scores of Mr. A's throughout the country.

First, his brain. Is Mr. A intelligent? If you mean can he reason from cause to effect, the answer is yes. If by intelligent you mean that he is a uniformly cultured, well-informed man, the answer is no.

#### NO EGGHEAD

For years eggheads, both foreign and domestic, have been clubbing our Mr. A on the head. They say he is stupid, uneducated, never reads books and never listens to good music. Some counts of the indictment are correct. Asked in the UPI survey to name the three best books he had read in the last year, he hadn't read any. He was asked if he could identify historian Will Durant, poet William Cullen Bryant, historian Samuel E. Morison, novelist James Branch Cabell and composer Richard Wagner. He said no to all of them.

He never finished college and that too is typical.

What does Mr. A read? In most cases he reads his local paper and if he's small town, the nearest metropolitan daily. Across the country the magazines most read by Mr. A are *Life*, *Time*, *Outdoor Life*, *Sports Afield*, *Playboy*, *American Rifleman*, *American Home* and *Mechanix Illustrated*.

But there is no use dwelling too long on the printed word for the fact is that Mr. A is not much of a reader. Nor can he be too easily lured to the movies by his wife. He sees an average of one movie a month and these were some of his recent favorites: "Bonnie and Clyde," "The Party," "The Graduate," "In a Family Way" and "Valley of the Dolls." If you are preparing to risk a surmise that what Mr. A goes to the movies to see is sex, you are dead right.

#### PRINCIPAL ENTERTAINMENT

Mr. A spends an average of two and one-half hours a day in front of the television set, almost twice as much time as his child does. This, of course, is his principal indoor entertainment and it is the source of much of his information. Walter Cronkite of CBS and NBC's "Today Show" won steady but not spectacular support in replies to questionnaires across the country. Rowan and Martin's "Laugh-In" got a good run from the listeners during the last season, but this is not basically Mr. A's cup of tea. What he likes is suspense and violence.

Favorite programs most mentioned: "I Spy," "The Avengers," "Mission Impossible," "Get Smart," "Garrison's Gorillas," "The FBI," "Combat," "Rat Patrol."

Commercials? Mr. A grumbles about them occasionally, but doesn't turn them off during his favorite programs. He would rather watch commercials than pay to have them taken off the air.

In the nationwide interviewing 82 prominent names of the living and the dead chosen at random were submitted to typical American men. They were asked to identify each person.

Some that every man could identify: President Andrew Jackson, Greta Garbo, David Brinkley, Lucille Ball, Douglas MacArthur, Drew Pearson, Gregory Peck, Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, Julius Caesar, Robert McNamara, Lawrence Welk, Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

Name that nobody could identify, among those questioned: Marvin Watson, postmaster general of the United States.

#### THE GIRL HE MARRIED

The average adult woman in this country is five feet, four and one-half inches tall and weighs 134 pounds.

[From Business Week, Mar. 16, 1968]

#### NAMES AND FACES: MONOGRAM'S STONE ROLLS SWIFTLY ALONG

(NOTE.—Martin Stone of Monogram Industries keeps things fast-paced in and out of the executive suite. In seven years he has built a conglomerate that moves with a sprint to match his own.)

Advice to the activist undergraduate who pictures the executive suite as a stronghold of stifling conformity: Spend a day with Martin Stone, the 39-year-old managerial whiz who heads an emergent conglomerate called Monogram Industries, Inc.

Cautionary note: Get in shape first.

Stone, who is both chairman and president, runs a breezily informal eight-man headquarters in the posh Westwood section of Los Angeles. He often walks the 2½ mi. to work, a course that takes him through the sprawling campus of his alma mater, the University of California at Los Angeles. It is more than 20 years since Stone's student days at UCLA, but time and success haven't changed his exuberant style.

#### FREE AND EASY

Wisecracks—and an occasional football—fly through Monogram's offices. Arrangements for lunch-time workouts and after-work handball games are carefully made and zealously guarded from workaday intrusions.

Stone is constantly in motion. He paces as he talks; when he does sit, he flings himself into the chair and his hands start a game of catch with a paperweight. As often as not, he munches an apple or cookie.

An associate says that Stone "does more business walking than sitting down." Stone just shrugs at the comment. "I like exercise," he says. "If I'm traveling and not getting much sleep, I'll work out instead of taking naps. I feel more alert."

When he is not traveling, Stone's business day usually begins at 8:15. Occasionally he skips lunch to work out at a nearby gym. He knocks off at 4:30 for three sets of tennis. And before the day is over, he jogs one or two miles around his neighborhood, accompanied by his golden retriever.

#### IN THERE PITCHING

His vacations have a physical slant, too. Two years ago, the Stones bicycled through Europe. This year, Stone spent a week working out as a pitcher with the Atlanta Braves at their West Palm Beach (Fla.) training camp. The arrangement, which was made possible by Stone's longtime friendship with one of the owners of the Braves, led one Monogram executive to quip: "What happens to us if they sign him up?"

Stone's youthful enthusiasm shows through in other ways: his dabbling in liberal Democratic politics and his tendency to mount a soapbox whenever civil rights, education, or Vietnam are mentioned. But Stone does more than pay lip service to the things he believes in. For instance, he has instituted a hiring program for hard-core unemployed ghetto youths, and recently he accepted the co-chairmanship of Senator Eugene McCarthy's California campaign for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

Behind the business day hi-jinks and extracurricular activities is a management and acquisition knowhow that has radically transformed Monogram. Seven years ago it was a money-losing company with annual sales of \$5-million; today it is a fast-moving merger-minded corporation with sales running at an annual rate of \$135-million.

Stone's penchant for physical activities is matched by right-hand man Harvey L. Karp, 40, who keeps up with the boss on the handball and tennis courts. Karp, who is Monogram's executive vice-president, secretary, and treasurer, also has a less strenuous hobby—collecting ancient glass. Henry Gluck, the company's 39-year-old vice-president for operations and No. 3 man, writes satirical essays in his spare time.

#### I. SUCCESS STORY

This unconventional trio presides over an empire that spreads from Culver City, Calif., to Tonawanda, N.Y., has 6,000 employees, and turns out a growing variety of products. Most of the growth came last year, when Monogram snapped up two far larger companies: Spaulding Fibre Co. and National Screw & Mfg. Co. Both had sales of nearly \$40-million, and the acquisitions put Monogram firmly in the big time.

Significant as this achievement was, Stone is even prouder of the way he steered Monogram into a position of strength from which to launch the merger drive. From 1961 to June, 1967, he points out, Monogram's average annual earnings growth was 91%, while sales were growing 65% per year. More than 80% of that growth was internal.

#### ROUGH START

Stone and Karp started almost from scratch when they took the helm at Monogram early in 1961. The company was losing

more than \$100,000 a month, most of it through one operation—manufacturing aircraft pulleys. But other divisions ran into trouble as their managers were moved in to plug the hole. It was, says Karp, "a classic case of what happens when the panic button is pushed."

Stone decided to divide the company into four divisions (of which three remain), and invited the managers to his home. "We put the name of every employee—about 800 at the time—on separate pieces of paper," Stone recalls. "Then we told the managers to choose the people they needed to operate their divisions. When all were satisfied, more than 300 names were still on the table."

Stone had already cut the managers' salaries and instituted a profit-based bonus system. Six months after the newly slimmed-down divisions went back to work, Monogram showed a profit.

#### SLIMMER LINE

Once the new setup was working smoothly, Stone nailed down Monogram's future by deciding to concentrate on two product lines—recirculating chemical aircraft toilets and specialty fasteners.

Stone figured that travel trailers and pleasure boats held out a limitless future for a low-cost toilet unit, and by 1965, he had developed the product he had been looking for in the "Monomatic." Gluck, a Wharton School graduate who had worked for Monogram years earlier, took a big pay cut to rejoin Stone and build up the consumer products division.

"Sanitation equipment seems to evoke disgust or hilarity," Gluck says, and getting the product across required careful selling. But the "Monomatic" became such a big seller that within two years Gluck's division had zoomed past the aircraft toilet division.

Judicious acquisitions of small companies helped the fastener and sanitation equipment lines grow, but until about a year ago Stone kept his merger program in low gear. From the beginning, Stone had decided to make Monogram an acquisition-oriented company. "But first we had to put it on a sound financial footing and establish its internal growth," he says.

The acquisition in 1964 of Magnasync Corp., a bankrupt manufacturer of motion picture sound recording devices, was a deviation from the plan. Monogram got 60% of Magnasync for only 5¢ a share—but much of its equipment had been destroyed by fire, and all but two employees had left. Subsequently, Moviola Mfg. Co., a maker of film editing equipment, was acquired to form Magnasync Moviola Corp. Operating as a sub-division, Magnasync Moviola has annual sales of \$5-million—and its stock now sells for around \$15.

#### BIG TIME

Stone moved tentatively toward bigger game in late 1966 when he bought 31,000 shares of Studebaker Corp. as part of a plan to acquire the company with a group of outsiders. But the plan collapsed and he sold the shares almost immediately. Last April, Stone paid \$15,350,000 for Spaulding, and a tender offer four months later bought National Screw into the fold for around \$21 million.

Stone is fascinated by the acquisition game. "I've never been able to resist a challenge," he says, "and the challenge now is to see if we can grow better and faster than anyone else." He considers acquisition techniques "a growth product—in the same sense as a line of computers."

"It's the most exciting aspect of the business," Stone declares. He gets a kick out of negotiating for a company. "Usually I can't wait to get there and begin," he says. His enthusiasm apparently rubs off on others. "It's hard to keep the operating people glued to internal growth while we're growing so fast through acquisitions," he adds.

## II. A RUNNING START

Stone started running early. Growing up in Los Angeles, he held his first job at 12 and worked his way through high school and college. "I was always the organizer," he recalls. When his sandlot baseball team needed competition, Stone organized seven other teams. Then he persuaded local merchants to put up the money for bats and balls.

He played baseball for UCLA (B.A. 1948) and got \$75 a month "for taking care of the diamond." He kept himself in Loyola University law school (LL.B., 1951) by hoisting boxes for Houston Fearless Corp., then a privately owned maker of film processing equipment. "I just felt better with manual jobs," he explains.

## LEARNING THE ROPES

After graduation from Loyola (Stone eventually went on to earn a master of laws degree at USC), he went to work full time at Houston Fearless. There he learned the ins and outs of management and acquisitions from Benjamin B. Smith, a co-owner of Houston Fearless and a self-styled doctor of sick companies. In the mid-1950s, he followed Smith to International Glass Corp., whose name, after several acquisitions, was eventually changed to Monogram.

As executive vice-president, secretary, and treasurer, Stone ran the company for Smith. But in 1959 the two men fell out over Stone's attempts to expand newly acquired Wickland Mfg. Co., a manufacturer of airplane toilets.

"We had to expand the company tenfold just to meet commitments that had been made before the acquisition," Stone recalls. "And we had to replace and redesign every unit that had been shipped." Stone walked out when Smith balked at his plan to pour more money into Wickland.

## QUICK RETURN

Stone thought he was through with the business world; he returned to UCLA to get a Ph.D. in economics. But the sabbatical was short-lived. A few months of graduate school convinced him that "there was more backbiting in the academic world than in business."

By this time, Harvey Karp, with whom Stone had worked at Houston Fearless, had also pulled up stakes, and the two looked for a way to team up in business. The vehicle they found was Electrovision Corp., which owned a string of movie theaters. Their plan was to sell the theaters and invest in industrial companies. Then Smith asked Stone to buy him out and run Monogram, and the stage was set for a classic American success story.

## III. POLITICAL ACTIVIST

Stone has not allowed his success to interfere with a strongly developed social conscience.

He launched his training program in May, 1965—before the Watts riot—out of a conviction that "business has an obligation to try to do something about the major problems of our society." Stone sets only one requirement for the participants: Each has to be a high school dropout who has never held a steady job.

The trainees start as helpers and then spend 90-day periods in three of several job categories at Monogram's sheet metal plant in Culver City.

## HAPPY RESULTS

Says Stone: "I really didn't think it would be good business. But it has turned out to be just that. After we started the program, we ran into a severe labor shortage. The training program gave us employees we wouldn't otherwise have had."

Of the 53 youths hired so far, 14 are still with the company. Most of the others have gone on to other jobs or joined the military.

Stone is critical of Washington's job training efforts. Nevertheless, he has encouraged some Monogram divisions to partic-

ipate in subsidized programs under the Manpower Development & Training Act. "I start with the assumption that I don't like the federal government," Stone says. "I have no confidence in its ability to do anything. But the problem is so important that we feel we have to try these programs."

Stone would prefer to see businessmen handle job training independently of the government. "The business community has a greater stake in social problems than any other group," he says. "And businessmen can be motivated to solve these problems, if they are approached in the proper way."

## PARADOX

If these views run counter to Stone's espousal of liberal Democratic causes, he is aware of the paradox. "I'm a Democrat," he says, "but sometimes I wonder why." He thinks the poverty program is "all overhead structure." But in the next breath Stone defends the Head Start program, in which his wife Elaine has been active as a teacher for several years.

Stone's political activism began when he tried—and failed—to win a nomination as congressman in 1960. Subsequently, he organized grass roots campaigns in upper-crust Bel Air, first for Adlai E. Stevenson and then for John F. Kennedy.

His decision to work in behalf of Senator McCarthy ended months of soul-searching over Vietnam. Stone considers U.S. policies in Vietnam "immoral," but he opposes the war primarily because of the damage he thinks it is doing on the domestic front. "Our system may fall if we don't correct the evils of widespread poverty and racial inequality," he says. And he believes that "the economic drain of the Vietnamese war and the moral conflict it has raised" are blocking serious efforts to solve these problems.

## FIRM STAND

Stone has heard some mutterings from Monogram stockholders who think he has no business in politics. But such complaints only touch another sore point.

"I didn't give up my civil rights by becoming president of a publicly held company," Stone says heatedly. "And I have no patience with people who complain about the problems of our time and refuse to take an active role in solving them. If the society around us goes to hell, the business community won't benefit. I think I have an obligation to participate."

## I FEEL SORRY FOR YOU

**HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, an 18-year-old marine sent a letter to the editor of the Panama City, Fla., News-Herald which deserves a lot more than reading. It deserves some careful thought. Those who read his letter are not likely to pass it over lightly. So I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEAR EDITOR: Well, I've been thinking of this a long time and now I've decided to turn to you for help.

I'm not sure if it will help any but I would like you to read what I have written and put it in your paper. If there is any charge just send it to me.

What is Vietnam—Vietnam is a hell which I am forced to be in.

It is a country in Southeast Asia, it's not as big as the state of Texas. I think it is a cause of human suffering, not a war. Just a way of ridding the little country of population.

It is one of the filthiest places I have ever been. It has the most diseases of any country known today.

We try to help but who gives a damn, who really cares? No one. Everybody back in the United States protests what I might die for, plus those who have already died.

I guess the reason I feel this way is because I've seen life for what it is.

But what is life? Life is cheap, my life is worth \$10,000, but what do I get? So, I get to see the inside of a grave.

Sure my mom will get that measly \$10,000, but will that bring me back? Here I am, a U.S. Marine. I'm here because of you. But who really gives a damn.

I'm only 18 years old and I've faced death in the eye more times than you ever will.

Sure I know what you're thinking. I'm just feeling sorry for myself. Hell no, I'm not. I'm feeling sorry for you.

Yes, you. The guy in college dodging the draft and you the hippie, the bum, the tramp, the ones who are so sorry the service wouldn't have you.

Just think how you would feel if you were laying next to your buddy and the next thing you know he's only half there.

But who really gives a damn, me, the guy sitting in the hole next to me?

Here I'm getting short, but I might not be here to finish this little manuscript. Yes, I'm the real patsy. I'm over here wondering if I'll see tomorrow or not. But you get used to it.

Lately I've been getting pretty close to God. But I'm pretty dumb on that subject. So I say, God, you're pulling the strings now.

When is it my turn to die? Sometimes I even joke about it. I know it's wrong, then I ask myself who am I kidding.

Then I figure God put me here for something. I just hope I haven't done it yet.

Now getting back to life, what is life to you? To me life is a house, a wife, crib, security, a job and most of all there has to be love.

But that's why I wonder at times why am I still alive. I have none of this, but why do we have to fight? Why can't there be peace and love for thy neighbor?

I'm not claiming to be religious, because I'm not. I have broken every one of the Ten Commandments some time or other.

All I want is to know why the citizens of the United States of America don't have enough backbone to stand behind us.

Sure war is wrong but without war there wouldn't be any need for your support. But to whom that read this, may it be many, I ask you all to support your young Americans wherever they may fight.

Because I know you would rather have the war here instead of in the United States. So I thank you for your cooperation.

Pfc. ROBERT E. HALL,  
Marine.

## RIOTS: RESEARCH AND NO RESULTS

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many taxpayers living in the "riot age" have not as yet reconciled themselves to the conclusion that riots have become profitable to some.

Many Americans would be aghast to learn that several million dollars have already been spent to investigate disorders and violence—especially that some of the millions are being spent on the elite intellectuals who cannot even control disorders at their own institutions.

The solution has been known to many throughout the years; that is, take the manacles off the police, let the local people through their own courts enforce their laws and maintain order.

Perhaps someday after violence and crime have been investigated fully, some report may conclude that the people themselves can make their own analyses and have the courage and initiative to protect their lives and property through the authority which they delegate to their local police and courts.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a newsclipping from the Daily News for May 19, and an article by Robert A. Nisbet from the magazine Public Interest:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 19, 1969]

**RIOT STUDY FOUND COSTLY: BUT SO FAR RESULTS HAVE BEEN FEW**

The Government has doled out more money for academic studies of riots than it spent on its own widely publicized Kerner Commission investigation. So far, it has had few results.

The Kerner Commission, formally known as the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, spent \$1.6 million between August, 1967, and April, 1968. It produced a widely publicized and highly controversial 423-page report which condemned "white racism" as the main factor underlying Negro rioting.

Sixteen academic studies totaling \$1,644,000 have been underwritten since August, 1967, on various phases of the same subject. Only five have been completed. Ten others fall due this year and next. The most expensive study, costing \$451,000, is not due until May, 1973.

**LAST WEEK**

The list of academic studies was disclosed last week by Dr. Louis A. Wienckowski, director of extramural research programs for the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).

Dr. Wienckowski acknowledged his program was "just kind of getting off the ground" but said the academic reports eventually would complement the Kerner Commission study by disclosing more basic data on "normal and abnormal behavior, social stratification, aggression, violence and things of this nature."

"Truth comes slowly," Dr. Wienckowski said in an interview. "Rome wasn't built in a year."

**COPIES SET**

He said as the social scientists finished their studies, copies will be given to interested government agencies. "But one of the problems here is that they'd rather not read a 600-page book," he said.

Professors conducting the studies are bound by strict contract, Dr. Wienckowski said, under which they cannot make "supplementary income" from the government. They are paid at the same rate as their regular salary, he said, and their university deducts from their pay checks the amount NIMH pays them for the research.

"We don't allow overruns," he said. "There's no way for them to get rich." He said they are free to publish their report but "in many instances they are so esoteric there is no market for them."

**COST \$17,512**

One project, costing \$17,512, was a "workshop on research problems in community violence" designed to help social scientists learn how to conduct such studies. It was conducted by Brandeis University's Lemberg Center for the study of violence, which also was listed for a \$406,889 study titled "The Origin and Control of Community Violence." Several interim papers from this study have been published.

Studies completed so far have dealt with participation in riots, a psychological and social studies of the 1967 Detroit riot, a comparative history of major riots from 1900 thru 1965 and a paper on ways to reduce prejudice.

The most expensive study, costing \$451,000, is titled "Organizational Responses to Major Community Crises." It is being conducted by the Ohio State University research foundation. The work began last June and the investigators have until May, 1973, to finish.

**WHEN AUTHORITY FALTERS, RAW POWER MOVES IN**

(By Robert A. Nisbet)

The most striking fact in the present period of revolutionary change is the quickened erosion of the traditional institutional authorities that for nearly a millennium have been Western man's principal sources of order and liberty. I am referring to the manifest decline of influence of the legal system, the church, family, local community and, most recently and perhaps most ominously, of school and the university.

There are some who see in the accelerating erosion of these authorities the beginning of a new and higher freedom of the individual. The fetters of constraint, it is said, are being struck off, leaving creative imagination free to build a truly legitimate society. Far greater, however, is the number of those persons who see in this erosion the specters of social anarchy and moral chaos.

I would be happy if I could join either of these groups in their perceptions. But I cannot. Nothing in history suggests to me the likelihood of either creative liberty or destructive license for very long in a population witnessing the dissolution of the social and moral authorities it has been accustomed to.

I should say, rather, that what is inevitable in such circumstances is the rise of power; power that invades the vacuum left by receding social authority; power that tends to usurp even those areas of traditional authority that have been left inviolate; power that becomes indistinguishable in a short time from organized violent forces, whether of the police, the military or the paramilitary.

The human mind cannot support moral chaos for very long. As more and more of the traditional authorities seem to come crashing down, or to be sapped and subverted, it begins to seek the security of organized power. The ordinary dependence on order becomes transformed into a relentless demand for order. And it is power, however, ugly its occasional manifestations, that then takes over.

To see the eruption of organized power as the consequence of a diminishing desire for liberty is easy. What requires more knowledge or wisdom is to see such power as the consequence of loss of authority in a social order. Authority and power: are these not the same, or but variations of the same thing?

They are not, and no greater mistake could be made than to suppose they are. Throughout human history, when the traditional authorities have been in dissolution, or have seemed to be, it is power—in the sense of naked coercion—that has sprung up.

**A TISSUE OF AUTHORITIES**

Authority, unlike power, is not rooted in force alone, whether latent or actual. It is built into the very fabric of human association. Civil society is a tissue of authorities. Authority has no reality save in the allegiances of the members of an organization, be this the family, a political association, the church or the university.

Authority, function, membership: these form a seamless web in traditional society. The authority of the family follows from its indispensable function. So does that of the

church, the guild, the local community and the school. When the function has become displaced or weakened, when allegiances have been transferred to other entities, there can be no other consequence but a decline of authority.

Culture, too, as Matthew Arnold wrote memorably a century ago, is inseparable from authority. There is the authority of learning and taste; of syntax and grammar in language; of scholarship, of science and of the arts. In traditional culture, there is an authority attaching to the names of Shakespeare, Montaigne, Newton and Pasteur in just as sure a sense of the word as though we were speaking of the law. There is the authority of logic, reason and genius.

Above all, there is the residual authority of the core of values around which Western culture has been formed. This core of values—justice, reason, equity, liberty, charity—was brought into being through the union of the Greek and Judaic traditions 2000 years ago. Until the present age, it has managed to withstand all assaults upon it. In the 18th and 19th centuries, conservatives, liberals and radicals, however passionately they may have fought each other, nevertheless recognized the authority of such values.

The most dangerous intellectual aspect of the contemporary scene is the widespread refusal of thinking men to distinguish between authority and power. They see the one as being as much a threat to liberty as the other. But this way lies madness—and the ultimate sovereignty of power.

There can be no possible freedom in society apart from authority. "Men are qualified for civil liberty," wrote Burke, "in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites." It is out of this disposition toward fruitful self-discipline that authority emerges and its legitimacy is recognized. Abolish the disposition and you equally abolish the capacity for liberty.

There are those, chiefly political romantics and sentimentalists, who think these "moral chains" are a part of man's own nature and that there is consequently no need to worry about their dissolution. But the horrors of our century should have taught us the precariousness of the virtue that romantics think to lie in man's germ plasm. In truth, man's virtue is inseparable from—is as precarious as—his culture.

**THE DANGER IN BOREDOM**

Boredom is one of the most dangerous accompaniments of the loss of authority in a social order. Between boredom and brute violence there is as close an affinity historically as there is between boredom and inanity, boredom and cruelty, boredom and nihilism. Yet boredom is one of the least understood, least appreciated forces in human history.

Nothing so engenders boredom as the sense of material fulfillment, of goals accomplished, of affluence possessed. It is such a boredom that goes furthest, I think, to explain the peculiar character of the New Left.

I do not deny that youth brings idealism in some degree to this movement; that disenchantment with the more corrupt manifestations of middle-class society plays its part. Youth is beyond question idealistic. But in our present society, youth is also bored. And it is from boredom that so much of the intellectual character of radical political action today is derived.

I should more accurately say nonintellectual character, for it is the consecration of the act, the cold contempt for philosophy and program and the increasingly ruthless behavior toward even the most intellectual parts of traditional culture that give to the New Left its most distinctive character.

It is boredom born of natural authority dissolved, of too long exposure to the void; boredom inherited from parents uneasy in

their middle-class affluence and who mistake failure of parental nerve for liberality of rearing; boredom acquired from university teachers grown intellectually impotent and contemptuous of calling that explains the mindless, purposeless deprecations today by the young on that most precious and distinctive of Western institutions: the university.

We do well to take seriously the university and what happens to its authority in our culture. For among its prime functions traditionally has been that of serving as arbiter to that age group that has, at least temporarily, outgrown the authorities of family, church and neighborhood. Potentially, this age group is the most revolutionary of all groups in society, far more revolutionary than, say, the workers, the unemployed, the impoverished.

High in intelligence, emotionally buoyant, at full physical tide, this is the age group that is channeled by the university into the several areas of the professions, that provides the intellectual leaders of society. In the university is acquired lasting motivations toward learning, toward profession, toward high culture, toward membership in the social order. But, by the same token, it is this age group in the university that has largely furnished the West with its steady supply of revolutionaries.

Who is to say that our society does not require its occasional infusion of revolutionaries? But in the present age, the revolutionaries have turned on the university itself, and this is not only destructive but totally self-destructive.

The university is the institution that is, by its delicate balance of function, authority and liberty and its normal absence of power, the least able of all institutions to withstand the fury of revolutionary violence. Through some kind of perverted historical wisdom, the nihilism of the New Left has correctly understood the strategic position of the university in modern culture and also its constitutional fragility.

Normally, there are no walls, no locked gates and doors, no guards to repulse attacks on classroom, office and academic study. Who, before the present age, would have thought it necessary to protect precious manuscripts from the hands of revolutionary marauders?

The New Left is free to say all that it wishes, but it has nothing to say. Its program is the act of destruction; its philosophy is the obscene word or gesture; its objective, the academic rubble.

#### FEAR OF THE VOID

It would all be a transitory charade, a tale told by an idiot, were it not for one thing: the fears aroused in a middle-class society that has lost its anchoring in natural authority. Fear of the void is for human beings a terrible fear, one that will not long be contained. And in this state of mind, it is only power that can seem redemptive, however stained with blood it may be.

The entire country watched last summer's confrontation between New Left and police in Chicago. It was violent, ugly, and could only have aroused the chill of fear in those who had chanced to see the rise of Nazism in Germany, the burning of the Reichstag and the beginnings of a police system that was in time to enclothe German society like a straitjacket.

But I know of no national poll or study that has shown other than approval of police actions by a large majority. The size of this majority will grow. Human beings, I repeat, will tolerate almost anything but the threatened loss of authority in the social order: the authority of law, of custom, of convention. The void does not have to be great, or seem great, for the fears it arouses to become sweeping, for sanity in politics to disintegrate.

We are told by the polls that a large number of people watching their television

screens that night in Chicago found even the berserk actions of police and pseudopolice gratifying, reassuring, healing to the sense of security. Let us not forget that there is a strong upswell of boredom in affluent middle-class society, too. And power, as history tells us, is as often the antidote to boredom in society as to anxiety.

We need, as Max Lerner recently wrote in a thoughtful column, a new social contract in our society, one that will do for our violence-torn social order what the doctrine of the social contract in the 17th century sought to do in that age, fresh as it was from the horrors of the religious wars. But the task will be far more difficult.

The institutions of Western society are less solid and encompassing than they were then. Two centuries of convulsive social change and of remorseless increase in centralized political and economic power have seen to that. We are plagued even by our achievements, for material progress has inevitably taken toll of traditional culture.

Above all, at this moment, we need a liberalism that is able to distinguish between legitimate authority—the authority resident in university, church, local community, family, language and culture—and mere power. Failure to make this distinction between authority and power can only result in the ever-wider replacement of the former by the latter.

If our liberalism can see no profound difference between the authority of an academic dean, however fallible this may sometimes be, and the power of the police riot squad, we shall find ourselves getting ever greater dosages of the latter. The impulse to liberty can survive everything but the destruction of its contexts; and these are contexts of authority—a legitimate authority that is inseparable from institutions.

#### CHARLES A. VANIK ON CORPS OF ENGINEERS DIKING REPORT

#### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Corps of Engineers held a briefing and meeting on their preliminary report on the diking of dredged materials in the city of Cleveland. The substance of the report was that the diking program was inconclusive since Lake Erie is so highly polluted it was impossible to determine any appreciable improvement as a result of the removal of dredged silt and polluted material into diked area adjoining Burke Lakefront Airport and other dikes throughout the Great Lakes harbors.

It was my hope to have the Assistant Secretary of the Interior Carl Klein comment upon the corps' report. My letter to Mr. Klein and his response which is contrary to the corps' position will be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

It has been my longstanding position, that removal of any and all polluted dredge from the lake's bottom can only be beneficial to the condition of Lake Erie which is so dreadfully polluted. It is inconceivable to me that any Federal agency should be allowed in any way to contribute to the repollution of the lake through open-lake dumping of highly polluted dredged spoil. It is indefensible to allow any dumping of dredged material which is acknowledged by everyone to be

polluted and which obviously adds to the pollution of Lake Erie.

It is sensible to advocate stopping pollution at its source. I have been among the strongest advocates for increased authorizations and appropriation toward that end. However, we have not succeeded in increasing these funds, even though our battle in this body continues year after year. This is no reason to terminate a program of diking dredged materials which are brought out of our lake's bottom every year without fail. The dredging program will not be stopped. The material with its highly polluted contents which is dredged will still be brought to the surface. Is it not just as sensible to dispose of this material on land as it is to transport it farther out into our already devastated lake and dump it? It seems incredible to me that anyone would argue that such funds for this continuing program should be discontinued on the theory that these funds then would be diverted toward pollution control at the source of the pollution. Such is not the case and will never be the case. We must spend such funds where pollution is known to occur and one such source is the Corps of Engineers dredging program in the Great Lakes, and particularly Lake Erie. The corps' diking program to contain this polluted spoil is one solution at hand now to control this problem and should be supported and extended to as many harbors as possible as soon as possible.

I wish to include at this point in the RECORD the exchange of correspondence with Assistant Secretary Klein and my office and a very fine editorial on this subject which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Sunday, May 18, 1969.

The letters and editorial are as follows:

MARCH 19, 1969.

HON. CARL KLEIN,  
Assistant Secretary,  
Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Yesterday, the Corps of Engineers Report on the "Pilot Study" of Dredging Disposal in the Great Lakes contended that the "effect on water quality of polluted sediment deposited in the Great Lakes remains unknown . . ." The Corps of Engineers Report suggests that the uncertain effect of dumped polluted dredgings does not justify the cost of establishing diked areas to receive this material.

The history of the issue will indicate that the Corps of Engineers first of all denied that the dumping of dredged materials into the open waters of the Great Lakes contributed to the pollution problem. Public indignation brought about the tests and the subsequent diking program.

I do not believe that the decision on the continuation of the "diking" program to curb pollution should rest solely on the Corps of Engineers. Tests already conducted indicate the polluted nature of the dredgings. The preponderance of the evidence has identified the dredgings as a major contributing source of lake pollution. The cost-benefit ratio of diking is self-evident. The public's money is being used to prevent highly polluted material from being dumped into their source of fresh water.

I hope that you will establish a firm policy directing the dumping of polluted, dredged material only in diked and controlled areas.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,  
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, May 8, 1969.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: This is in response to your letter of March 19, 1969, concerning the Corps of Engineers' report on the "Pilot Study" of Dredging Disposal in the Great Lakes.

The Corps of Engineers' report has only recently been made available to this agency. The full report is a rather massive document of some twelve volumes and our review is not yet fully completed.

Our preliminary review indicates that the Corps of Engineers had assembled an impressive quantity of factual information about the Great Lakes dredging operations. To a limited degree and in some areas of this endeavor, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has assisted the Corps by supplying scientific data and information.

On the basis of our preliminary review, we feel there are a number of important aspects of this problem in which we cannot wholly agree with the conclusions drawn by the Corps of Engineers. Some of these are:

(a) While the study as conducted did not conclusively demonstrate a massive deleterious effect on water quality from open water dredging, it did show that polluted sediments were toxic to small forms of animal life. We believe that this fact should be recognized in the conclusions of the report.

(b) The costs of a program to prevent pollution from dredging disposal cannot be justified on a cost-benefit basis in this study without attempting to engage in the debate of cost-benefit numbers of questionable meaning. We should point out that the values to be protected by this program and other programs intended to reduce pollution in the Great Lakes are the total worth of these lakes. The real worth of these lakes to present and future generations is almost incalculable.

It is generally conceded that the present level of pollutants discharged to the lakes is seriously degrading these waters and if not abated will hasten the essential destruction of the lakes. The elimination of any source of pollution in the Great Lakes will help enhance the water quality in those lakes which, in turn, will increase the long-range financial worth of the lakes and communities adjoining the lakes.

(c) This Department has taken and is maintaining a strong position opposing the continued dumping of polluted materials in the open waters of the Great Lakes. To this end, we have consistently recommended that permits not be issued by the U.S. Corps of Engineers when such permits would allow the open-lake disposal of polluted materials.

(d) To this end, too, we will continue to press for alternative diked or on-land disposal of the vast quantities of polluted spoil dredged by the Corps. We believe that the Pilot Study has shown such alternative disposal to be a realistic alternative and highly effective from the pollution control standpoint.

I do appreciate this opportunity to place my views on the record, and I trust that your interest in and support of water pollution control activities will continue.

Sincerely yours,

CARL L. KLEIN,  
Assistant Secretary.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer,  
May 18, 1969]

**KEEP POLLUTION OUT OF LAKE**

Polluted dredgings from Great Lakes harbors should be deposited in diked areas or on land to prevent further degradation of the lakes.

This will increase dredging costs, but if the nation is serious about protecting its water resources, it will have to pay the price.

A debate on what to do with polluted dredgings is shaping up in hearings being conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Ultimately, the debate will reach Congress, which will have to make a decision.

The corps conducted a two-year study of the problem in cooperation with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and other agencies and research organizations.

It found that dumping in the open lake, the customary practice of the past, produced no measurable increase in pollution levels, yet nevertheless concluded that "in-lake disposal of heavily polluted dredgings must be considered presumptively undesirable."

The reasoning: Even though the added pollution load from dredgings may not have produced measurable deterioration of water quality, it is known that dredgings from some harbors, such as Cleveland's are heavily polluted with organic material, oil and phosphates. It would not be wise to add pollutants to a lake already badly polluted.

The corps also found that depositing dredgings, behind dikes effectively prevented pollutants from reaching the lake.

It suggested further study of the problem and concluded that a 10-year program to deposit polluted material in diked areas may be desirable. It estimated the additional costs of such a program at \$120 million in 10 years if all polluted Great Lakes harbors were included.

Opponents argue that it would be better to spend the \$120 million in attacking pollution at the source by improving municipal treatment plants.

But Lake Erie can't wait until treatment plants are built or improved. In the words of Dr. Edward J. Martin, head of Cleveland's clean water task force, "Lake Erie has had it, and if we are serious about saving the lake, we just can't put another pound of stuff in it."

Opponents argue that diking will not make a frontal attack on the lake's algae problem. Federal pollution experts say otherwise. They have found that three-fourths of the phosphorus load to Lake Erie is deposited in the harbor sediments that are dredged in the harbor mouth. Keeping these sediments from the lake would be a major step in reducing the lake's major problem—overenrichment.

**THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
BATTLE OF MONTE CASSINO**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 17, marked the 25th anniversary of the victorious Battle of Monte Cassino. This historical episode was achieved primarily through the efforts of the Polish Army fighting with the Allied forces in Italy.

The Polish soldiers were assigned to this task in the fierce battle along with other of our allies. With a great loss of men, the Polish flag was the first to appear on top of the abbey at Monte Cassino, thus opening the road to Rome. The best of Poland's sons sacrificed their

lives for freedom, justice, and democracy.

There is a Polish cemetery at Monte Cassino, where 1,051 soldiers slumber in peace. Somehow they have been forgotten. The cemetery is in a pathetic state and needs restoration and maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, I must add there are three other Polish cemeteries which all, unfortunately, lack proper maintenance since the brave Polish soldiers who fought so effectively in World War II have been forgotten by their compatriots among the Allies.

Thousands of miles separate us from Monte Cassino, but it is only proper to pay tribute and homage to those heroes who so courageously fought for our ideals.

We must note, Mr. Speaker, that people of Poland continue to suffer under the oppressive rule of the Russian-maintained Communist dictatorship since the Polish forces in the Allied effort were denied the opportunity to restore freedom to the homeland due to the concessions made to Stalin at Yalta by President Franklin Roosevelt.

We recognize that communism remains a threat to freedom of all mankind and Red aggression is a constant menace to peace and freedom. I am confident that the day will come that the heroic sacrifices at Monte Cassino and other battles of World War II will be rewarded with the restoration of freedom to the homeland. Freedom remains the proper goal of all the peoples held in bondage by communism and their governmental policies must have as their ultimate goal the restoration of legitimate governments and self-determination by all peoples. We will not have a world of peace and freedom until Communist tyrants lose their power.

As we mark the 25th anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino, we re-emphasize our belief in the ultimate triumph of freedom over communism.

**CRIMES AGAINST THE UKRAINIAN  
PEOPLE**

**HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1969, Mr. Volodymyr Y. Mayewsky, chairman of the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., of Washington, wrote a most interesting letter to the editor of the Washington Post and several other newspapers in the Washington area.

Unfortunately, Mr. Mayewsky's letter did not receive the wide attention it deserved, particularly since he was discussing the increasing occurrence of crimes against the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia.

As I should like to make Mr. Mayewsky's comments known to all who read this RECORD, with permission I include

his letter in full at this point in the RECORD. I should also like to include the text of two articles, one from the American Ukrainian Catholic Daily of February 27, 1969, and one from the Washington Post of Sunday March 16, 1969, describing some of the crimes Mr. Mayewsky refers to in his letter.

The articles follow:

**ORGANIZATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF  
FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE,  
INC.,**

Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

The WASHINGTON POST,  
Mr. PHILIP L. GEYELIN,  
Editor,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GEYELIN: Last month the American press reported yet another crime perpetrated against the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia. The State Security Police (K.G.B.) on January 27, 1969, arrested in Lviv, Ukraine, the Most Rev. Wasył Welychkowsky, Ukrainian Catholic Archbishop of Lviv, and a number of Ukrainian Catholic priests.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine was brutally destroyed by Moscow in 1945-46, as well as the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, however, it continued to exist underground. Priests were ordained and bishops were consecrated secretly and religious obligations were fulfilled despite the danger of arrest by the K.G.B. It was while Archbishop Welychkowsky was on his way to hear the confession of a sick person that he was apprehended by the K.G.B.

Then on March 16, 1969 the Washington Post reported the tragic news of the Archbishop's death while under arrest. With his death Moscow added another martyr to the long list of Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox hierarchy and clergy who perished during Stalin's regime.

The arrest and subsequent death of Archbishop Welychkowsky occurred during a wave of anti-Ukrainian Catholic acts committed by the Soviet authorities. House-to-house searches were conducted by the K.G.B. for prayer books and religious articles. The Moscow Orthodox patriarchate tightened its control over the Church in Ukraine. A number of the remaining churches in Ukraine were closed by official decree. All other religious institutions, seminaries and publications had already been abolished under Stalin's regime.

The intensification of the destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine indicates the bizarre commitment of Moscow's militant atheistic institutions to their proclamation that "by 1970, the 100th Anniversary of Lenin's birth, the Ukrainian Catholic Church will be completely crushed".

It is obvious that this renewed attack upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church, just as the K.G.B. mass arrests and incarceration of Ukrainian intellectuals and wanton destruction of Ukrainian ancient and historical buildings and archives (the latest of which was the razing of the Vydubetsky Monastery with the resultant loss of many thousand volumes of priceless Ukrainian and Jewish archives) is just another phase of the brutal design by the imperialist Russians to suppress once and for all the aspiration for independence by a dauntless Ukrainian people.

Although the Russian policy of cultural and religious genocide toward Ukrainians and other non-Russian people in the U.S.S.R. is a flagrant violation of the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN and other proper authorities are curiously silent about this. It is hoped that our press media would voice its condemnation of the Russian genocide policy and resolutely expose this morbid political expedient.

Sincerely,

VOLODYMYR Y. MAYEWSKY,  
Chairman.

[From the America, Ukrainian Catholic  
Daily, Feb. 27, 1968]

**ARCHBISHOP WELYCHKOWSKY ARRESTED IN  
LVIV—NEW WAVE OF PERSECUTION SWEEPS  
OVER UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH**

PHILADELPHIA.—According to reports received from reliable sources, the Soviet police (MVD) on January 27, 1969, arrested in Lviv Most Rev. Wasył Welychkowsky, Ukrainian Catholic Archbishop of Lviv. The Archbishop had gone to confess a woman in her home. Police agents followed him to the woman's home and arrested him. The Archbishop was then taken back to his apartment where a thorough search was made. When the Archbishop was being taken away, members of the sick woman's family heard one of the agents say: "You'll never see him again."

On the same day a host of other Ukrainian Catholic priests were arrested. Their names have not been disclosed as yet.

It is said that about a month and a half before the Archbishop's arrest he was visited by a man who called himself a tourist. The man spoke French and said he was a priest. He told Archbishop Welychkowsky that he had come with a tourist group and had instructions from the Vatican to find out about the activities of the underground Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. The man said that he would need to have the information recorded on paper.

It soon turned out that the man was no tourist, but an agent of the MVD. Following Archbishop Welychkowsky's arrest he was shown the written notes which he had made for the "tourist."

Following the arrest of the Archbishop, searches and arrests were made in the homes of other Ukrainian Catholic priests in Lviv and in other West Ukrainian cities.

In Stanislaviv, members of the Communist Party, on instructions from the MVD, gave out lists of instructions to Ukrainian nuns. The instructions warned the nuns not to attend Masses, receive priests in their homes, baptize children, or persuade people to go to confession.

Failure to comply with the instructions would bring three years imprisonment and the loss of all civil rights.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1969]

**PRIEST'S DEATH IN RED JAIL REPORTED**

ROME, March 15.—Reports circulated in church circles today that a Ukrainian Roman Catholic bishop has died in a Soviet prison where he had been confined since January 27.

He was identified as the Most Rev. Baul Welyczkowsky, about 65, who had been secretly consecrated a bishop several years ago and jailed for engaging in religious activities without government permission.

Informants said he died recently in a prison at Leopoli, in the Ukraine.

The Bishop was a member of the Redemptorist religious society. His work was said to be so secret that it did not appear in the *Annuario Pontificio*, the official Vatican yearbook listing all cardinals and bishops.

**THE COMING VIOLENT CON-  
FRONTATION WITH SDS**

**HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the CBS television program "Face the Nation" on May 11, 1969, the national secretary of the infamous organization calling itself Students for a Democratic Society advo-

cated that student radicals arm themselves and spoke openly for revolutionary change in our society by force and violence. Asked if SDS were a part of the international Communist conspiracy this same national secretary answered:

There is a bit of truth to that—that we are part of an international movement. We all see ourselves fighting a common struggle . . . because the system we are up against is an international system, the system of exploitation of capitalism.

This is the same old line of violence supposedly justified by the oppressiveness of our social order—which, of course, is so much garbage, as well as excuse for the Communist line of violent overthrow of the existing order. But one thing is becoming reasonably clear: the simple truth that if organizations like SDS resort to guns and violence there will have to be a square confrontation with law enforcement whose obligation it is to protect society from violence wherever it comes from. In this event people are going to be hurt, perhaps even killed. Those in SDS who are contemplating arming themselves—for what?—ought to also contemplate that if they use those arms it may well turn out to be an invitation to suicide on their part.

Recently the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader carried a reprint from the October 1968 Reader's Digest on the subject of SDS entitled "Engineers of Campus Chaos." Because of the current widespread interest in the nature, objectives, and tactics of this organization I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

**THE FACTS ON SDS: ENGINEERS OF CAMPUS  
CHAOS**

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

During the past year, college campuses across the United States from Columbia to Stanford exploded with violence, bloodshed and arson. In the thick of this disruption was an organization of self-proclaimed radicals called the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

This fall, as classes resume, educators and police who once shrugged off SDS as just another band of youthful rebels are bracing for more trouble. To see why, look at a sampling of SDS's recent record. At the University of Wisconsin last fall, 70 persons were injured after an SDS-organized riot against Dow chemical Co. recruiters. At the University of Georgia, SDS-led demonstrators occupied the administration building, demanding that women students be allowed to drink and stay out all night.

At San Francisco State, they launched a rampage of looting, brawling and attempted arson of a campus bookstore, all in the name of defending four hoodlums who had beaten up the editor of the student newspaper. At the University of California in Berkeley, they deployed radio-directed students as shock troops, erected barricades and fought pitched battles with police in an assault on the Oakland Induction Center.

New York University philosophy professor Sidney Hook sums it up: "By their lawless actions, the members of SDS threaten to become the true grave diggers of academic freedom in the United States."

**SALABLE LINE**

SDS was activated in June 1962 by a gathering of 50 collegians at Port Huron, Mich. The organization's first manifesto was the "Port Huron Statement," a 30,000-word mildly Marxist economic critique of America. In it, the members were, in one SDSer's words, "naming the enemy and then saying how to get him."

This has proven a most salable line among the new collegiate generation. In just 14 years, America's college population has skyrocketed from 2,600,000 to seven million. Typically, at Cornell the biggest freshman and sophomore classes fell to green teaching assistants with an average age of 26; at Berkeley, 900 graduate assistants carried the instruction load in the first two years, and classes often bloated to 1500.

Thousands of students arrived on campus expecting close and intellectually enriching contact with wise professors, and instead crashed up against the increasing impersonality, the anonymity and regimented demands of today's mass universities.

Some among them began looking for a scapegoat. Yale psychologist Kenneth Keniston calls the activists a tiny minority with a "protest-prone personality." Prof. Lewis Feuer, who quit Berkeley in disgust after campus totalitarians took over, found them "possessed by a terrible, compulsive irrationality that corrupted their idealism." Another critic diagnosed this significant and talented minority as "super-idealists, unhappy because America fails to live up to its textbook image, upset because life is different from dreams."

Bored with the prospect of ordinary careers in the affluent "post-industrial" technocracy, many of these students began cranking SDS mimeographs, walking picket lines and attending SDS rallies. By mid-1968, SDS claimed to have 6300 dues-paying members with another 35,000 unregistered participants in 250 chapters, all under the direction of SDS headquarters in a shabby two-room flat on Chicago's West Madison Street.

#### MINISKIRTS AND MANUALS

The student who walks into an SDS meeting today hears Marxist rhetoric often virtually indistinguishable from Radio Moscow's worst Stalinist paranoia. SDS organizers denounce "oppressors," "exploiters," and the "Al Capones who run this country." The university is a "colony" of "the military-industrial complex." Members refer openly to themselves as "professional revolutionaries" whose careers are "committed to the destruction of imperialism and capitalism." SDS National Secretary Greg Calvert boasted to a New York Times reporter: "We're working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. We're actively organizing sedition."

Scores of those who have swallowed the SDS hook are attracted by big issues such as slum poverty, civil rights and the Vietnam war. But SDS strategy also calls for pouncing on any issue that will excite students. At Princeton it was letting girls in the dormitories, at the University of Texas the presence of a Confederate flag, at San Francisco State a food-price protest and demand to take over the cafeteria and bookstore, at the University of Chicago a controversy over draft-deferment exams and class rankings.

"Every attempt should be made to connect campus issues with off-campus questions," advises former SDS Vice President Carl Davidson. "In the high schools, raise demands to wear long hair and miniskirts, and then politicize them," prescribes a California SDSer. At Wisconsin, another reports, "We organized dormitory students around rules, and then it was easy to move them on such issues as the university's relation to Chase Manhattan Bank."

Specific suggestions for throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery of society include such tactics as: picking public fights with welfare workers; starting trash-can fires and pulling fire alarms in high schools as "forms of protest"; making appointments by the score with university deans and registrars—to "overuse the bureaucracy"; checking out an inordinate number of books to disrupt libraries and study programs; dis-

rupting draft boards by registering under a false name so "federal agents will spend much time attempting to track down people who do not exist." Such tactics are far more than youthful pranks. Their ultimate goal is nothing less than the destruction of society itself.

#### HOW PINK?

Though the SDS has an image of independent radicalism, mounting evidence indicates it is not as much a "New Left" as it would have press and public believe. For instance:

Communists have sat in on SDS meetings and coached organizers from the start. In turn, SDS leaders have been welcomed at secret Communist conventions.

The 1965 SDS convention repealed a constitutional stipulation barring communists from membership. Subsequently, Communist Party leaders quietly told members they "could work through SDS." Soon a Progressive Labor Party group sympathetic to the Red Chinese moved into SDS. Today the Maoist, Stalinist and Trotskyite Communist Parties abound at SDS conventions and control some SDS chapters.

SDSers maintain contracts with Communist nations through frequent foreign travels. Tom Hayden, an SDS founder and its tactical chieftain, visited Hanoi in 1965 with top U.S. Red strategist Herbert Aptheker. He has also sojourned in Moscow, Peking and Havana. In September 1967, 10 SDSers journeyed to Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, for a week-long ultra-secret powwow with Vietcong and North Vietnamese representatives. Other leaders went to Havana for Castro's International Cultural Congress last January.

A strong Communist flavor as vividly apparent at SDS's national convention in East Lansing, Mich., last June. Moved by the romantic image of Castro, delegates spouted the maxims of Che Guevara and paraded in khakis. Of the three national officers chosen, only one failed to proclaim himself a communist. Before her unanimous election as inter-organizational secretary, non-student Bernadine Dohrn, 26, was asked if she was a "socialist." Her reply: "I consider myself a revolutionary communist." At that, the audience of 500 rose in cheers.

The SDSers marched the red flags of Communist revolution and the black flag of anarchy to the dais of their convention hall. Without a ripple of dissent, speaker after speaker espoused the dogma that American society must be destroyed by constant disruption now and revolutionary "armed struggle" when the time is ripe. "The ability to manipulate people through violence and mass media has never been greater, the potential for us as radicals never more exciting, than now," one speaker proclaimed.

Behind the scenes, FBI intelligence has revealed, a secret workshop in "sabotage and explosives" dealt with what type of bomb best destroys communications and how to fire Molotov cocktails from shotguns.

Yet it would be a mistake simply to identify all SDS members as Moscow or Peking Kremlin and non-Communist. Their Common bond "is a passionate desire to destroy, to annihilate, to tear down," says FBI director J. Edgar Hoover. "To put it bluntly, they are a new type of subversive, and their danger is great."

To understand how dangerous, look at the SDS in action at the most explosive of the recent disorders—the upheaval at Columbia.

#### REVOLT AT COLUMBIA

Late last year, 300 delegates to the SDS National Council at Bloomington, Ind., decided to launch a national campaign they dubbed "Ten days to shake the empire." Secret caucuses picked Columbia for a "beacon" demonstration whose flare would spark a nationwide conflagration.

Field general for the insurrection was Jun-

ior Mark Rudd, who had been named SDS chapter chairman after returning from a January tour in Cuba. On March 27, he led a hundred followers into Low Library, Columbia's large-domed administrative center, and demanded that the university end its sponsorship of a defense research institute.

Ordered to appear for disciplinary action, Rudd announced that a new march would be made into Low Library on April 23. Blocked by 200 anti-SDS students on that date, he and his followers stormed into Hamilton Hall, Columbia's main undergraduate classroom center. There they imprisoned Dean Henry Coleman and two aides for 25 hours and unveiled a list of "demands" ranging from complete amnesty for Rudd and others to stopping construction on a nearby gym bordering Harlem. The next day, an SDS raiding party smashed into and occupied Low Library; later three other university buildings were seized.

Raiders broke into the university president's office, filched his files, handed out copies of his personal correspondence. They set up a "war room" in one building and coordinated activity through a network of 40 walkie-talkies, telephones and runners.

Shut out of their classes, other students were outraged. They formed a "Majority Coalition," swiftly marshaled 2,000 signatures demanding that the University president take "firm action." Said Coalition spokesman Paul Vilardi: "Students do have some reasonable complaints, but what SDS is doing to Columbia is like slitting your wife's throat because she eats crackers in bed."

But President Grayson Kirk vacillated. He suspended gym construction, and reportedly promised to end military research, even to tender his own resignation "for reasons of health." So 400 anti-protesters, wearing coats and ties as their own badge of protest, formed a human wall around Low Library offices to stop food and messengers. The radicals tried to storm through, swinging fists, but the blockaders held. Finally, with the radicals rumored to be arming themselves with pipes, staves, and bricks, Kirk sent the Majority Coalition home and asked police to clear the buildings.

At Low Library, 500 students and faculty blocked the way; at Fayerweather Hall, another 125. They screamed "Police brutality!" into grinding television cameras as police formed a standard riot wedge and charged, bloodying noses and heads. Police arrested 707—26 percent not on Columbia student rolls.

"This cop violence is good!" said Rudd. "We're going to get a lot of help." Grabbing the police-intervention issue, SDSers inveigled many former critics into joining a campus-wide strike. The Columbia faculty gave in and canceled formal classes for the rest of the school year.

But that was not the end of the Columbia tragedy. Four weeks later Rudd and his followers marched into Hamilton again. Campus gates were barricaded, and, following a peaceful arrest, fires were set in Fayerweather, and bricks were hurled at police. Someone even broke into the office of a professor who had condemned extremism, and there burned his manuscript and notes representing ten years of research.

#### TIME TO GET TOUGH

The sad lesson of Columbia was stated by New York Times education writer Fred M. Hechinger: "Any society, academic or otherwise, that lacks the will to defend itself against illegitimate disruption and takeover is crippled and, as a free society, may be doomed."

Indeed, the lessons must now be clear to all:

1—Students and faculty must support prompt action to maintain campus peace. At

Brooklyn College, when SDSers seized the registrar's office, other students condemned the disrupters as "today's version of Hitler's storm troopers," demanded "strict enforcement of the law"—and got it. College authorities summarily expelled the rebels, police carted them off, and peace returned to Brooklyn College.

2—College administrators must not appease or temporize with totalitarian minorities using coercion and anti-democratic tactics. Although the intervention of civic police was abhorrent to all, both students and administrators at Columbia admit that firm action taken against the first few hundred Hamilton Hall sit-ins would have avoided the escalation of protest to a university-wide strike. Before Columbia's troubles were over 5,000 students were involved, a serious clash with police had occurred, and the entire school had suffered an inestimable loss of prestige.

3—We must all support basic university reforms that are needed. Inevitably, a "knowledge factory" atmosphere has developed from the campus population explosion, with accompanying depersonalization and frustration. Educators must pay far more attention to the individual student and to legitimate, orderly expression of grievances.

Talking to educators and students around the country, I find a hopeful, growing determination that responsible, forceful action by the democratic can demolish the SDS "imperialist conspiracy" syndrome. "Students are usually idealists and in fact come to college to seek a better world by getting the best possible education," Columbia junior Jonathan Edelstein said to me. "But if we let a dictatorial extremist minority who think they have already found all the answers rob us of that opportunity, we will lose the future."

#### FALK OFFERS WAY OUT OF VIETNAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 priority of the American Government right now should be to end our tragic military engagement in South Vietnam. All other problems facing this Nation—ranging from deployment of the Safeguard ABM to the need for tax reform and to the dismantling of the Job Corps—relate very directly to the disastrous adventurism we have been following in Southeast Asia over the past decade.

Last week's address by President Nixon was impressive only because it was his first real look at the problems of reducing our Vietnam commitment. But if the President intends to continue along a path of gradual give and take, it means only that we are in for an extremely drawn-out period of negotiation and counter-negotiation. Meanwhile the fighting goes on, the killing and destruction mount.

Last month, Dr. Richard A. Falk, Milbank Professor of International Law at Princeton University, presented a logical and realistic program that will bring to a quicker close the tragedy of Vietnam. I believe Professor Falk's analysis and recommendations to be of great merit, and

I now submit his speech for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

#### AN END FOR THE VIETNAM WAR: A PLAN AND A RATIONALE

(By Richard A. Falk, Milbank Professor of International Law at Princeton University, and fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 1968-69)

By now there is almost general assent to the assertion that the prospects for peace in Vietnam depend heavily on whether the United States Government can and will exert effective influence upon the Saigon regime. As matters now stand it seems evident that the government in Saigon headed by Nguyen Van Thieu will do what it can to prevent a negotiated end to the Vietnam War. It alone, of the four parties to the Paris talks, stands to gain from an indefinite continuation of the military stalemate and it alone stands to lose from changing this stalemate on the battlefield into a political compromise in the conference hall. In fact, the leadership of this Saigon regime cannot realistically expect to stay in power or possibly even to stay alive long after American troops are withdrawn, and it must and will act accordingly.

Vietnam is largely an agricultural country. As such, political control over the more than 12,000 villages of Vietnam is a basic ingredient of national power. Through the years the N.L.F. has created the kind of civil-military presence that gives it preponderant control in the countryside. So long as this control persists, and it is very difficult to dislodge, no hostile regime in Saigon can expect to exercise governmental authority in South Vietnam. Furthermore, the elections of 1967, although rigged by Saigon to a large extent, demonstrated that the Thieu-Ky group even lacked political support in the principal cities of South Vietnam. The Saigon regime is, in short, no political match for the N.L.F., and there is every reason to think that Thieu, Ky, and Huong understand their lack of popular support. The regime also knows that, without the Americans, it is no military match for the N.L.F. and so it opposes any effort to withdraw foreign troops and to remove from the scene the fantastic array of counterinsurgency weapons that the United States has brought to bear against the N.L.F. and the military units of North Vietnam.

But does the leadership of the United States understand that the Saigon regime cannot hope to survive a negotiated peace? The pursuit of peace at Paris needs to take full account of the vulnerability of the Thieu regime to peace in Vietnam. It is difficult to assess the official American attitude toward this critical issue at this stage. It seems clear that American pressure has been used to bring the Saigon regime to Paris and induced its offer of negotiations with the N.L.F. [William Shannon, of the New York Times, said that] it is President's Nixon's "guiding belief that to make peace in Vietnam with the cooperation of the Saigon regime is difficult, to make peace without it is impossible." [N.Y. Times, April 6, 1969, Sec. 4, p. 4.] My position arises from the opposite proposition—namely, that to make peace in Vietnam with the cooperation of the Saigon regime is impossible, to make peace without this cooperation is difficult. This difference in emphasis bears directly on the time needed to bring the fighting to an end in Vietnam and the stability of the political settlement reached through negotiations. On both counts President Nixon's "guiding belief" leads to bad results.

It seems important, first of all, to give some reasons for believing that the Saigon regime, as presently constituted, opposes a negotiated ending to the Vietnam War. The Thieu government opposed the original partial halt of bombing North Vietnam on March 31, 1968, and its extension to the whole of North Vietnam as of October 31, 1968; Saigon

leaders have repeatedly advocated the resumption of bombing in the North and have even threatened to do so on their own. The Saigon government effort made no secret of its obstructive attitudes at every stage of the long effort to get the Paris talks started. In South Vietnam the Saigon regime continues to promise a military victory and, most significantly, to treat as a political crime the advocacy of a negotiated compromise or a coalition government. The jails of South Vietnam are filled with non-Communist political prisoners, including prominent leaders of opposition groups, conservatively estimated at 20,000 [Fellowship of Reconciliation 'White Paper'], whose only crime is to promote in Saigon the sort of compromise settlement that Thieu and Ky say in Paris that they favor. A moderate student leader in South Vietnam, Tran Van Minh, has estimated that 95 percent of the people oppose the regime and its policies toward the war. Newspapers in South Vietnam are censored, censored, and even shut down by the Government if they urge a negotiated compromise or express support for a strategy of reconciliation. As recently as March 15, 1969, a leading Buddhist figure, Thich Thien Minh, was arrested with 50 of his followers; he has been sentenced to 10 years of hard labor. The leaders of the Buddhist Struggle Movement of 1966 remain in jail under conditions of hardship and cruelty.

Truong Dinh Dzu, the Saigon lawyer who ran a strong second to the Thieu group in the elections of September 1967, remains in jail on a five-year conviction, obviously a reprisal for his peace campaign, his strength in urban areas, and his charges of fraud with respect to the election returns. If the Saigon government has imprisoned and keeps imprisoned the principal Buddhist and student leaders and has alienated even the urban middle classes, what kind of treatment could the supporters of the N.L.F. expect to receive if they disarmed themselves? Where is Saigon's base of popular support outside a conscripted, and not notably loyal, mass army, and an exceptionally corrupt civil bureaucracy? The evidence seems overwhelming that the Saigon government does not want to run the risk of a negotiated peace and that it is prepared to do all that it can to prevent its occurrence. Otherwise, it would make no sense to prohibit and punish third force politics. If this assessment is correct, then the prospects for peace remain poor so long as Saigon's assent is a condition. The United States has, on occasion, displayed some capacity to create puppets, but almost none to manipulate them. In the Orient in particular, there is a long tradition by which weak governments allow a powerful foreigner to enter the country as an ally and then manipulate him mercilessly thereafter; the trojan horse becomes a mouse, in effect. The United States has, for instance, been manipulated into burdensome policies against its own geo-political interests for two decades by tying its Asian policy so closely to the wishes of the helplessly dependent client regime of Chiang Kai Shek on Formosa. There is little reason, then, to suppose that we will have the tact and skill to induce the Saigon regime to act against its perceived interests. Whatever else, Thieu and his followers are Vietnamese, whose entire life-style, if not their life, is at stake. Let us, at least, not be so naive as to think that such leaders can be easily persuaded to act in the manner that we deem sensible for the service of our interests, which have at last apparently been crystallized around finding a way to turn a military stalemate into a political compromise.

There is one problem even with this more moderate United States war aim: the military stalemate has been possible only as the result of a massive U.S. effort during recent years. This effort has greatly exceeded the

support that has been given to the N.L.F. by D.R.V.; at each stage of the war, including the present one, the simultaneous withdrawal of all foreign forces on both sides would seem likely to lead to rapid political and military victory by the N.L.F., the military stalemate would be broken.

Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense, has acknowledged as much in March of 1969 when he testified before the Senate Armed Forces Committee after recently returning from Vietnam.

Mr. Laird, while reporting to the Senate that South Vietnam now has 1,000,000 men under arms, being furnished with more and better U.S. equipment, nevertheless concluded that no U.S. troop reductions could be foreseen. In Mr. Laird's words: "The current operating assumption as stated to me is that even the currently funded modernization program for South Vietnamese forces will equip the South Vietnamese forces only to withstand the V.C. insurgents that would remain after all North Vietnamese forces had been withdrawn to North Vietnam." As a result Mr. Laird was advised by U.S. military planners in Saigon "that no reduction in U.S. personnel would be possible in the absence of total withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops." Mr. Laird conceives of "beginning" [the word alone staggers the imagination] "the development of indigenous forces which would be capable of suppressing the insurgency on their own if North Vietnamese and U.S. forces were withdrawn." This is what Mr. Laird has chosen to describe [in a U.S. News and World Report interview (April 7, 1969, p. 31)] as "Vietnamizing" the war, as unhappy a verbal choice as it is disastrous as a basis for U.S. policy. He explained that he preferred to describe this policy as "Vietnamizing" rather than "de-Americanizing" because in his words "[t]o many people, 'de-Americanizing' the war means that we would give up our objective, which is self-determination for the people of Vietnam. I would like to see that objective achieved by the Vietnamese people." [P. 31.]

Such a contention is so perversely absurd that it suggests ignorance rather than malice; even to mention the word self-determination in a situation in which the main progressive political forces have joined or sympathize with the N.L.F. and where the leaders of more conservative and traditional political forces are jailed as enemies of the state is to invoke an ideal whose realization has been frustrated, not advanced, by the policies we are following in Vietnam. Had the logic of self-determination ever been allowed to assert itself in Vietnam after 1954 there would never have been a war, had self-determination been our objective the war would have ended long ago and the country reunified under the modernizing leadership of the N.L.F. Let us not, after all these years, deceive ourselves at the expense of the Vietnamese. The indications are now that President Nixon's peacemaking strategy is a more moderate variant of what Mr. Laird has said. It seems based upon building up the fighting potential of the Saigon armed forces, token deescalation (say 50,000 Americans withdrawn by the end of 1969), and a long slow process of dual negotiations, public and secret. Such an approach to peace in Vietnam is inadequate. It will take much too long and it is not even likely to work. In addition, it is premised on the need to base peace on some arrangement that is acceptable to the Saigon regime. The effort to build the Saigon regime into something more than an isolated military apparatus has been the illusion that so many pre-Nixon Vietnam policies were fastened to. It has been neither a worthwhile or an attainable objective in the past. It is certainly not worthwhile now, and it is probably not attainable either, at least not without several more years of bloodshed and ravage. To

sacrifice more lives because so many have been lost already is to compound the error, not to vindicate the commitment. President Nixon seems, against his evident will, to be drifting into an approach to Vietnam resembling his predecessors, an approach that will bring neither a military victory nor a political settlement, but merely a cruel continuation of a military stalemate, that routinely entails 1600 B-52 bombing raids per month against utterly defenseless, and often heavily populated, target areas throughout South Vietnam.

But how can a political compromise be sustained in a setting where the adversary, the N.L.F., possesses the only national structure capable of both fighting and governing in South Vietnam? The Saigon regime has no actual and little potential political base; it might eventually be able, with its huge armies and payroll, to rule, if not to govern, the country in the absence of the N.L.F. But whatever else, the N.L.F. is not absent, and it will not, after years of struggle and sacrifice, allow Saigon to rule South Vietnam. It is barely possible that third force groups, especially the Buddhists in conjunction with the urban middle classes, if given a measure of political freedom, might be able to organize a political party that was capable of governing or sharing power with the N.L.F., but such third force groups would lack all capacity to rule or to offset N.L.F. military pressure. Only a coalition between the third force groups and the civil-military bureaucracy would have a reasonably secure counter-structure with some prospect of power-sharing with the N.L.F. But such a coalition is impossible so long as the generals in control of the Saigon regime keep moderate politicians in prison. And, in fact, it seems impossible unless the Saigon regime itself changes its character and outlook; even then any effort at this stage to coalesce a counter-structure to the N.L.F. is up against immense odds. The N.L.F. has existed for many years, has superb organization, and has established an apparent unity of purpose that has retained its sharp focus through all these years of fighting a war of great destructive magnitude. The N.L.F., although more diverse than most Americans realize, is itself presently trying to broaden its political base to preempt the third force option. This broadening has involved cooperation with the Alliance of National, Democratic, and Peace Forces, an urban coalition founded by eminent leaders of civic life in Saigon and Hue after Tet, 1968, and it has involved an indicated policy of reconciliation and cooperation with diverse, even antagonistic, forces. One would expect the N.L.F., even more than the Saigon regime, to oppose the formation of an effective counter-structure in the closing stages of the war; without the existence of such a counter-structure the prospects of a power-sharing compromise contribute a thin veneer to disguise the realities of political defeat for the anti-N.L.F. forces in South Vietnam. There is no way to overcome this underlying political imbalance in South Vietnam by military means.

The American military effort, despite its scale and savagery, cannot expect to do more than prevent victory by the N.L.F. By being able to destroy any concentration of people and dwellings identifiable as "enemy-held," the United States can successfully thwart, punish, and deter N.L.F. strategies of "liberation," especially if directed at cities and "liberation" is destruction and the N.L.F., however hard it is for the Americans to accept, are, unlike their Saigonese opponents Vietnamese patriots that do not act to invite unnecessary destruction of their country. The N.L.F. has often deliberately avoided visible liberation of government-occupied territories. Informal arrangements between A.R.V.N. and N.L.F. are common in the countryside where the former pays taxes

and, sometimes, give supplies in exchange for a pledge of no-attack. These arrangements, so bewildering to Americans, have been described in convincing detail by Katsuchi Honda in a series of articles for the middle-of-the-road Japanese newspaper *Asahi Shimbun*; these articles are available in English translation and should be read by as many Americans as possible.\*

By any normal test, the N.L.F. has won the war in Vietnam. Henry Kissinger, the Presidential Adviser, writing about Vietnam shortly before his appointment to office, suggested as "one of the cardinal maxims of guerrilla war" the proposition that "the guerrilla wins if he does not lose. The conventional army loses if it does not win." [Kissinger, "The Viet Nam Negotiations," 47 Foreign Affairs, 211, 214 (1969).] The United States has acted only to prevent an N.L.F. victory, hence the guerrilla has not lost; hence it has won. It is essential to grasp these facts of underlying military and political imbalance that are critical for any sense of what constitutes a reasonable settlement for Vietnam.

The United States is clearly able to inflict fantastic losses on the N.L.F. and to devastate Vietnamese society in the process of denying victory to the N.L.F. To stop this process of destruction is clearly in the interest of the N.L.F. and D.R.V., as well as ourselves. In fact, the bargaining position of the U.S. rests on its ability to stop what it is doing and get out. It does not rest on the existence of a real counter-structure to the N.L.F. that might make a genuine political case for transferring a stalemate from the battlefield to the political process. Therefore, a political settlement will, at best, be fragile as its implementation would necessarily depend on the part of the N.L.F.-D.R.V. Once U.S. forces leave Vietnam the survival of a political compromise, because of the realities of power in the country, is probably at the sufferance of the N.L.F., for the reasons outlined above: namely, that no counter-structure to the N.L.F. will have emerged and no over-balanced military counterweight will remain. But the alternative to acknowledging this situation is to go on with this barbaric war to no effect. The incentives for N.L.F. restraint in such circumstances would relate to maintaining whatever settlement process was agreed upon. If there was no prospect of a seizure of control by anti-N.L.F. forces in the course of regroupment and internal disarmament, then I think there is reason to believe that the N.L.F. leadership would not disrupt the formal settlement procedures, although the possibility of struggles among various Vietnamese groups cannot be entirely excluded. Incentives to induce compliance by the Governments in North and South Vietnam could be woven into the settlement process, especially in relation to the receipt of economic assistance for reconstruction, trade and aid, and progress toward reunification. We should understand, however, that the N.L.F. is almost certain to hold the balance of power in the South and the N.L.F.-D.R.V. in the country as a whole after the war ends. Ho Chi Minh and his government remains the transcendent expression of national liberation and unity for all of Vietnam, his ideological identity being a matter of secondary importance. The patriotic struggle for national autonomy and freedom has been carried on for several decades under the leadership of Hanoi, and it is this struggle,

\*It is possible to obtain copies of Mr. Honda's two pamphlets, "Vietnam—A Voice from the Villages" and "The National Liberation Front—the so-called Viet Cong" by sending to The Committee for the English Publication of "Vietnam—A Voice from the Villages," 13-7 Nishitaka 2 Chome, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN. There is a small charge depending on the quantity ordered and whether copies are sent by air or sea mail.

not its Western perception as a conflict between Communists and anti-Communists, that remain dominant in Vietnam today.

The conflict going on in Vietnam (and elsewhere in the ex-Colonial world) is clarified by distinguishing three outlooks:

1. Colonialist and/or neo-colonialist
2. Anti-colonialist and traditionalist
3. Anti-colonialist and modernizer

In the first category are Vietnamese who benefitted or identified with the colonial system or its neo-colonial sequel in the South, people who have willingly fought for both the French and the Americans. Many members of the ruling group of generals in Saigon have had this background, as do most leaders of the Catholic Church in Vietnam, and some large landholders. Others, most prominently Ngo Dinh Diem, Premier from 1955 until his assassination in late 1963, belong in the second category; they were anti-French, but sought to maintain intact the traditional social order of Vietnamese society based on a feudal structure of social, economic, and political privilege. The social conservative and traditionalist is likely to have been anti-French, but pro-American. In the third category are those Vietnamese who seek radical social reform, a strong central state, and a major effort to build rapidly a modern industrial state in Vietnam. In the North this third position has, of course, prevailed, being facilitated by the strong anti-colonial leadership of Ho Chi Minh that succeeded in mobilizing a wide united front in opposition to the French and organizing an effective government thereafter. In the South as a consequence of the transitional arrangements agreed upon in 1954 at Geneva, a regime was installed that was nationalist in orientation, but far less concerned with nationalist goals than with the preservation of the traditional social order of Vietnam. As a consequence, when the struggle for control broke into the open this type of Vietnamese leader accepted a neo-colonial presence in the form of American support to avoid losing power to the more radical elements in the South that began to coalesce around the N.L.F. in the early 1960's after the Diem administration made it apparent that any reformist orientation would be subject to rigid repression. The perception of the conflict in Vietnam has been distorted by the fact of the Nationalist cause in the revolutionary war against the French and by the strong political significance of the ethnic minorities in the South. To the United States Government from 1950 onwards, that is, during the colonial war with the French, the radical ideology of the Vietminh and their presumed affiliation with the international communist movement has been the prime feature of the conflict, inducing our high level of economic support for the French colonial cause (the U.S. was paying 80 percent of the cost of the Indochina War in its closing years and in the spring of 1954 the United States tried to organize a cooperative Western military intervention on behalf of the French). Some conservative groups, including the leadership of the Catholic Church, tended to confirm this view of the first Indochina war, preferring colonial status to a communist orientation.

At best, Catholic leaders, like Diem himself, preferred exile to allegiance in the war of independence. On the other hand, many Vietnamese placed, and continue to do so, the struggle for national autonomy and unity far above other values, including the post-colonial orientation of the government, and for them Ho Chi Minh is a great revolutionary hero, and whether or not he is a Communist as well is of far lesser importance. For others, the importance of the anti-colonial movement does not end with the achievement of national independence, but must go on to destroy the traditional structures of domestic society and initiate the work of reconstruction and modernization. Again, the political ideology of the modern-

izing elite often seems less important than its commitment to these tasks. After 1954 the Diem regime in the South sought to build a strong national state without seeking to disturb the traditional structures of Vietnamese society. This brought that regime into sharp conflict with the religious sects and ethnic minorities who sought, above all else, to retain their autonomy over the affairs of their quite distinct groups; also Diem abolished elections at the village level and thereby undermined the most meaningful form of political participation for most Vietnamese in their society of villages, a form of political participation that had even existed during the colonial period. As a consequence, Diem's form of Catholic nationalism, while traditionalist in socio-economic policy, had the effect of alienating both the ethnic and religious minorities and the rural population, or, that is, most of South Vietnam. The Thieu regime has corrected some of these centralizing tendencies of Diem without threatening the traditional social and economic structure of the South, and has thereby gained some support, at least as expressed in the 1967 elections, from such ethnic minorities as the Montagnards and Chams and from such religious sects as the Cao Dai and Hoa Hoa.

The N.L.F. is both a centralizing and modernizing radical minority that threatens to break down the traditional structures of the South with a radical program of land reform, widespread public education, mass political movements, and a high degree of centralism and conformism. But the key point, so often lost on Americans, is that the Communist leadership of the N.L.F. is secondary to the struggle between traditionalism and modernism that is going on in the South. Because the traditionalists were either pro-French or aloof from the colonial war their side has been comparatively weak throughout Vietnamese society, progressively weakened in the years since 1954 because of their dependence on outside, foreign help—leading to the creation of an extreme neo-colonialist situation in which many more Western troops are in the South at far worse consequences for Vietnam than at any time during the French period.

The legitimacy of the nationalist element in the original Diem position was soon lost as a consequence of growing American prominence in South Vietnam; the issue of anti-Communism became virtually the sole rallying cry of those Vietnamese on our side (with the limited exception of certain ethnic minorities who fear a loss of their autonomy if traditional Vietnamese society is changed). For most third force groups concern about the threat of Communism is far less significant, especially at this stage in the conflict, the attainment of peace and national autonomy (the expulsion of the foreign invader is the recurrent theme and source of national glory throughout Vietnamese history); it is for this reason that even non-Communist political groups, including such socially and economically conservative groups as the Buddhists, are left-leaning in the sense of preferring to risk an N.L.F. victory rather than endure a continuation of the war under Thieu's leadership; hence, the regime's suppression of these groups and hence its inevitable political isolation. The Thieu government has by now alienated, if not worse, virtually all anti-colonial and anti-traditionalist elements in Vietnamese society. The explanation of this alienation is at the root of the weakness of the Saigon regime and helps to explain why it can never hope to survive peace or the departure of the Americans. De-Americanization is thus a cruel hoax, prolonging the agony without altering the political situation. No American effort, whether military or political, can overcome this fundamental loss of appeal and legitimacy by the Thieu government, and they know it. To suggest, then, that Vietnamese self-

determination can be promoted by "Vietnamizing" the war, that is, by increasing the military capability of the Saigon regime, as Mr. Laird suggested, is to reveal how deeply we misunderstand what we are doing in South Vietnam. By now, we should at least realize that the largest obstacle by far to Vietnamese self-determination is, and has been all along, American support for Saigon.

#### AN OUTLINE OF A PROPOSAL TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

We are left, then, with the overwhelming question: How, in light of this analysis, can the war in Vietnam be brought to an end? It is generally conceded that the United States Government is unwilling at this stage to admit its mistakes and withdraw honorably from the war in Vietnam. Too much blood, too much treasure has been wasted to say so. Too many American reputations, fortunes, and careers have been and are continuing to be built on advice to Saigon and Washington about how to defeat the N.L.F. Because the error has been so momentous the scandal must be disguised. This is the initial somewhat alarming critical fact that a proposed settlement must encompass if it is to have any prospect of being acceptable. The second critical fact is the acknowledgement that there is now no way to win the war for Saigon. More blood, more treasure will produce more devastation, but not victory for the American side. As it is, Vietnam is being devastated at a rate that no country has ever endured over such a long period. We use cruel and superior weapons to inflict heavy casualties on the Vietnamese and then complain bitterly about their tactics that produce our own far smaller, but still very considerable, losses. The military-political consensus in Washington now seems built around the proposition that, although we cannot defeat the N.L.F., we can and should indefinitely prevent its victory. This military stalemate is costly in many ways and, therefore, the incentive to find a political settlement that preserves the military standoff—no N.L.F. victory—is high. The United States Government has seemed increasingly ready since March 31, 1968, to find such a negotiated compromise, but not on realistic terms. To keep the government of Thieu-Ky-Huong in power is *not* to achieve compromise. A compromise entails a power-sharing setup that corresponds to the political and military realities of Vietnam. It is essential that policy-makers in Washington begin to define a compromise in these terms.

The third critical fact is that the assured prevention of an N.L.F. victory in peace is even harder than has been the prevention of an N.L.F. victory in war. Given the political imbalance—the strong anti-traditionalist, anti-neo-colonialist majority—it is hard to believe that a compromise would hold up after American troops left Vietnam. Therefore, Washington searches for some way by which the imbalance can be effectively denied expression, that the real dominance of the N.L.F. will be somehow kept from view in the postwar period in Vietnam. Such a search is in vain so long as third force politics are repressed by Saigon. And, of course, for the Saigon regime more than their reputations are at stake—their positions of power, and quite likely their lives would be placed in severe jeopardy, in such jeopardy that no amount of reassurance on our part or security on their part could produce confidence. And it is for this reason that the Saigon regime cannot risk peace, especially if peace entails disarming their forces and losing unilateral control over police and militia units. And unless peace implies this, the N.L.F. would have to be wildly self-destructive to participate in the arrangement.

A proposal for peace in Vietnam needs to take these considerations into account. The United States Government requires some bargaining leverage in relation to both the N.L.F.—D.R.V., but even more so, in relation

to the Saigon regime. This leverage cannot be acquired by escalation or by prolonging the present level of stalemate. Deescalation is the only way to acquire diplomatic leverage in relation to both sides in the Vietnamese struggle: for Hanoi and the N.L.F., the process of deescalation is itself a prime goal as it involves, above all else, the partial withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam; for Saigon, deescalation is a way of underlining the writing already on the wall, either the regime comes to support the search for a compromise settlement, tendering its good faith by releasing the non-Communist political prisoners from jail and providing an atmosphere for the practice of third force politics, or the Americans will indeed go home and leave the regime exposed to their N.L.F. and other adversaries. Deescalation is a process and an attitude, not a single event located in time. Hence, one side—the N.L.F.—D.R.V.—has an incentive to strengthen the process and reward the attitude and the other side—the Saigon regime—has the incentive to stop or slow the process and undermine the attitude.

Significant deescalation is critical to a rapid settlement of the war. To illustrate this position I have prepared an outline of a settlement plan designed to suggest a direction of approach. The plan is divided into three stages and has the following main elements.

**Stage I. Incremental Withdrawals:** In Stage I the United States would initiate the withdrawal of its troops at a rate of between 50,000 and 100,000 every two months. The rationale of this process of withdrawal should be allowed to remain publically ambiguous. By more quiet channels of diplomatic communication withdrawal should be loosely linked to some kind of reciprocal behavior by the North Vietnamese, at least to the extent of the expectation that the D.R.V. would refrain from major combat drives or from increasing markedly the rate of infiltration. The United States should make it clear that certain kinds of D.R.V. initiatives in the war would lead to the termination, possibly even the reversal, of the withdrawal process. In our relations with Saigon we should convey the intention to continue the process of withdrawal until the regime has been dramatically liberalized, political prisoners released, and third force political activity allowed. At this point, negotiations in Paris would be more likely to achieve agreement on a political settlement as Saigon would come to realize that a bargain, however risky, was preferable to defeat. It is true that such a withdrawal process might lead to the collapse of the Thieu regime, possibly even to its sudden abdication from power. But, in my judgment, this would be a positive achievement of the policy, not a sign of its failure. The Saigon regime is not fit to govern South Vietnam or even to share in this process. Incremental withdrawal is a stage-setting prelude to a negotiated compromise that might disguise the American defeat in Vietnam for a reasonable length of time.

**Phase II. The Shape of Settlement:** There are several central elements in a negotiated compromise of the sort that should be attainable in Paris:

(1) The completion of the process of withdrawal of foreign troops; perhaps on an informal basis, perhaps more formally; reconnaissance capabilities could monitor any agreed rate of withdrawal without the need for any more complicated apparatus of inspection;

(2) The establishment of a partial cease-fire by agreeing to stop offensive (or initiated) operations in certain areas and by stopping certain kinds of military operations; the gradual enlargement of the cease-fire until it becomes total at a fixed date;

(3) The regroupment and disarmament of N.L.F. and A.R.V.N. main-force units in various areas, separated from each other, but not in a form that would encourage the partition

of the country. This process might be observed and reported upon by an augmented International Control Commission.

(4) The formation of a South Vietnamese provisional government that includes strong representation on the part of three groups: the N.L.F., the army and civil service, and the third force constituencies, especially the Buddhists and the urban civilian classes. The Minister of the Interior in this provisional government should be a third force political figure of prominence who would be entrusted with control over police functions. The composition of the provisional government would be determined, if at all possible, by agreement among representatives of the three principal political groupings in South Vietnam and ratified through formal declarations issued on behalf of the United States and North Vietnam;

(5) A schedule and procedure for holding elections based on free political competition and certain common rules of campaigning. Elections should be held in stages; first, on a village level; second, on district and province levels; and third, on the national level. An International Election Observation Commission (IEOC) could be established to observe and report on the conduct of these elections; it would be staffed and funded on an agreed international basis and would include observers from each major Vietnamese political party. The national elections would be held within two years after the date of a formal cease-fire was declared, unless a majority of the IEOC postponed the date of the elections for reasons given in an accompanying public report. The growth of constitutional democracy should not be insisted upon at the cost of other elements of peace in Vietnam;

(6) The parties to a final settlement would make a pledge of amnesty, all prisoners would be released and exchanged, and guarantees against reprisals would be made. The United States, and possibly other countries, would agree to offer asylum for South Vietnamese applicants up to 10,000 in number. A second observation group—International Peace Observation Group (I.P.O.G.)—should be constituted to investigate and report upon allegations of reprisal. After a civil struggle of such cruelty, bitterness, and duration, there are almost certain to be, especially at local levels, some reprisals in the struggle to repay old debts or to eliminate economic or political rivals from the scene; the effort of the IPOG should try to keep reprisals at a minimum and to prevent claims and counter-claims about reprisal activity from disrupting the settlement process.

(7) The United States should pledge \$1-2 billion per year for a minimum of three years for the economic reconstruction of war-ravaged Vietnam, both North and South. The funds should be administered by a small agency staffed by international civil servants and allocated for peaceful purposes according to proposals and priorities determined by the two Vietnamese governments, The Soviet Union, and possibly France, West Germany, and Japan, might also be encouraged to contribute funds in this manner for Vietnamese economic reconstruction.

(8) The reunification of Vietnam shall proceed according to a schedule determined by voluntary negotiations between the two governments of Vietnam, but not commencing until after the elections of a national government in the South. In the event that elections are not held in the South, or that the elected government is overthrown in some way, then reunification can be negotiated, provided it does not take formal effect prior to five years from the formal declaration of a cease-fire in the South. In the meantime, South Vietnam will follow a neutral foreign policy, enter no military alliance, allow no foreign bases or troops on its territory, and receive no foreign military assistance except that needed for internal police security. Relations between the North and

South will be normalized within 3-6 months after the cease-fire goes into effect, allowing free travel, trade, and relations between both parts of Vietnam.

(9) The settlement of the Vietnam War will be agreed to by the N.L.F., D.R.V., U.S., and representatives of the provisional Saigon government. This settlement will, in turn, if possible, be guaranteed by an international conference of principal states, including China, Japan, India, the Soviet Union, and the United States. At this conference an effort would be made to agree on a code of principles for the maintenance of peace in Asia.

#### Phase III. Sustaining Peace:

(1) The two observer groups could be withdrawn, in whole or in part, at the discretion of the elected national government in the South or, in the event national elections are not held, at any point subsequent to three years after the cease-fire is proclaimed;

(2) An annual conference of the guaranteeing parties would be held to review progress toward implementing the Vietnam settlement and toward peace in Asia. Particular attention would be given to the possibilities of neutralization of countries that seem vulnerable to civil strife and to competing interventions. A status of neutralization would not be imposed on any country unless its constituted government sought such a status and retained the right to terminate its neutralized status after three months' notice;

(3) Efforts would be made to develop normal diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations between the United States and all Asian countries, including North Vietnam and China. Offers of genuine compromise and peaceful settlement should be made with respect to disputes about the future of Okinawa and Formosa. The United States and the Soviet Union should pledge action to sponsor application for membership in the United Nations for all states that are presently non-members, including divided countries.

#### A CONCLUDING COMMENT ON THE PLAN OF SETTLEMENT

The outlines of this plan have been given in a general form. More detailed provisions would obviously be needed to implement this proposal. The plan is conceived of as encouraging a process of settlement that would continue even if disrupted in certain particulars. Not too much attention should be given to the provision for national elections. Few Asian countries have truly elected governments, and the polarities of South Vietnamese society make it less susceptible than most countries, even in the absence of decades of civil struggle, to the procedures of popular democracy. Certain important related problems, such as the settlement of the Laotian War, are here left out of explicit account. It is hoped that progress toward peace in the wider combat area of Southeast Asia could be achieved at the Conference of Guaranty or in some other more suitable diplomatic forum. As in Vietnam, however, internal struggles of revolutionary intensity are bound to continue between the forces of tradition and the forces of radical change throughout the post-colonial world. These forces of radical change may or may not be identified with Communist ideology in one of its several forms. In any event, these struggles will be determined primarily by the national conditions of each particular country, and efforts to reverse a political outcome by military intervention are bound to be costly and unlikely to be successful in any permanent sense. In fact, to intervene on behalf of the traditionalist faction is to revive the colonial phase of the struggle and shift those elements of a society which are nationalistic into the opposition. In the post-colonial period, unless a radical elite took control during the course of decolonialization, there is almost certain to be a radical challenge directed at the traditionalist structure of the national society once independence has been achieved. Without such a challenge, poverty,

disease, famine, and stagnancy are almost certain to dominate the national scene.

#### HAVE WE LEARNED ANYTHING IN VIETNAM?

If we are ever to understand the Vietnamese experience it is essential that War is to perceive clearly both phases of the revolutionary struggle; the first, to eliminate foreign influence and control and to restore the attributes of national independence; the second, to eliminate the traditional, feudalist power structure and to reconstitute the domestic political order so that modern economic and social policies can be pursued. No national revolution is complete until it passes through both phases, although the rate and form of passage will vary greatly depending on national circumstances, and especially depending on the domestic ratios of power. This kind of disruptive process is going on throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Communist and other ideologies try to relate to these fundamental pressures for change, but the realities and equities of a particular national struggle depend not on the abstract rhetoric of the cold war, but on the capabilities and backing of contending national factions. As yet, there is little evidence that revolution in the third world is understood in these terms.

Two years ago McGeorge Bundy, one of the early architects of the escalated American involvement in Vietnam, including the extension of the war to the North, commenting on American foreign policy, said that "There are wild men in the wings, but on the main stage even the argument on Vietnam turns on tactics, not fundamentals." [Bundy, "The End of Either/Or," 45 *Foreign Affairs* 189-201, 191 (1971).] The argument is on fundamentals, and it is the wild men like Mr. Bundy, sadly enough, who continue to occupy the main stage. Mr. Bundy, in what was presented as a dramatic change of view, speaking at De Pauw University in October of 1968 urged that the United States deescalate its involvement in Vietnam and, in effect, de-Americanize the war. His emphasis was on the costs to American society of continuing the war: "Until the present burden of Vietnam is at least partly lifted from our society, it will not be easy—it may not even be possible—to move forward effectively with other great national tasks. This has not always been my view, but . . . it seems to me wholly clear now that at its current level of effort and cost the war cannot be allowed to continue for long. Its penalties upon us all are much too great." (De Pauw, p. 2.) Mr. Bundy says that he no longer thinks we can have both unlimited expenditures for butter and guns, and the time has come for more stress on butter. And lest he be understood as a sudden convert to matters of principle Mr. Bundy made plain that his change of position on Vietnam was a pure matter of expediency: "I remind you also, if you stand on the other side, that my argument against escalation and against an indefinite continuation of our present course has been based not on moral outrage or political hostility to the objectives, but rather on the simple and practical ground that escalation will not work and that continuation of our present course is unacceptable." There is not even a pretension of moral concern for the suffering of Vietnam brought on by the policies he advocated with such vigor a few years earlier, nor even any humility expressed with respect to the wrongheadedness of a policy that misjudged the basic character of conflict in Vietnam.

Even so ardent a liberal critic of Administration policy in Vietnam as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., has written in March of 1969 that "The tragedy of Vietnam is the tragedy of the catastrophic overextension and misapplication of valid principles. The original insights of collective security and liberal evangelism were generous and wise." ["Vietnam and the End of the Age of Superpowers," *Harpers*, March 1969, pp. 41-49, 44.]

McGeorge Bundy and Arthur Schlesinger epitomize the liberal establishment in mid-century America. It is a pragmatic intelligence that does not allow its self-righteousness to fasten itself onto dogmas and rigid positions in the manner of Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow, but it is utterly numb when it comes to dealing with the senseless tragedy that we have inflicted on the Vietnamese and ourselves. It is numb to the suffering we have caused and it is blind to the realization that we are continuing to arm a government we imposed on South Vietnam for our purposes so that it can better fight against its own population in the name of self-determination.

We will learn nothing from the Vietnam war until we begin to listen directly to the Vietnamese victims of our policies. Eventually we may be able to listen to the leaders of the N.L.F. and discover that they are not demonic terrorists of a hardened Communist variety, but intelligent, dedicated Vietnamese patriots that want above all else to be given a chance, at last, to build a new and better Vietnamese society for their long-oppressed population and that they see some form of socialism as the best way to do this.

Perhaps Americans are ready to listen to those Vietnamese that have been caught in the middle during the war, have not joined up with the N.L.F., but have advocated some kind of peaceful settlement of the war. One of the most moving of these Vietnamese documents is a recently translated article of a student leader writing with the pen name Nguyen Van Minh, who supported the Buddhist Struggle Movement and has been in prison for several years. [*The Nation*, March 24, 1969, pp. 359-62.] Nguyen Van Minh estimates that as many as 95 percent of the people living in South Vietnam are enemies of the regime in the sense of favoring a negotiated compromise with the N.L.F. It is in this darkened light of overcrowded jails that we must hear the new Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, when he insists that our objective in South Vietnam is to secure self-determination for the people.

The future of America depends on coming to terms with who we are in light of what we have done and allowed to be done in our names in Vietnam. The argument about Vietnam does concern fundamentals, not tactics; if we are to rescue ourselves from militarism and racism, then it is the McGeorge Bundys and Arthur Schlesingers who must be driven from the main stage. We need principles, as well as tactics, to conduct our foreign policy in the nuclear age. It is time for America to stop fighting against the forces of revolutionary nationalism around the globe, it is time to abandon the cruel pretension that popular causes can be suppressed by the hardware and doctrines of counterinsurgency warfare, and it is time to redeem the future by acknowledging that what we have done in Vietnam has been not merely a mistake but a tragedy. It is a time for action, not mute acquiescence. We are further dishonored as individuals and as citizens of the United States each day that we allow the government to continue this war in Vietnam in our name.

#### COMMERCIAL CHURCH PROPERTIES VALUED AT \$102.4 BILLION ESCAPE \$2.2 BILLION IN TAXES ANNUALLY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest in a current article discloses some interesting facts and sta-

tistics with respect to church-operated businesses which enjoy tax-exempt status although their activities have no relationship to the religious function of churches.

This article discloses that the value of tax-exempt church real estate property has been valued at \$102.4 billion and that this costs the American taxpayer \$2.2 billion annually.

This article reports that church-operated businesses include motels, hotels, business properties, restaurants, radio stations, manufacturing and food processing plants, and racetracks, among other businesses—all of which operate with tax-free profits.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place in the RECORD herewith the article from the Reader's Digest entitled "Should Churches Be Allowed To Do Business Tax Free?"

The article follows:

#### SHOULD CHURCHES BE ALLOWED TO DO BUSINESS TAX-FREE?

(By O. K. Armstrong)

In 1952, three churches of Bloomington, Ill.—the First Baptist, the First Christian and the Second Presbyterian—bought the Biltmore Hotel in Dayton, Ohio, for \$3,500,000, mostly on credit. They then leased back the hotel to a firm made up principally of the original owners. This firm operated it, paying the churches \$250,000 annual rent. For the churches, this was tax-exempt income, and they used part of it to pay off the purchase.

This type of transaction is often called a "bootstrap sale" because in effect the business buys itself. The advantages? As tax expert H. Vernon Scott has pointed out in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee: 1) The seller is able to ask a higher price for his business than he could get elsewhere, and so realizes a big profit—taxed at the low capital-gains rate. 2) The leasing corporation gets a high return on a small investment. 3) The church gets a profitable business—and the income, tax-free—with no risk and little if any investment. Everyone benefits except the government, which loses a source of tax revenue, and all citizen-taxpayers, who must take up the slack.

The whole procedure is entirely legal. It is a tax-avoidance plan for the business enterprise, which the church covers with the blanket of its own tax exemption. The Internal Revenue Code specifically permits churches—unlike other tax-exempt organizations such as orphanages, charitable foundations and hospitals—to engage in competitive, money-making businesses, unrelated to their religious purposes, without paying one cent of income tax. Further, churches are excused from filing any disclosure of properties or income of any kind.

Taking advantage of these provisions, numerous churches and religious orders have plunged into the world of business—by lease-back arrangements, by use of "feeder" corporations (set up to run a business and give all profits to the church), by direct ownership and operation of commercial ventures. They now own business blocks in every major city. They own apartments, restaurants, radio stations, manufacturing and food-processing plants, racetracks, even liquor stores. They produce plastics, textiles, dairy products, tires, trucks, fishing lures. And the profits are all tax-free.

#### BEHIND THE FAVORABLE DISCRIMINATION

According to the 1968 *Yearbook of American Churches*, there are about 240 religious bodies in the United States. They have a total

membership of about 124 million—or 62 percent of all Americans. The members worship in some 330,000 sanctuaries, from cathedrals to small houses, and give an estimated \$9 billion a year to these headquarters.

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits the government from passing laws "respecting an establishment of religion." And since the power to tax implies some power of control, traditionally houses of worship have never been taxed in America. Moreover, all 50 states and the District of Columbia specifically exempt from property taxation all sanctuaries and other facilities used for religious purposes.

However, property—whether real or personal—used by churches for competitive business enterprises has no constitutional basis for exemption from taxation. The laws which permit this favorable discrimination can be changed, and many responsible religious leaders, as well as many overburdened taxpayers, now urge that it be done.

Church business ventures generally fall into one or more of these three categories:

1. *Real Estate.* By analyzing the tax rolls in 14 U.S. cities and extrapolating from those figures, Dr. Martin A. Larson, author of the authoritative *Church Wealth and Business Income*, has estimated the value of tax-exempt church property in 1968 at \$102.5 billion—up 26 percent in the last four years. Larson computes that this item alone, the tax exemption on real estate, cost U.S. taxpayers \$2.2 billion last year!

In some states, church-owned businesses do pay a property tax; in others, they are exempt even from this assessment. Many churches have acquired large tracts of real estate. In 1939, a church purchased a 121-acre tract near New Britain, Conn., and after one body was buried in the tract, the land was classified as a cemetery, which reduced its taxes. In 27 years, the land appreciated in value many times over. All but ten acres of it was then sold to the city, at a high profit to the church—completely exempt from capital-gains taxes.

In downtown Chicago stands the 22-story Chicago Temple, owned by the Methodist Church. Several lower floors are used for worship and church-related purposes; the other floors are rented for commercial use. The Methodist Church pays a property tax on the commercial portion of the building—but no federal income tax on the rent receipts of \$250,000 a year.

Many church-related colleges have state charters stipulating that their properties shall remain forever tax-free. William Jewell College, for example, a Baptist-related school at Liberty, Mo., owns business realty in many Missouri communities—all tax-exempt.

Hundreds of such investments are speeding the erosion of the tax base in communities across the country, at a time when the revenue need for schools and other essential public services has become acute. "If the trend is not checked, we may expect half or more of all property to be tax-exempt within 25 years—and more than half of that will belong to churches," says C. Stanley Lowell, associate director of Americans United for Separation of Church & State.

2. *Profit-Making Enterprises.* Each year, churches acquire millions of dollars' worth of property through gifts and bequests: securities, real estate, thriving businesses. Their tax-exemption advantage makes it tempting for the church to retain and operate the business enterprises. In addition, churches sometimes invest directly in secular businesses.

The Cathedral of Tomorrow, an independent church in Akron, Ohio, owns a shopping center, an electronics company, a plastics and wire plant, an apartment complex, and a girdle factory. A trappist monastery in Kentucky sells fruitcake, cheese, Canadian bacon and beef-sausage sticks by mail. A church organization owns two major

garbage dumps outside Chicago, and leases them to a refuse collector.

Christ's Church of the Golden Rule, near Willits, Calif., purchased a luxurious ranch—once the home of Seabiscuit and other famous race horses. The church members (some 125 in number) live there while operating it as a business. They also own and operate a \$500,000 motel and several other enterprises, all exempt from federal taxation.

Printing of publications for Evangelical United Brethren churches (recently merged into the United Methodist Church) used to require most of the space of a four-story building in Dayton, Ohio. When improved printing methods made much of that space redundant, the denominational officials obtained contracts to print a brand of trading stamps.

The money involved in these business operations can be considerable. In Washington, D.C., Watergate, a new \$70-million high-rise luxury apartment complex beside the Potomac River, was financed by an Italy-based real-estate company in which the Vatican is said to have controlling interest. Profits accruing to the church in this venture are exempt from federal taxes.

There are now some 2200 tax-exempt nursing and retirement homes in operation. Where these are operated for the welfare of needy patrons, on a non-profit basis, they are properly tax-exempt. But increasing numbers of churches are using their tax-exempt status to turn them into money-making enterprises. In some cases, entry fees may run as high as \$50,000, plus monthly charges of several hundred dollars, and the church may amortize the entire facility within five or six years.

For federal and state governments, church-owned and church-operated businesses represent a large loss of revenue—the taxes that would be collected if the enterprises were run by competitive private industry. It is impossible to calculate the loss exactly, but responsible estimates put it at \$6.5 billion a year.

3. *Lease-Back Operations.* The lease-back device, exemplified by the Dayton Biltmore Hotel deal, is one of the fastest-growing ways for churches and other tax-exempt institutions to make money. An item in the *Prentice-Hall Executive Tax Report* reads: "Have you put a price on your business? You may be able to double it—by selling to a charity." And an ad in *The Wall Street Journal*: "Highly respected charitable fund (non-profit) will purchase closely held companies with minimum pre-tax profit of \$250,000. Financial and other benefits very rewarding."

Any church organization, however small, can make use of this tax advantage. For example, an enterprising executive of White Plains, N.Y., together with two ministers, organized the "Stratford Retreat House," which assumed churchly functions. According to the literature of the Retreat House, its managers purchased, as a church, on lease-back arrangements, several businesses, principally electronics firms.

Yet, the U.S. Supreme Court has refused to close this loophole in the tax laws, and Congress has rejected legislation that would eliminate it.

#### VOICES FOR REFORM

Some churches justify their involvement in unrelated businesses on the ground that all profits are fed back into church work, religious programs and good causes. But most religious leaders now seem to take a different view. They would advocate keeping the tax exemption on passive income—as from stocks, bonds, interest and rents. But they would eliminate tax exemption where a church actively engages in business projects for profit.

"Our churches are morally bound to take the lead to eliminate operations that force unfair competition upon private, tax-paying

industry," says the Rev. Clyde W. Taylor, general director of the National Association of Evangelicals, comprising 40 denominations.

"Earnings from businesses that have no direct connection with the religious purpose of the church should pay income taxes, regardless of how that income is used," agreed a conference sponsored by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

A 1966 study document of the National Council of Churches, which represents about half of the Protestant church membership in the United States, concluded: "Existing tax exemptions for unrelated business income of a church or church-related service agency should be discontinued."

Similar recommendations have been made by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the United Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. The *Washington Newsletter*, publication of the National Council of Catholic Men, in May 1967 declared: "To require churches to pay taxes on their corporate profits would remove the undemocratic advantage they now enjoy in competing with corporations and small business."

Thus, there is a clear mandate for reform. Congress, with the cooperation of church leaders of all creeds, should take action on this matter at the earliest possible moment.

#### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE STUDY DISCUSSION GROUPS

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, annually the U.S. Department of Agriculture provides a graduate school, open to qualified employees of the Federal Government, to provide needed educational opportunities for Federal employees.

According to the billing of the six meetings, July 7 through August 15 of this year, are called study-discussion groups and include such subjects as Swahili, American protest literature, racial conflict in the United States, and changing human behavior.

Many of the taxpayers who wonder what is going on in their National Government may question this educational expenditure as irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker, so our colleagues may see the study discussion group schedule, I insert the statement of purpose of the graduate school and the schedule of classes in the RECORD:

[From the 1969 summer catalog of the Department of Agriculture Graduate School]

#### STUDY-DISCUSSION GROUPS FOR FEDERAL SUMMER EMPLOYEES AND OTHER YOUNG ADULTS

Purpose of the school: The objective of the Graduate School of the United States Department of Agriculture has always been to improve the federal service by providing needed educational opportunities for federal employees. The Graduate School has six main programs: Resident evening, special, correspondence, international, public lectures, and the press. Graduate study is a primary interest of the school, but it also offers a large number of undergraduate as well as non-credit courses. All courses are open to qualified employees of the federal government and to other qualified persons as facilities permit.

#### SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Registration, June 30–July 3; classes begin July 7.

NUMBER, COURSE TITLE, CREDIT, INSTRUCTOR, DAY, TIME, AND FEE

1-5: Rocks and Fossils (non-credit), Russell C. McGregor, Bureau of the Budget, W 6:10-8, \$15. (Principal rock types and fossils of Central Atlantic Region. Three field trips.)

2-95: Improving Reading Ability (non-credit), Dee W. Henderson, Graduate School, USDA, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Skills to improve reading.)

2-26: American Protest Literature (non-credit), Eleanor W. Traylor, Montgomery Community College, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Study of selected essays, stories, and one novel.)

2-27: Significant Books of Twentieth Century (non-credit), M. Clare Ruppert, Trinity College, W 6:10-8, \$15. (Greek biography and drama.)

2-32: Swahili (non-credit), Milan G. P. de Lany, Voice of America, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Introduction to elementary Swahili.)

3-6: Preparatory Mathematics for Introductory Statistics (non-credit), William E. Kibler, Statistical Reporting Service, USDA, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Basic review of numeric operations and algebraic manipulation.)

4-9: Basic Concepts of Data Processing (non-credit), Robert E. Nicholson, National Security Agency, W 6:10-8, \$15. (Elements of data, components of machine system, and history of data processing.)

6-27: War Against Poverty USA (non-credit), Andrew S. Adams, Office of Economic Opportunity, W 6:10-8, \$15. (Federal anti-poverty programs.)

6-40: Urban Systems (noncredit), Peter W. House, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies (Coordinator), W 6:10-8, \$15. (Operation of an urban gaming model—City I or City II—in which an urban area's physical development, economic base, fiscal policy, political life, public administration, and systems operation are examined.)

6-38: Civil Rights—Problems and Solutions (non-credit), Robert J. Coates, Department of Transportation, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (To develop understanding of problems facing minority groups in our society.)

6-36: Governing Science and Technology, (non-credit), Warren H. Donnelly, Legislative Reference Service, M 6:10-8, \$15. (Review of substance and formation of science policy by Executive and Legislative branches.)

7-11: Public Policy and Environmental Pollution, (non-credit), Leon G. Billings, Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Senate Committee on Public Works, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Examination of impact of air, water, and residue of human consumption on man and society.)

7-12: Conditions of Personality Growth, (non-credit), Eugene Stammeyer, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Aspects of society that contribute to emotional integration.)

7-13: Changing Human Behavior, (non-credit), Joseph J. McPherson, Office of Education, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Basic principles involved in changing human behavior.)

7-14: Your Mind: Key to Success in Government (non-credit), James M. Keys, Department of the Interior, M 6:10-8, \$15. (Traditional Aristotelian logic as valuable tool in everyday work situations, even in computerized world.)

7-16: Racial Conflict in United States (non-credit), Stuart Wright, National Institutes of Health, M 6:10-8, \$15. (To review problems of Negro-white conflict and to help the student develop his own working philosophy of race relations.)

7-17: Introduction to Modern China, (non-credit), Joseph J. Simon, Central Intelligence Agency, W 6:10-8, 15. (Social background to modern China.)

7-20: World Politics (non-credit), Stuart

H. Sweeney, Attorney, W 6:10-8, \$15. (Basic problems of mankind relative to government.)

7-18: Youth and Change (non-credit), Logan H. Sallada, Office of Education, Th 6:10-8, \$15. (Mobility of youth and desire to establish lines of communication and identification with forces of change.)

7-38: Early Childhood Education (non-credit), Earl S. Schaefer, National Institute of Mental Health, and Lois-Ellen Datta, Office of Economic Opportunity, W 6:10-8, \$15. (Social, emotional, and cognitive development and infant and pre-school intervention.)

7-19: Great Decisions 1969 (non-credit), John B. Holden, Graduate School, USDA (Coordinator), M 6:10-8, \$15. (Czechoslovakia, Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe; Africa, Asia, and development decade; Southeast Asia; Western Europe and United States; Castro's Cuba; Middle East tinder box.)

7-21: Critical Issues and Decisions (non-credit), Dee W. Henderson, Graduate School, USDA (Coordinator), Th 6:10-8, \$15. (Man, society, and state; democracy, mass culture, excellence, and political dissent—Federal executives as leaders.)

8-16: Architecture of Washington, D.C. (non-credit), Donald E. Jackson, National Capital Planning Association, W 6:10-8, \$15. (Architecture of unique Federal City, Walking trips.)

8-17: Pencil Sketching (non-credit), James V. Cupoli, Artist, F. 6:10-8, \$15. (Sketching on Georgetown Canal.)

8-18: Art Appreciation (non-credit), Edward R. Brohel, Artist, Tu 6:10-8, \$15. (Survey of main collections in Washington museums, Field trip.)

8-70: Popular Photography (non-credit), Norman L. McCullough, Research Analysis Corporation, Th 6:10-8, \$15. (Nontechnical demonstration course.)

## SENATE—Tuesday, May 20, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Vice President.

President Hugh B. Brown, first counselor in the first presidency, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, offered the following prayer:

O God, the Eternal Father, in all of the vicissitudes of life, we are aware of Thy mercy and Thy love, and we acknowledge Thy sovereignty and omnipotence. As we pause in prayer, we thank Thee for the blessings of the past. We implore Thy forgiveness for the weaknesses to which we are prone. We pray for Thy guidance and direction in the future.

We pray that Thou wilt bless the great flag of America and the Constitution of the United States, under whose wise provisions we have our freedom. We pray that Thou wilt bless the President of the United States with wisdom, with health, and with inspiration, as he carries the heavy responsibilities of his great office.

Bless, also, all those who are engaged in Thy work in the governmental affairs of our Nation, in the executive, the legislative, and the judicial arms, that all may work together for the good and welfare of the people of our great country.

Grant us peace, O Lord, both at home and abroad, and be with us with Thy

Holy Spirit as we separate and go about our various responsibilities this day and always.

In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 16, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES FOR THE RETIRED SERVICEMAN'S FAMILY PROTECTION PLAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States received on May 19, 1969, under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 14, 1969, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to Section 1444(b), title 10, United States Code, transmitted herewith is the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries for the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan,

covering the administration of the Plan for Calendar Year 1967.

The Plan, inaugurated in November 1953, provides that members of the uniformed services may elect reduced retired pay during their lifetime in order to provide survivor annuities for their widows and children. The basic principle underlying the Plan is that reductions in retired pay shall be computed by the actuarially-equivalent method using actuarial tables selected by the Board. Thus, the Plan is to be self-supporting, imposing no added cost to the Federal Government, beyond administrative costs.

RICHARD NIXON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1969.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 14, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate on May 19, 1969, received messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on May 19, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, May 20, 1969.)