

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE ORBITING ASTRONOMICAL  
OBSERVATORY (OAO-II)

## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on May 22 to attend an awards ceremony at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., honoring the Government-industry-university team responsible for the magnificent accomplishments of the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory, OAO-II.

This spacecraft had been in orbit almost 6 months. It was launched from Cape Kennedy on December 7, 1968. Scientists say the OAO represents as great an advance in astronomy as Galileo's telescope. It is examining the universe from a wholly new vantage point, above the obscuring atmosphere of the earth.

One of the most impressive things about the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory is the teamwork that it symbolizes. I agree with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, the NASA Administrator, who said:

We have proved that men and women at widely scattered geographical points, in varied walks of life and diverse occupations and professions, can work together as a team to accomplish one of the most difficult scientific and technological goals ever undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the program and the list of awardees at the OAO ceremony. A sampling of the names—names like Kupperian, Mitchell, Garbarini, Purcell, Roman, Spitzer, and Krueger—indicates what an all-American team effort the OAO really is.

I also wish to commend Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the National Academy of Sciences, for the excellent address he delivered at the ceremony. Dr. Seitz is retiring as President of the Academy, and it was most appropriate that he was awarded the Distinguished Public Service Medal by Dr. Paine.

I include the awards as follows:

## NASA HONORARY AWARDS AND MEDALS

Frederick Seitz, National Academy of Sciences, Distinguished Public Service Medal.

Jesse L. Mitchell, OSSA, Distinguished Service Medal.

Joseph Purcell, GSFC, Distinguished Service Medal.

C. Dixon Ashworth, OSSA, Exceptional Service Medal.

Arthur D. Code, Washburn Observatory, University of Wisconsin, Public Service Award.

Robert F. Garbarini, OSSA, Exceptional Service Medal.

Donald A. Krueger, GSFC, Exceptional Service Medal.

James E. Kupperian, GSFC, Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal.

H. Robert Lynn, GSFC, Exceptional Service Medal.

Donald L. Moyer, Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation, Public Service Award.

Nancy G. Roman, OSSA, Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal.

Jack Sargent, GSFC, Exceptional Service Medal.

Nicholas S. Sinder, Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation, Public Service Award.  
Lyman Spitzer, Jr., Princeton University Observatory, Public Service Award.

Harold Wexler, Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation, Public Service Award.

Fred L. Whipple, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, Public Service Award.

## GROUP ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS

OAO-II Project Team: Launch Operations Support.

OAO-II Project Team: Launch Vehicle Management.

OAO-II Project Team: Project Management and Support, Administrative Support, Integration Support, Network Support, Project Management, Systems Review, Technology Functional Support, Test and Evaluation, Tracking and Data Support.

## THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

## HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the better arguments in support of the Safeguard ABM system was made recently by Representative MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota.

The speech effectively answers many of the arguments of the opposition which have been received by Members of Congress in recent weeks. Because of the importance of this excellent speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM AND THE CAUSE OF  
PEACE

(Speech of Representative MARK ANDREWS Before North Dakota Motor Carriers Association, Fargo, N. Dak., May 17, 1969)

We have now entered an age of missileery, yet the basic fundamentals involved in our nation's protection are little different now from what they have always been. Some 194 years ago, a silversmith in New England named Paul Revere, mounted his horse one April night and rode, as history tells us, through "every middlesex, village and farm," to warn his neighbors of military invasion. Our American ancestors were few in number in 1775 and not blessed with an abundance of worldly goods.

The Colonists were obviously no match for the power of England with its enormous professional army and the world's largest fleet. You may well ask, "What was Paul Revere actually doing? What was the practical purpose of his famous ride?" He was buying time for himself and his neighbors to prepare. They had no way of knowing when the British Crown would turn loose on them a full scale military assault. They could not know whether they were inviting a new 30 year's war or a hundred year's war.

How could they be expected to fathom the intentions of an autocratic King. But knowing history, they were aware that the British Crown had always put down rebellion in its Dominions, and all the leaders were sent to London Dock to be hanged for treason. It was this knowledge which prompted the famous comment by Benjamin Franklin, after signing the Declaration of Independence,

"We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

So, a few days or a few hours of advanced warning could make a difference between life and death for them, or between organized resistance and the need to disperse into the wilderness beyond the King's authority.

Reflecting on American defense problems and the cost today, one is struck with the close parallel between the situation facing the colonists or 1775 and our own uncertain outlook. We are a nation without imperial pretensions. We have no desire to occupy any other nation or to bend its people to our will. We have set up a vast establishment called the Department of Defense, and we insist that its mission be confined directly to the defense of this Republic. Even so, we find that billions each year must be applied to defense activities. Why is this so?

It is so mainly because we cannot know the true intentions of our enemies, and we must try to prepare for every eventuality. We must buy time for survival and response if such a situation is ever forced upon us. And, even more important, we must make sure that our technical knowledge is advancing at a constant rate so that we have available to our nation the latest in sophisticated know-how in this age of satellites, moonshots and many other advances that were only dreamed of a decade or two ago.

We cannot hope to match the manpower of the 1,300,000,000 persons behind the iron and bamboo curtains of censorship and secrecy. We have no means of certifying the true intentions of their leadership. We can only be guided by assessment of their past actions. The history written in the U.S.S.R. since 1917 offers small reason to place confidence in their good intentions. For over 50 years they have preached that an agreement with the capitalist is nothing but a chance to take advantage of a sworn enemy. During the same 50 years they have done everything in their power to weaken self-government anywhere in the world and to promote the creation of police states.

Their essential attitudes have not changed, but we must face each new day with the realization that they are in the world with us. They do have very advanced weaponry. Their commitments are unreliable. Their objectives are uncertain. Their good faith is obscured by regular planned actions which seem to support continuation of an international strategy of terror. And, worst of all, their interpretation of just what advantage may be gained from any given situation is unknown on this side of the ocean until after they have acted.

While we all hope for a mutual cutback in armaments, the cutbacks must be mutual, and verification by the U.S. must be assured, so that we can know for certain what is going on in the closed society of the Communist World. Unfortunately, the Communists have never been willing to agree to the kind of verification considered necessary for our safety.

So much for the past and the present. What, then, of the future. If the foregoing statements do not still hold—if the mission of our Defense Department therefore, is to be changed—then the people must so signify. If our people are willing to risk a little more on Soviet good intentions, if our people feel that we don't need to stay abreast of technological improvements, then we can spend much less on national defense. But a decision of that kind, with today's weapons and tomorrow's advancements, can involve the very life or death of the entire nation. It cannot and should not be made by the President or Secretary of Defense or the Congress alone. The defense of our nation is a decision that involves all of us and should only be

made by all Americans. First, of course, we must have all the facts. Public officials can only weigh the risks, make available information and offer suggestions for protection from those risks. If the time arrives when the people conclude that the cost of that protection is too high, then the decision to recede and accept the greater risks must be the people's to make, as the risks are theirs to shoulder.

And, let's look frankly at the American mood of today. First, we're approaching the end, we hope, of a war—a war that has probably been the most unpopular our nation has ever been engaged in. Every time our nation has concluded a war there has been an overwhelming public opinion toward disarmament and against the military. It happened after the Civil War, after the Spanish-American War, After World War I, World War II and after Korea. Add to this feeling the fact that during the last few years the Defense Department has been less than prudent in many of its major contracts. The TFX scandal, for example, or the Sheridan tank case. Also, the draft, designed for the full mobilization of World Wars I and II, has been a bone of contention among our young men.

Thus, the situation is ripe for political opportunists who jump at the chance to exploit concern and seek headlines, rather than give the facts—self-seekers who fan the flames of discontent and attempt to cater to the mood and the emotions of the present, rather than the need, opportunities and obligations of the future.

It is easy to strike a responsive cord by saying, "Think of all the good things you can have by refusing to spend money for defense."—easy, that is, if you forget to add into your figures the cost of the risk of losing our freedom.

We even have a prominent politician in our own state who points out that the Minuteman Missile System was constructed to be impervious to nuclear attack. He asks, "What has changed that now makes it vulnerable?" This kind of statement certainly gains him the headlines he desires, but it completely avoids the obvious facts. He conveniently forgets that Soviet technology hasn't stood still in the last decade. Among other things, the Soviets have developed the SS-9 intercontinental ballistic missile, with a 20-plus megaton warhead, which is far more powerful than anything we have. With its payload equivalence of more than 20 million tons of TNT, if an SS-9 dropped anywhere near one of our Minuteman sites, the site would be totally ineffective.

If we were to follow his logic, we would still be driving around in Model T Fords and farming with horses, since there would be no such thing as obsolescence. The French would still be safe behind their Maginot Line, which was built in the early 1930's as totally impregnable. But, of course, technology caught up and passed them, and France was overrun.

The greatest need for President Nixon's ABM Program is not solely to deploy two sites or twelve sites or to protect us from a small Russian attack or a foreseeable Chinese attack, or a stray missile that may come in by mistake. The greatest need is to give continuity to the development of technology on our side of the iron curtain—technology that can give us the lead time we might so badly need in some difficult time in the future.

Roosevelt was told by many scientists that the atomic bomb would never work. President Truman had most of the scientific community in his time opposed to his go-ahead on the hydrogen bomb. President Eisenhower had the professors saying that we couldn't take accurate photos from satellites miles up in space to allow us to know what the enemy was doing. But, these Presidents all had the courage of their convictions. They all recognized that the mili-

tary safety and thus the future of America depended on one thing—staying ahead in technical knowledge. Where would we have been during the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis if President Kennedy hadn't had at his disposal the lead in technology given this nation by the action and wisdom of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower.

I have no way of knowing who the President of the United States might be a decade or so from now sitting at a world conference table with the leaders of the other nations that share this globe with us. But, whoever he might be, and whatever the time in history, it is vital to our best interests that he represent an America that is a first-rate power militarily.

When I was first elected to represent you some six years ago, the national budget totalled \$111 billion. This year Congress is asked to consider a budget in which the funds requested total \$192.9 billion. During the past six years total spending by the government has risen almost 74 percent. Our Defense budget request this year, of course, is still the largest one in our budget. Yet, in the time that I have been privileged to serve in Congress, defense spending has actually dropped from 45% to 41% of the budget, even though we've been involved in Viet Nam. These actual budget figures certainly belie the argument that our nation's fiscal problems are solely due to "runaway defense budgeting".

Now, what of the Safeguard System, originally called the Sentinel, the very development of which has spurred so much dissension. The idea of an ABM System is not new. It has been the subject of research for over 15 years—15 years during which dramatic advancements have been scored in our knowledge and abilities in space. A decade ago there was little hope held for its eventual success, but within the past two years we have seen giant strides made that now indicate the state of the art has progressed sufficiently to justify on-site deployment testing of such a system.

So much has been said and written about the Safeguard System that mass confusion seems to have resulted. I believe, therefore, it would be helpful to summarize for you at this point first, what the Safeguard is designed to do as part of our Nation's defenses; secondly, the positions taken by those who oppose it; and, thirdly, the responses of those who support it.

First of all, about the Safeguard System itself. As now proposed it would include two sites being set up for in-place, functional testing. If, at the end of this testing, it was found that the system performed well the two sites would be expanded to twelve which would then give us coverage of our country.

As now proposed, it is designed to do three things, and President Nixon pointed out these three in his message to the nation outlining the deployment of this system and the significant changes made from the Johnson sentinel concept. Mr. Nixon indicated it should: first, protect our present landbased ballistic missile forces, which because of new developments in the Soviet Union, were no longer as secure as we once had reason to believe; secondly, the Safeguard System would be capable of intercepting a minor attack from new and emerging nuclear powers such as China; thirdly, and perhaps most important, the Safeguard System would give us the opportunity of intercepting and shooting down a mistaken attack by a handful of missiles launched in error from Soviet Russia or anywhere else.

With over 2,000 missiles on both sides of the world ready to go, the possibility of a circuit closing by mistake is always with us. At the present time our only reaction against a mistaken attack would be massive retaliation with our own missiles.

Yet, we've heard one of our state's prominent politicians state, "... Why do we now seek to protect, with an ABM system, silos

whose retaliation Minuteman missiles should be long gone in event of attack?" (unquote) I think most of us feel that if our nation is to remain dependent on the sole alternative of massive retaliation and instant incineration for the world in case of a small attack, then we indeed have entered an age of nuclear madness.

A defensive missile system is a long overdue complement to our offensive missile system. The Safeguard system contemplates the deployment of two units, one in North Dakota and one in Montana, to be constructed as research and development projects. The total cost is not tens of billions of dollars, as some would have you believe, but \$2.1 billion with an initial expenditure of \$900 million during the next fiscal year. These are, indeed, fantastic sums, but this expenditure next year represents slightly over one percent of our Defense budget. If for this we can gain a workable missile defense system and an alternative to massive retaliation, we will have made, I feel, a wise investment.

Now, just what is the Safeguard System. It is an interception and destruct system, utilizing both long-range and short-range radar identification of incoming enemy missiles, and long-range and short-range interception capabilities. The long-range anti-missile, the Spartan can intercept at a distance of several hundred miles. The short-range missile, the Sprint, can intercept up to 25 miles traveling at unusually high speeds to meet any enemy missiles that may have avoided contact with the Spartan. The long-range anti-missile, the Spartan, has been tested on many occasions, as has the Sprint. The new radar with a 360 degree detection ability has been used in our moonshot. The computers are within the state of the art and have now progressed sufficiently to justify on-site testing. Thus, while all the component parts are in existence at present, the "entity" needs to be tested and certified for real reliability.

The main substance of the arguments of the opponents of the ABM System can be grouped in four distinct categories.

First, that this is being done to keep the pipeline of the defense industries full and is stimulated solely by the military-industrial establishment.

Second, that the installation would be obsolete before it is built.

Third, that it would cost far too much money—money much better spent for the domestic needs of our nation.

Fourth, that this would escalate the arms race and make even more difficult the anticipated strategic arms control talks with the Soviet Union.

All of these arguments have been repeatedly met and answered by the President and other proponents of the Safeguard deployment. No solution has been given by the opponents to the three needs that the President stressed in justifying the ABM deployment:

One, the protection of a portion of our retaliatory force against a first strike.

Two, a protection of our nation against a small attack from a lesser nuclear power such as China.

Three, a way to deal with a missile fired in error by malfunction from one of the major powers.

The philosophy behind the Safeguard decision is, of course, the conviction that first strike capability is a threat of nuclear war, while second strike capability is a deterrent to war. Our defense officials are convinced that the Soviet Union is attempting to maintain second strike or deterrent force against our ICBM weapons. If the ABM is effective and deployed, we will have an assured second strike deterrent—far better than depending solely on massive numbers of offensive missiles as at present. There is no serious doubt that the best way to deter a nuclear attack is to maintain the unmistak-



able ability to inflict unacceptable damage on any aggressor even after absorbing a first strike on our forces.

It is interesting to observe at this point that after the announcement of the Safeguard System there were no questions raised by the Soviets regarding our desire to maintain an ability to inflict second strike damage. Initial reaction by the Soviet Press indicated very little concern about the matter because they feel it's proper for us to protect our defense capabilities.

In fact, in a press conference in London on February 9, 1967, shortly after President Johnson announced the study of an ABM System, Premier Kosygin was asked: "Do you believe it is possible to agree on the moratorium on the deployment of an anti-missile defense system?" He replied in part:

"I believe that defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people. Some argue like this: What is cheaper, to have offensive weapons which can destroy towns and whole states or to have defensive weapons which can prevent this destruction? At present the theory is current somewhere that the system which is cheaper should be developed. Such so-called theoreticians argue as to the cost of killing a man—\$500,000 or \$100,000. Maybe an anti-missile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives."

Kosygin's argument could well be used in our nation also. Moreover, it was after former President Johnson's announcement to proceed with the more provocative city-oriented Sentinel ABM System that the Soviet Union agreed to engage in strategic arms limitation negotiations. It is also significant that the Soviets are now on their second generation of deploying an ABM System, and that the British Government, as well as most of our NATO allies, have publicly supported the concept of the ABM. So much for the ABM System as military hardware and its effect on world opinion.

But, as I mentioned earlier, our people are suspicious of the expenditures made for defense. Who could help but be when one reads these stories in the newspaper about the TFX scandal. The plane contract was awarded, not to the low bidder, but to a company in Texas, which turned out a plane that not only cost three times as much as the original estimate, but has not been able to be used effectively yet by the Air Force. Also, the \$1.3 billion Sheridan tank fiasco, which has produced a tank that at present is almost as hazardous for its crew as it is for the enemy.

Actions such as these cannot be condoned by any American, regardless of political party, and we can only hope that the Defense Department, under new leadership, will see that this type of contracting is not allowed to continue. But abuses of the procurement system cannot be allowed to be used as the justification for America to cut back much needed defense system deployment.

Certainly, the President, who is hard-pressed today to start new programs he feels desirable for the internal growth of our nation, would like to avoid the funding necessary for weapons of this type and use the money instead for dams, roads, bridges, education, and anti-crime programs and all of the many other things that America needs. He knows, however, because of the information he has at hand, that this system is absolutely necessary and vital for our nation's future.

All the billions spent on national defense during the "cold war" years are nothing but a repetition of Paul Revere's ride—an effort to buy security for ourselves, and time for the world to mature and solve its most dangerous problems without resorting to nuclear warfare. We can even, in some ways, compare Paul Revere's horse to the scientist's laboratory. Both have the ability of giving us that

extra time we need so desperately. Time to stay ahead while we attempt to resolve our differences peacefully.

Fortunately, many weapons have been purchased and deployed but never used; and on reaching obsolescence were consigned to the scrap heap—but they kept the peace while they were on duty, and this is why they were developed.

Faced with all of these facts, what, then, will be my position as your Representative.

First, as of this time, I feel it is highly necessary to deploy—as research and development prototypes—these two Safeguard installations.

Second, it is important to know that despite what the confusers would have you believe, this is not an ongoing authorization to proceed. Anything beyond the original two prototypes sites will take a new authorization and a new appropriation by Congress. I will not support further funding beyond the \$2.1 billion for these prototypes unless there is convincing evidence that the system does in fact work. Reliance on a faulty deterrent is more dangerous than no deterrent at all.

Third, I will not in any event base my position on blind acceptance of the good intentions of the Soviet Union. History forbids it. In the Cuban crisis we held a missile superiority of three to one and the showdown was resolved in our favor. But with all of the talk about our country being satisfied with parity or less in weaponry now, we must realize that the Reds might misinterpret and since they still do not understand free and open debate in an open society, may miscalculate our power. Hitler miscalculated and he confused himself into believing that America did not have the capability to resist and would not, in fact, resist. So, he took a chance and World War II resulted. Our apparent weakness invited that war.

Preservation of peace and avoidance of nuclear conflict has been a continuing effort. Our journey on that path has never been a partisan, political issue. It would be tragic if this tradition no longer holds. Perhaps many leading opponents of the ABM have always favored compromise at any cost. They fear confrontation. They fear the use of power by the American people. Yet, history teaches us that only evident military supremacy on the part of the free world can prevent war.

Fourth, I think it is a mistake to put the sole reliance on our nation's strategic defense in one system. We must face the fact that science is universal and holds no permanent secrets for exclusive use by any nation. Any weapon that can be built, will be built; but it might not be used. Such was the case with gas, and bacteria warfare weapons in World War II. Because both sides had them in quantity, they were not used.

It should be the function of diplomacy to concentrate on securing such international agreements as will encourage friendships among all nations and gradually make weapon building an expensive folly. Meanwhile, we have to remember that a police state will use any weapon if it can do so with impunity, as Hitler did with the V-2 rockets against England.

Fifth, I accept the definition of the Safeguard system as a wholly defensive weapon. A system with a range of a few hundred miles can hardly be an aggressors weapon, yet listen to the outcry from the same voices that always cry out in fear of any change on the chess board of world affairs—in the immediate postwar era when we decided to build a nuclear weapons force; next when we decided to build a hydrogen bomb; then when we decided to deploy an intercontinental rocket force; and again when we decided to construct the Polaris submarine fleet. Each time, the same people sang the same tune—we were aggressors, building weapons to blackmail the world.

Now by some tortured logic, these same

people would tell us the system of rockets to cover a few hundred miles is escalation of the war threat because we are reducing the ability of an enemy to use his rockets against us. And, if we have an enemy who worries about that point, then he must have aggressive intentions. Presumably they would have us trust the Russians' good intentions as did the people of Czechoslovakia.

Sixth, I am convinced that we must reduce our total defense spending, which now stands at 8.9 percent of our gross national product. I would like to see us work toward a figure averaging 7 percent or less if possible. This should be able to be done without comprising our basic and necessary research programs or our strategic deterrent. Some policy of this kind is required or we will be drawn into a permanent and continuing role as world policeman.

I have confidence in our technology and our ability to remain ahead of an enemy qualitatively for as long into the future as we must, but since 1954 we have virtually alone held together the ranks of the free world and communism has been exposed in all of its weaknesses. It is now time for other nations to exert and defend their nationhood, if they will, and to police their own areas. If they won't our sons should not be offered as hostage for their failures.

We must move toward the conference table on disarmament, but we must also insist on verification of the other side so we can be sure that an agreement is not merely a worthless scrap of paper. The Kremlin has used our defense expenditures as an alibi for the obvious weaknesses of their political and economic system, their failure to unify their satellites, their failure to develop Russia internally, and their failure to meet consumer goods demand. It is to our long-term advantage to shatter that alibi and force exposure of their weakness in the eyes of their own people. We must do this by fostering the interchange of ideas and people between our countries, not by allowing an iron curtain to bar their peoples' eyes from what opportunities and freedoms exist in the rest of the world. We must move to have them understand us better, and we they. But, of course, once again let me add that in any dealings with the Russians, we have to make sure that all the cards are played face up on the table.

And, finally, let's not forget that the search for knowledge and the desire to broaden our technology must be a constant and sustained thing if we are to remain ahead.

Knowledge and design of this Safeguard ABM or any other weapons system is merely one more step in the drive to remain abreast or ahead of those who would oppose us and all we stand for. If, after site testing, it is a proven addition to the national security and if changing events in the world require it as a response, and if there is no acceptable alternative to meet the three identifiable dangers as laid out by President Nixon, then it certainly deserves support and deployment. That decision must be made in the 70's, but we will have the opportunity to make it only if we move ahead with test site deployment now. One very prominent and senior Democratic Member of the House put it bluntly, "I'd rather not need it and have it than need it and not have it."

Actually, a decision in support of ABM is no different than the first great military decision of our country, when the Continental Congress started its own Navy by purchasing and armoring the old French Ship "Bon Homme Richard", and directed John Paul Jones to patrol the Atlantic as a first line of defense for this continent.

In conclusion, I believe that the great majority of the people I have the privilege to represent in Congress—and, indeed, the great majority of the people throughout the nation, with their down-to-earth common sense, are having a tough time swallowing the so-called sophisticated arguments that conclude it is somehow bad to defend ourselves. Frankly, I

don't understand those who regard deployment of an ABM by our country as provocative, but not provocative of the Soviet Union to have already deployed two ABM Systems. Nor do I understand why it should be provocative of us to defend our Minuteman forces against a developing Soviet preemptive first strike capability, whereas it is not provocative of the Soviets to develop that destabilizing capability. We are told, if you pause to think about it, to stop our provocative action of punching the Soviets on their fist with our eyes. I sincerely hope that such an inverted Alice-In-Wonderland view of the world will not be allowed to prevail.

In the context of the total picture of history as it has been written, I would consider support of continued ABM development to be the action of a dove, not a hawk, for history leaves no doubt that only the strong can discourage attack and bring peace to the world of men.

#### YOUNG ARKANSAN DEPLORES LACK OF RESPECT FOR FLAG AND COUNTRY

#### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I receive many fine letters from young people throughout the First Congressional District of Arkansas. These letters show a deep concern for the problems that face our country. They also indicate that the vast majority of our young people are a credit to our country and provide great hope for the future.

I received a letter from one of our fine young people in Jonesboro, Ark., the other day that I consider typical of the type of mail I am receiving from the young generation. I would like to share this letter with you and my colleagues at this time as an indication of the thinking of the young people in northeast Arkansas:

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: My name is Carolyn Pitts, I'm 13 years old and I'm in the 7th Grade.

The reason that I'm writing is because I think we are not spending enough money, time and effort on the problems of America, and too much on the Space Program. I watched on television last week while delinquents at Harvard University made a mock funeral of the United States flag! It made my blood boil to think any American could stoop so low as to do a thing like that! The students claim they are striking because of "deplorable use of Brute Force" to quote a line of our daily paper, *The Jonesboro Sun*. This is only one incident.

Last night in Memphis, Tennessee, a group who called themselves Jimi Hendrix Experience made a poor copy of the National Anthem in which the tune was the only thing faintly recognizable. He prefaced it with "here's a thing they brainwashed you with at school before we could get a hold of you".

There are things like this going on all over the world today, and I, and many others are afraid that the Communists are behind all this and if we don't do something very definite to stop these things, I'm afraid America might someday be ruled by Communists. If we allow this to happen, all of the hardship our fore-fathers, soldiers and boys in Vietnam faced will be going to waste.

I love America; I am concerned about its future. If you are not already doing some-

thing about these things, I would appreciate your mentioning it and trying to get something done about it.

#### SENATOR DIRKSEN'S PROPOSALS ON EAST-WEST TRADE

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader (Mr. DIRKSEN), in an article published in the Reader's Digest for June 1969, has made one of the most significant contributions to the study of East-West trade that has appeared in recent years.

We are at present in a time when all of our relations with the Soviet Union and its allies are being reviewed to see whether measures should be relaxed or increased. Senator DIRKSEN in the Reader's Digest article points out that it is time to take a tough line on East-West trade. He says:

It is time for the U.S. to insist on getting from the Communists something in return—a *quid pro quo*—for scientific and technological genius they need so desperately from us.

Senator DIRKSEN suggests that we might get as concessions the following:

First. Payment of long-standing lend-lease debts;

Second. Guaranteed access to Berlin.

Third. Hands-off policy by the Soviets toward Latin America and the Middle East.

Specifically, the distinguished Senator from Illinois calls for the establishment of a free world trade organization to supervise all exchanges with the Soviet bloc. This is an urgent proposal. It would protect free countries against the disruptive tactics of Communist economic strategists. Senator DIRKSEN points out that American exports to the Soviets have jumped 56 percent since 1962. It is ridiculous to say that these goods are nonstrategic. Goods of any kind help the Soviets to solve their production bottlenecks and to allot a greater part of their economy to military production. Senator DIRKSEN says:

Many "peaceful" items sold to the Communists have clear military application.

To use just one example cited by Senator DIRKSEN: We have supplied the Soviets with technical data for the production of polystyrene, used in air conditioners, but polystyrene can also be used as a binder for explosives, as a rocket igniter, and as a component for ICBM's.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the views of the distinguished Senator from Illinois will be getting such wide distribution in the Reader's Digest among the people of our country and of the world. It is especially important that these views get the widest attention at a time when the administration is reviewing the abortive policies of the previous administrations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Needed: A Realistic East-West Trade Policy," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### NEEDED: A REALISTIC EAST-WEST TRADE POLICY

(By Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN)

Seven years ago, a Senate subcommittee on which I served conducted an exhaustive probe of East-West trade and found that the United States and its allies were making a direct contribution to communist military and industrial strength.

What was then a serious situation has now degenerated into a critical one. Since 1962, American exports to the Soviet bloc have increased 56 percent, and those of U.S. allies 68 percent—to a total of \$3.9 billion a year. Even more ominously, these shipments include material of undeniable military significance.

At a time when the Soviet Union and its satellites were keeping the Vietnam war going, the Johnson Administration unilaterally removed from the Commodity Control List more than 500 items previously barred for sale to the Soviet bloc without a special license. All were said to be "non-strategic"—"peaceful goods which may be freely exported without any risks to the United States' national interests." But a reading of the fine print turns up the following: rifle-cleaning compounds, propellers, industrial chemicals, crude rubber, aluminum and magnesium scrap.

Top Washington officials defended their decision to export \$35 million worth of machine tools for a Soviet auto plant, on the ground that it will make the Kremlin more "consumer-goods minded." Senators protested in vain that there is nothing to stop the Russians from using these tools for making armored trucks and vehicles.

"As far as computers are concerned," a communist journal admits, "we are still living in primeval times. We are 50 times worse off than the United States, 15 times worse off than West Germany and Scandinavia." Yet, encouraged by Washington, top U.S. firms, including IBM and Sperry Rand, peddle their sophisticated electronic wares throughout the Soviet bloc.

Concern over such developments runs deep. "American policy on East-West trade is contradictory and self-defeating," reports Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, director of the University of Pennsylvania's Foreign Policy Research Institute.

"A complete policy revision is necessary to curb the enemy's military-industrial buildup," says Rep. Glenard P. Lipscomb (R., Calif.) one of Congress' top experts in the field.

"The United States must recognize the value of trade as a major cold-war weapon," says Samuel F. Clabaugh, research associate of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies.

When the U.S.S.R. and its Warsaw Pact allies invaded Czechoslovakia last year, I called upon our government to institute an economic embargo of the Soviet Union. "It's the only weapon we have," I said. And I remain convinced that the Soviets have real reason to fear it.

East Depends on West. Actually, the communists are in desperate need of Western technological assistance. Spectacular Soviet achievements in rocketry and space exploration have distracted many from the fact that the Soviet economy is in dire straits. "We have the worst and most backward productive structure among the industrially developed countries," says Russian economist Abel G. Aganbegian. Industrial output per worker is one fourth that in the United States (agricultural output per worker, one twelfth), and the crisis is worsening.

The solution to the crisis lies with the West. The Soviet textile industry, for instance, is a severe drain on the economy, with its obsolete equipment and fantastic



waste of manpower. Not surprisingly, Soviet agents have fanned out across the free world to purchase what they term "turnkey" factories.\*

The Russians could, of course, build the factories themselves. But, as experts at the Foreign Policy Research Institute spell it out, "If they can procure the model from the West, mediocre technicians can copy it. Meanwhile their best engineers need not be diverted from more important work."

As the State Department has concluded, "It is only with the infusion of Western technology, capital equipment and managerial and marketing support" that the communists can raise their productivity. Clearly, this dependence on Western technology represents a vulnerability that should be capitalized upon.

Bridge-Building? In recent years, President Johnson sought repeatedly to woo the communist bloc with promises of economic assistance. Trade delegations were dispatched to the U.S.S.R., Poland, Romania and Bulgaria. Lists of embargoed goods were slashed, and communist credit was guaranteed. American firms were encouraged to trade with bloc countries in a patriotic gesture that could lessen international tensions. Meanwhile, provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act—designed to bar U.S. aid to nations supplying the communists with strategic goods—were simply not enforced. By word and deed, Washington demonstrated its faith in "bridges of friendship" to the East.

Not surprisingly, Soviet bloc trade with Western Europe boomed. An Italian firm has contracted to supply the communists with \$90 million worth of computers and calculators. Dangling credits before the East Germans, Bonn hopes to increase its trade there 150 percent by 1975.

But Washington has been unalarmed. Indeed, the director of the State Department's Office of East-West Trade, Robert B. Wright, suggested in a remarkable speech last year that the government felt that increased trade could end the cold war, that "we have nothing to fear, nothing to lose." But Wright and other advocates of expanded East-West trade are laboring under two delusions:

1. *That trade, by definition, promotes friendly relations.* History tells us otherwise. Germany and Russia were trading up to the very day that Nazi panzer columns rumbled across the Soviet borders in 1941. Scrap iron sold to the Japanese by business-as-usual Americans was fashioned into the bombs dropped on Pearl Harbor.

The argument is made that "winds of change" are blowing across the communist empire, and that American assistance can encourage liberalization. But does it?

Consider Poland, the recipient of more than \$550 million in U.S. aid and the only member of the communist bloc awarded our "most favored nation" tariff status. American assistance was supposed to mean a better life for the Polish people and to help Poland win independence from Moscow. Instead, the Polish hard-liners in control beefed up their 250,000-man army, tripled their rocket forces and quintupled their armored divisions. Exports to North Vietnam have been stepped up sharply; the regime's second-ranking official visited Hanoi to brag that Polish anti-aircraft batteries have shot down or damaged 40 U.S. planes. Not only did Polish troops march with the Red Army into Czechoslovakia, but Warsaw has promised volunteers to Ho Chi Minh if needed in the "struggle against the imperialist aggressor."

2. *That "non-strategic" trade constitutes no danger to the United States.* The distinc-

tion between strategic and non-strategic trade is largely imaginary. Western goods of any kind relieve production bottlenecks and enable Soviet planners to shift from domestic to military production patterns.

At the same time, many "peaceful" items sold to the communists have clear military application. Consider the technical data supplied the Soviets for the production of polystyrene—a chemical used in air conditioners and other "non-strategic" items, according to the Commerce Department. Polystyrene has other uses: as a binder for explosives, as a rocket igniter, as a component for intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Oil War. Merely cutting off the export of strategic goods is not enough, the United States must begin fighting the cold war with the same weapons as its adversaries, recognizing that trade can be a powerful, perhaps crucial weapon.

The Soviets themselves make no bones about it. "Trade policy is an integral part of our foreign policy," says top Soviet economist P. A. Chervyakov, and the record bears him out. In 1932, Stalin drastically cut purchases from the West—at great cost to Soviet economic development—in an attempt to intensify the free world's Great Depression. And a critical need for Western goods immediately after World War II did not deter the Soviets from holding such purchases to a minimum, in the belief that this would hamper Allied conversion to a peacetime economy.

Economic blackmail and political retaliation are practiced shamelessly. In 1949 when the Australians broke up a Soviet spy ring, Soviet purchases of badly needed Australian wool were immediately cut off. When Yugoslavia moved toward independence, the Soviets disregarded existing agreements and slapped a total embargo on all Russian-Yugoslav commerce. In 1958, the Russians shut off crude-oil deliveries to Finland, canceled orders and delayed trade negotiations there until certain conservative members of Finland's cabinet resigned. Such communist economic warfare is global. Prices are rigged, goods are dumped—all as part of the strategy to disrupt Western economies, to ensnare emerging nations and promote friction within the non-communist world.

Nothing demonstrates this quite so effectively as the "oil offensive" that the U.S.S.R. has waged for more than a decade. Kremlin strategists believe that the American oil industry is the "foundation of Western political influence" throughout the underdeveloped world. "If this foundation cracks," a Soviet theoretician has written, "the entire edifice may come tumbling down."

To this end, Soviet oil is dumped in Western markets at ridiculously low prices. While Czechoslovakia is forced to pay 18 rubles per ton, for instance, Italy pays less than eight rubles. Results: the Russians acquire badly needed Western currency, and the economies of the United States and its oil-producing allies are threatened.

Despite this, Washington has on numerous occasions approved the export of petroleum drilling equipment, even of an entire oil refinery, to the Soviet bloc.

Best Weapon. It is time for the United States to tie its trade to global politics, to insist on getting from the communists something in return—a *quid pro quo*—for the scientific and technological genius they need so desperately from us. By demanding political concessions for economic favors, as Georgetown Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky suggests, the United States will be following a practical alternative to complete embargo or haphazard liberalization.

Such a policy would allow for credits and cash payments, consumer goods and producer goods. Adaptable to changing conditions, it would infuse a consistency and a rationality into our trade relations with the entire communist bloc. The list of concessions would be graded. It could include the payment of long-standing Lend-Lease debts,

guaranteed access to Berlin, a hands-off attitude by the Soviets toward Latin America and the Middle East.

Such a policy, to be effective, requires what is now tragically lacking—a sense of unity among the Western industrial powers. There must be established a free-world trade organization that would supervise all exchanges with the Soviet bloc, protect free countries against the disruptive tactics of communist economic strategists, and the outline effective countermeasures.

The need for a bold new policy on East-West trade is clear, as President Richard Nixon is well aware. As long ago as 1962, he demanded that the Western powers adopt a solid trade front in the struggle against communism. "Trade and economic sanctions must be wielded as a lever at the bargaining table to move the Russians from their intransigent positions," he said. "The Berlin Wall might have crumbled in a week if we had threatened a complete economic embargo on East Germany. The Soviet Union's support of guerrillas in South Vietnam might well have been traded for the right to buy Western goods. Western productivity, technical know-how and trade add up to one of our best weapons. We must use it in the cold war."

That was true then. It is even truer today.

#### STAR EDITORIAL POINTS TO PROBLEM OF FOUNDATION PAY TO JUDICIARY

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today's Evening Star carries an editorial, entitled "The Douglas Letter," which strikes at the heart of the unfortunate problem created by the acceptance of pay, by a Supreme Court justice, from a foundation.

Consequently, this perceptive editorial does much to underscore the need and propriety of the legislation which, at this moment, I am drafting in an effort to remedy this situation.

Simply put, my legislation would provide that "there shall be no outside services rendered, for pay, by anyone who has a judicial appointment and that there shall be no payment of any kind, no gratuities to any Federal Government employee, or elected officials, by any foundation."

The Evening Star's editorial reads as follows:

#### THE DOUGLAS LETTER

The statement issued by the Supreme Court's press officer on behalf of Justice Douglas is a curious document.

Its essence is that the justice "knew very little" about the tax troubles of the Albert Parvin Foundation, of which he was president at \$12,000 a year until he resigned this month. This, however, neither denies nor disputes a New York Times report of a letter allegedly written by Justice Douglas on May 12 to Albert Parvin, for whom the foundation is named.

In that letter, according to the Times report, Justice Douglas denounced an Internal Revenue Service investigation of the foundation as a "manufactured case" intended to "get me off the court." He added that "I do not propose to bend to any such pressure."

This, on its face, was highly improper, even though the justice presumably did not expect the letter to be made public.

\*Such factories are designed, built, and installed by Westerners, who also train local people to run them, and thus turn over to Soviet managers the key to a complete, functioning plant.

It is improper because it reveals a state of mind which disqualifies or should disqualify Justice Douglas from participating in the decision of any case involving the IRS which might come before the court in the future. To say the least, his bias is showing.

Another point: If Justice Douglas knew very little about the foundation's tax problem, as the press officer's statement says, how could he describe the IRS investigation, which began in 1966, as a "manufactured case"? Before making any such accusation, one might expect a Supreme Court justice at least to know what he is talking about.

Finally, the letter indicates that Justice Douglas gave some tax advice to Parvin. If he did, it was a gross impropriety, if not a violation of law.

This is too serious a matter to be hushed up or dropped. The fitness of Justice Douglas to stay on the court is very much in question. If there is reason to think there is more to it than has yet appeared, the Department of Justice should take possession of all documents and correspondence bearing on the relationship between the justice on the one hand and the foundation and Parvin on the other. This would make it possible to get to the bottom of this matter, which most certainly should be done.

I congratulate the Evening Star for its eloquent articulation of a very real problem which begs for remedy if public esteem and respect is to be restored with reference to the judicial branch of this Government.

#### A TEXAS EDUCATOR-SENATOR WRITES OF MEXICAN-AMERICAN PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION

### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when I was trying to have the Bilingual Education Act enacted, thousands of educators gave their assistance to that effort. One of those outstanding persons was Mr. Joe J. Bernal, State senator from San Antonio and a former classroom teacher. Senator Bernal's sensitivity to the educational difficulties of the Mexican-Americans and his outstanding knowledge made him a stalwart in our legislative efforts.

Recently Senator Bernal wrote an article entitled "I am Mexican-American," which was published in the National Education Association Journal of May 1969. Because of his ability and knowledge which is reflected in this article, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### ANITA INSISTS: I AM MEXICAN-AMERICAN

(By Joe J. Bernal, State Senator, Texas; social worker, Inman Christian Center, San Antonio)

The average Mexican-American drops out of school by the seventh grade. In Texas, almost 80 percent of students with Spanish surnames drop out before completing high school. In California, 73.5 percent of the state's Mexican-American students do not complete high school.

Some incidents that took place in a Texas high school where 98 percent of the students are Mexican-American may help to explain the high dropout rate.

"I don't know what the fuss is all about," the teacher said to her senior civics class. The "fuss" the teacher referred to was a potential walkout by 300 to 500 students who had made certain demands on their school personnel.

Their demands were simple. They wanted to select the nominees to the student council instead of having school officials name the candidates. Because some students were interested in going to college, they wanted chemistry and trigonometry and sociology taught in their school and they wanted to be counseled about available college grants, scholarships, and work-study assistance. Finally, they wanted to be taught about the contributions their ancestors had made to the state of Texas.

The civics teacher could see no reason for their demands, particularly the last one. "After all," she said, "you're all Americans."

Anita, one of the school cheerleaders, stood up and disagreed. "I'm not American. I'm Mexican-American. You're white and I'm brown."

Anita sat down, sobbing. She had never spoken up to a teacher before. But she was on sure ground, she felt. In spite of her tears, she felt glad that she had said what she had. She was Mexican-American.

Like many other Mexican-American girls, Anita had been taught at home to regard her bronze color as a matter for pride. After all, Anita told herself, the appearance of the Virgin of Guadalupe to the lowly Indian, Juan Diego, showed without any doubt that the Virgin, *La Virgen Morena*, had Anita's Mexican-American coloring. But Mrs. Smith wouldn't know that.

Color, of course, has been only one source of misunderstanding between Mexican-American students and many of their Anglo teachers.

The Mexican-American has maintained his mother tongue longer than has any other minority group. Whereas most immigrants largely replaced their mother tongues with English in one or two generations, the Mexican-American has clung to Spanish for three, four, and five generations. This is due primarily to the proximity of the Mexican border. Spanish language TV, newspapers, radio, and movies are commonplace in the barrios.

Many unfortunate classroom situations have arisen because schools and teachers have refused to recognize that Spanish is the social language of their Mexican-American students.

"¿Traes un lapiz?" Ector had leaned over to Juan for a pencil.

"I've warned you about speaking Spanish in my class," the teacher said sharply. "Go see the vice-principal right now, Ector. I can't have any more of that murmuring in Spanish."

Mrs. Jones was irritated. Too many of her students kept lapsing into Spanish. There was a school policy against the use of Spanish and she had a vague idea that there was a law against speaking Spanish in the schools of Texas.

Ector, a six-foot varsity tackle, was active in all school activities and popular with his peers.

I didn't do anything wrong, Ector kept repeating to himself as he made his way to the office. I get A's in Spanish class but when I use Spanish to whisper to a friend in Mrs. Jones' room, I get sent to the office.

Ector arrived at the vice-principal's office. After explaining why he was there, Ector sat through a 15-minute lecture on why it is very American to speak English.

Mr. Neill's lecture, which he had often de-

livered before, mentioned the vague law that prohibited the use of the Spanish language in the schools.

"Well, Ector, you can take three licks and go back to class or go home and bring your parents," Mr. Neill stated after the lecture.

I know I'm as good an American as he is, Ector thought to himself. My brother is in Vietnam and I'll probably be going, too. Why does Mr. Neill have to tell me about speaking English and being an American? I can speak it, and I was born in the United States. Mr. Neill wants to whip me! He's worse than Mrs. Jones. My father hasn't given me a licking since I was eight. Now he will have to miss work to come to school because my mother can't speak English. He's going to be mad.

"Well, Ector, will it be three licks or your parents?" Mr. Neill asked.

"The three licks."

The school district has now changed its policy and Spanish can be used whenever it enhances a teaching situation. High schools there offer courses in sociology, chemistry, and many other college preparatory subjects formerly considered too difficult for "Mexican" children. The high school where the incidents took place has had a change of administration and the new principal, a Mexican-American, is well aware that frequently schools have not been able to work successfully with Mexican-American students.

It is important for schools to recognize the advantages of being truly bilingual. The so-called language-educated person is skilled in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Generally, the Mexican-American's Spanish language skill is limited to listening and speaking, sometimes to listening only. And yet the skill he has developed in speaking and/or understanding Spanish impairs his ability to become skilled in speaking and/or understanding English. Much of this can be traced to conflicting attitudes on the part of school people. His two languages are placed in constant conflict and it is difficult for him to achieve true proficiency in either.

In the classroom, much can be done to help Mexican-American students overcome this language conflict. The use of Spanish in the education process will help. In some cases Spanish can be used as the teaching language. For instance, bilingualists can be taught mathematics in Spanish. Admittedly, this will not improve their abilities in English, but at least their mathematical learning will not be held back because of their deficiency in English.

Intelligence tests, if they are to be regarded as such, that are not as heavily weighted on verbal ability should be developed, and until they are, teachers and counselors may inadvertently classify bright bilingual children as slow learners.

The schools need to consider the cultural and economic environment that surrounds the lower four-fifths of Mexican-American citizens. Having become a minority in the land that belonged to their ancestors, these people have existed in a system dominated by Anglo institutions—governmental, educational, and economic. They have expressed their rebellion against foreign institutions by withdrawing from the culture and clinging to their own Mexican-American traditions.

It is important that teachers show respect for the language and the culture their Mexican-American students cherish. Even if the teacher does not speak Spanish and the class is being conducted in English, he should allow a child to express himself in Spanish when he becomes stuck for words. When the teacher wants to encourage students to speak English to one another, he should not put it on the basis of "You're American. Speak American." Instead, he should say something like, "Yes, Spanish is a great lan-



guage—even Thomas Jefferson said so. You need English, though, to live and work in the United States."

Mexican-Americans have a proud heritage and they deserve to learn about it in school. They should study histories of Latin America. United States history ought to emphasize Mexican contributions. School libraries should make available biographies of Spanish-speaking leaders.

Students need to have the opportunity to learn about contemporary Mexican-Americans who are contributing to the American scene. Successful Spanish-speaking community leaders and college students should be brought into high schools to discuss career attainment. (Similarly, successful Mexican-American high school students should be urged to speak to elementary and junior high students to point out the advantages of remaining in school.)

Particularly helpful in adapting the schools to the needs of Mexican-American students will be for the teachers of these students to have special training—courses dealing with the education of the culturally different and economically deprived.

#### STUDENT UNREST AND CAMPUS RESEARCH

**HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Don K. Price, dean of John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, is an acknowledged authority on science policy. He has served most helpfully for the past several years as a member of the research management advisory panel of our subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. On May 22, Mr. Price was honored as the recipient of the annual Midwest Research Institute citation in Kansas City, Mo.

In his acceptance speech, he brought insight and understanding to bear on the issue of Government-sponsored research in universities. Congress is greatly concerned with the charges and replies between student militants and school administrations over the relevance of these research grants and contracts. Don Price states:

We do need to see that our science and technology are made relevant to contemporary problems. But what the rebels need to learn—and it will be very difficult for many of them—is that relevance can be attained in society only by responsibility, and responsibility can be achieved only by organization, and by the discipline and self control that we need to make large scale organization successful.

Mr. Price notes the possibility that the Congress may react against campus confrontations "to force the transfer of research contracts from universities to more secure sites." He concludes:

Only if university faculties can take effective action to make it clear that they propose to defend universities as centers of learning and rational inquiry can they protect the academic community from serious political reprisal.

Mr. Speaker, because of the immediate interest to the Members, I include

the text of Don K. Price's address at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF DON K. PRICE, DEAN, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, AND 1969 MRI CITATION RECIPIENT AT THE MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE ANNUAL MEETING OF TRUSTEES, KANSAS CITY, MO., MAY 22, 1969

The Midwest Research Institute award is an honor in which, of course, I take great pride, as I am sure all of my distinguished predecessors have done before me. But to me the honor is particularly gratifying for two reasons. First, any university administrator is likely these days to feel the need of any kind of consolation he can get. Second, honors such as this go in the normal course of things to scientists and business executives but come as more of a surprise to anyone who works in my field of interest.

Sir Bernard Darwin, one of the great English sportswriters of a generation ago, used to remark that golf was the most humbling game. I suppose that was because among the sports that he covered he never included public administration.

Work in public administration, in either its practical or academic aspects, is not calculated to build up a man's ego.

In the academic world it is not considered an elegant or rigorous field of study. In the eyes of the physicist or the economist it lacks theoretical rigors and it is tainted by a concern for the solution of immediate practical problems.

And in the world of practical affairs it is—at least in the United States—caught in the middle and squeezed badly between the power and the glory of political leadership on the one hand, and on the other hand, the smug certainty of truth and high moral standards that is properly cultivated in the several scientific and professional communities.

These are the old and traditional humiliations of American public administration. But now another has been added. We are ignored by student protest movements. (I knock on wood; at least I can say: up to now.) Student rebels attack their Presidents and Deans, they seize scientific laboratories, they demand that business schools be abolished. They obviously consider these the pillars of the Establishment. But they simply ignore schools of public administration as too insignificant to bother with. This is, I may add, a humiliation I find it possible to bear with equanimity.

Now it is obvious that student unrest, as difficult as it is to diagnose precisely, is a worldwide movement. One of its main common features is a discontent with scientific modes of thinking and with technological progress or its side effects. Some of its self-proclaimed leaders are also self-proclaimed Communists, but their movement has none of the ideological discipline of the Communist student movements of my youth. Wherever they crop up in the Soviet Union and its satellites they are treated very roughly indeed. Unlike the real Communists their purpose is not to build a political system on a base of scientific thought and technological advancement, but to challenge, on quasi-religious or moralistic grounds, the whole notion of material progress as based on technology without moral direction.

The way in which all of this has developed in the universities reminds me irresistibly of an O. Henry story. Some of you may be old enough to have enjoyed O. Henry and his greatest single creation, Jeff Peters, "The Gentle Grafter." Jeff Peters' greatest discovery, as he put it, was that "A trust is its weakest point." Jeff and his partner had escaped from Mexico after selling a silver mine they did not own. Then in a small town on the Rio Grande they established a real trust—a complete monopoly. They bought up

all the saloons just before the town was isolated by a flood.

For a short time, with no interference from any meddling trustbusters, they jacked up the prices and were on their way to fantastic wealth. But Jeff Peters' partner, normally a teetotaler, decided to sample their stock. Whiskey moved him to oratory of the kind he had been brought up on as a boy. A few hours later, when Jeff found that no one was coming into the saloon any more, he went out to discover that his partner had organized a mass meeting, had given a rousing temperance lecture, and had gotten every man in town to sign a teetotaler's pledge.

Now the contemporary university is in a plight much like that of Jeff Peters. It had a big share—if not a monopoly—of basic research, which a frightened nation came to consider the key to national security and prosperity, and the Congress then came through with financial support beyond the wildest dreams of scientists of a generation ago. But many professors, unaccustomed to this heady prosperity and conscience-stricken about it, now undertake to persuade the nation that it is drunk on technological progress and ought to sober up—drunk either on the pride in new scientific weapons which ignores the dangers of a continuing arms race, or on the pride in industrial productivity which ignores the accompanying pollution of the environment and the neglect of social problems like hunger and racial inequities.

We should really worry less, I think, about the student rebels and more about the issues that their elders have persuaded them to raise. But I am inclined to think that they both have chosen the wrong target. They should concentrate their fire not on science or technology, but on the administrative and political system that supports and directs it.

This would be consistent with their demand for relevance. With this demand I find myself in sympathy, though they make it hard to sympathize with them by their manners. We should not reject the idea in the way we might refuse to buy a product that is plugged by a television ad, just because we hear the pitch made so repetitiously and loudly and offensively. We do need to see that our science and technology are made relevant to contemporary problems. But what the rebels need to learn—and it will be very difficult for many of them—is that relevance can be attained in modern society only by responsibility, and responsibility can be achieved only by organization, and by the discipline and self-control that we need to make large-scale organization successful. And this is why I think they should be concerned not only with science itself, but with the administrative system that supports and directs it. I would like to talk tonight about some of the faults of that system, which we should worry about, but also about some of its virtue.

Very few people have bothered to reflect on the fundamental changes in our national system of public administration that have taken place over the past generation. Even well informed people do not identify it as a fundamental administrative change, perhaps because it was not accomplished by people who thought of themselves as administrators. It was done much more by the scientists, the engineers, the physicians, and other professionals, with a big assist from politicians. The virtues of the new system have been energy, initiative, and extremely rapid scientific and educational advancement. But the cost has been the undertaking of many technological innovations that satisfied the professional ambitions of the innovators but carried with them considerable costs for human welfare.

What do I mean by this administrative

revolution? Back in that distant and rather calm and stodgy period which we recall as the early New Deal, it was still assumed that government functions were administered by government employees and that it was their job to do what their political superiors told them to do, not to initiate new policies themselves. By way of illustration I may recall that when the National Academy of Sciences recommended that government help fight the depression by making grants to research institutes and universities, "Honest Harold" Ickes refused on grounds that public funds should be spent only through public agencies, and a responsible hierarchy of public officials.

To some businessmen it may have looked like socialism to spend tax money through government relief agencies, but administratively it was a very conservative system. The typical civil servant, tightly controlled within the framework of the traditional government bureau, was in no position to undertake radical innovation: the institutional structure within which he worked was too much under the thumb of comptrollers and Congressmen, and he was not geared into the most profoundly innovative forces in modern society, namely, the intellectual power of modern science and the flexible enterprise of the private corporation.

But now all that has changed, and the scientists started it. The wartime system for the support of research decided boldly not to put the scientists into uniform or even on a civilian government payroll; it contracted with universities and industrial corporations for the research it needed, and for the development of that research into weapons systems, and even for the initial efforts to test those weapons in the field.

After the war, the system of administering government functions through grants or contracts with private corporations and institutions spread most rapidly first in such new technological programs as the atomic energy and medical research and space programs, but then to other fields. What would Harold Ickes—or for that matter Harry Hopkins—think if today he could see the most controversial parts of the poverty program administered largely through contracts with specially created private corporations which have largely bypassed the established system of state and local governments, and other parts through contracts with great industrial corporations?

In all these movements, of course, the research institutes and the universities, supported by government funds but enjoying the freedom and initiative that go with technically private status, have been profoundly innovative forces in our economy and in our society. They have greatly furthered a tendency which was already characteristic of our political attitude. They have made us as a nation less inclined to deal with public issues on the grounds of social theory or party ideology, and more inclined to approach them in the traditional mood of the analytical scientist or engineer. We are not mainly concerned to ask whether a certain policy is Jeffersonian or Hamiltonian, Catholic or Marxist. Instead, we are inclined to try to discover whether particular problems can be dealt with in more practical ways.

American students of public administration are just beginning to catch up with these developments. For generations they have been inclined to apologize for the American administrative system and to admire the more orderly and disciplined civil services of Great Britain and Western Europe. But now they see Great Britain and Western Europe beginning to look with envy on the dynamism, the flexibility, and the freedom of this curious system in which universities and research institutes are deeply involved in government policy but without any noticeable loss of freedom on the part of the professor or the

research investigator. And we are even more surprised to note that the British civil service is now being made over avowedly in partial imitation of the American system, with its emphasis on technical and professional initiative rather than administrative regularity. Or that German universities, originally the model for our own, are beginning to imitate us.

Never and nowhere before have scientists and scholars been in such a favorable position to influence policy decisions while retaining a secure base of support. This new system, which has made it possible for government to intervene in the solution of social and economic problems without assuming the ownership or destroying the autonomy of our academic or business institutions, may help us avoid the apparent necessity of choosing between socialism and capitalism which seemed to confront us a half century ago.

The rebels of the New Left see this system, of course, in a different light. By getting deeply involved in current problems, the scientist (they say) has sacrificed his position of complete detachment from the system and forfeited his status as an independent moral censor. But the dilemma of the New Left is an absolute one. It is not possible to be relevant without also becoming responsible. Absolute purity in politics means absolute irrelevance. The universities and the research institutes of America are in the mainstream of the American political tradition as they search out new ways of putting their skills at the service of the public, in return for the support which is given them for their intellectual interests.

With respect to the methods of most of the recent student protests, I have no sympathy. But with respect to the underlying national and academic problems which are at the root of much of the protest, and which trouble the vast majority of students who have no part in disorders and violence as much as they trouble the rebels, I have the deepest concern. If we in the universities are to be responsible as well as relevant, in an effort to deal with those problems, we are going to have to make a more effective union between the work of the technological and scientific community on the one hand, and the administrators and students of administration on the other.

In the practical administration of government affairs, I have noted that the administrator is caught in the middle. The dynamic initiative comes from the bureaus and agencies whose purposes are dominated, many of them, by interest in technological progress, or in devising scientific and technical solutions to human problems. The typical bureau or agency, like the typical private corporation, is tempted to see the fate of the world as wrapped up within his particular institutional purposes. The fallacy of socialism indeed is that it does not see that this narrowness of view, this greed for irresponsible power within a narrow scope, is as great a temptation and a threat in a governmental as in a private institution; indeed in government, without the discipline of the balance sheet, it is harder to control, and its external costs—the costs that society generally pays for the profits or benefits of a particular program—may be harder to identify.

But the man who is put in a position of general administrative responsibility is the most likely to have these problems—these external costs—forced on his attention. Whether he is a political appointee, or a scientist who has moved up into the administrative hierarchy, or a career man trained in administration, he finds it hard to evade the issue when specialists disagree—when the agriculturalist differs with the fish and wildlife man on the dangers of pesticides, or the aeronautical engineer with the city

planner on the development of airports, or the nuclear engineer with the public health doctor on the standards of safety for nuclear reactors, or the generals with the diplomats on new ballistic missile systems for either offense or defense.

If the administrator, as he deals with these dilemmas, is not to become the prisoner of the experts—if he is to be able to put the issues up to legislators in ways that the public can understand and ultimately control—he has to have help from experts outside the bureaucratic hierarchy. So must the political leader who proposes to attack the policy of the government. And either one will soon find that a scholar or scientist who has not been involved enough in a policy issue to understand it is worthless for this purpose. The virtue of the system we have developed since the second World War is that universities and research institutes are full of men who have had more than a nodding acquaintance with crucial policy issues and whose views are informed by something more than moral passion—indeed, by solid professional competence. If the rebels really want academic science to be relevant to social issues, they should applaud this system, which opens up the crucial issues for public discussion, with experts available to support criticism of current policies, in a way that is not possible in the traditional European system that isolates the scholar from the bureaucracy.

Now the whole system is threatened. The direct threat from the student rebels is not the main danger. It can be controlled—with help from the students themselves—as soon as university faculties conclude that it must be. The far greater danger comes from the indirect effects of student rebellions. For the support that Congress has provided in its annual appropriations is not something that the research world can afford to take for granted. Like any other vested interest the universities, after two or three years, came to think that annual appropriations could be counted on as a matter of right. But, as Jeff Peters noted, a trust is its weakest point. And I would judge that at this moment the whole financial and administrative structure of higher education and research in the United States is in danger, and only if university faculties can take effective action to make it clear that they propose to defend universities as centers of learning and rational inquiry can they protect the academic and research community from serious political reprisal.

Now if I were in an industrial or government laboratory or an independent research institute, I would be tempted to view this situation with malicious satisfaction, and with some cupidity. University scientists have been smug enough in the past to make this reaction inevitable. If students are disagreeable and politically unpopular, may not Congress be tempted to force the transfer of research contracts from universities to more secure sites? In the short run this is quite likely, and the shift in money may be followed by the transfer of professors who are inclined to think that labs without students may offer some attractions.

But in a fundamental sense the rest of the research world would lose as heavily as the universities by such a development. For the style, the attitudes, the sense of freedom, the obligation to share basic concepts for testing and criticism, that are fostered in the self-governing university faculty are the fundamental protections of the scientist wherever he works. This is not entirely a matter of intangible attitudes. The desire of the nonacademic laboratory to compete with the university for scarce talent gives it an incentive for maintaining an atmosphere of intellectual inquiry, and for encouraging scientists to remain actively engaged in the community of free scholarship, that might be lost entirely if a rigid bureaucratic bar-



rier should be erected between the two parts of the scientific community.

But although I am temperamentally a pessimist, I see some grounds for hope that the whole community of science will hang together on its general standards, and help provide the technical base, and perhaps even some of the moral support, for solving the problems that require the most urgent attention by the nation.

The first is that scientists now recognize the breadth and scope of the problems that have been caused by our uncritical addiction to technological and industrial progress, and our lack of attention to the problems that it brings. Scientists have been in the forefront of the movement to call attention to the pollution of our environment, and to demand remedial action. Scientists are beginning to be concerned with the other problems that we lump together rather indiscriminately as our domestic "urban problem"—problems of race, poverty, nutrition, housing, and crime—as well as with the global problems of population and economic development. In the field of national security, scientists, without assuming (most of them) that we are yet in a world where a great nation can dispense with military power, are beginning to appreciate how much security depends on other considerations than military hardware. And their broadening of concern in all these directions has led them to broaden their conception of science itself, to include the social as well as the physical and biological sciences in the equipment the experts need if their work is to be relevant to the issues of the next generation.

The second ground for hope is that the sciences are beginning to be incorporated into the processes of administration, in practice as well as in theory. Over the past couple of decades a new range of techniques for the study and control of administrative systems and of the methods of making decisions has been developed by the operations researchers and the systems analysts. And these new techniques will doubtless serve not merely to make management more efficient in carrying out predetermined policies, but also to let scientists and administrators together play a more effective role in the criticism of old policies and the formulation of new ones.

It used to be fashionable in scientific meetings to speak in glowing terms about the Utopia that we would build if the average citizen would only listen to the scientists. Now that the rebellion against science and technology is coming not from the man in the street but from within the academic community itself, any such note of optimism sounds fatuous. But in a time of troubles it is especially necessary to keep one's head; romantic despair and blind resentment are equally dangerous moods. I do not expect science alone to save us. But in the independent research institutes and the universities of this country we can nurture the rational and critical methods of thought—the habit of judging issues by intellectual as well as moral standards—that offer the greatest hope for the future.

#### STATEMENT CONCERNING WAR IN VIETNAM

**HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a statement concerning the war in Vietnam, forwarded to me by Mr. John Park Cravens, of Russellville, Ark. Mr. Cravens shares

my conviction that the war in Vietnam should be brought to a conclusion at the earliest possible date.

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

STATEMENT BY JOHN PARK CRAVENS,  
MAY 21, 1969

I can understand why America fought Spain in 1898, and World Wars One and Two, and the war in Korea. But I do not understand why we have let Castro and Russia take over Cuba right under our land's nose, and why our nation is now at war with North Vietnam thousands of miles away and backed by China and Russia, and other countries.

I do not understand why we took up a fight that France lost, and decided was hopeless and not worth the price. I do not understand why we have for years maintained a National Chinese, and forces of our own, on islands not far from the Chinese mainland. As I see it, our country is the victim of what General deGaulle and France avoided. The war we are now presently in in Vietnam is hopeless for several reasons as I see it.

America has internal disorders, and there is an explosive situation here at home that "has gotta give" and it is up to our country to change our Vietnam war policy now for our land's self preservation. Our nation should stop now, and no longer try to police the world.

No matter what enemy we fight, China and Russia will back the enemy to the hilt with money, arms, and other ways, and in a showdown with manpower. I love my country, and I am proud of its fighting its enemies heritage, but I do not believe in its exhausting its military and financial power in vain. Indeed there is such a thing as going too far with foreign financial and military aid.

I am a service-connected disabled veteran of World War One, and I have a son who is a service-connected disabled veteran of the war in Korea, and I have another son who has had military service. My forefathers came to America from Europe in the 16th Century, and several fought in the American Revolution. I write this letter as a patriot, and as a foe of communism. I am neither a Hawk nor a Dove, but a true average American who wants what is best for his land in every thing.

God bless our space program and our heroes on their way to the moon now, and bring our sons home from Vietnam.

#### THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC AGENCY

**HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 the American Oceanic Organization had the great privilege of having as its principal speaker Dr. William A. Nierenberg, director of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography. Because of the pertinence and importance of the subject, I include Dr. Nierenberg's speech in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD:

THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC AGENCY

(By Dr. William A. Nierenberg, director, Scripps Institute of Oceanography)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the subject perhaps is of the most pressing importance, and that is the Marine Commission's proposal to the President (now before the Congress), for a National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency—which I

will call NOAA from here on, as does everyone else. In order to make my talk as useful as I can, I think I will take a somewhat different point of view than that in the Report itself, which, of course, is a very voluminous document. In addition, there is important supporting data in the equally voluminous panel reports. Rather than make a parallel argument in favor of NOAA, I will go the other way and examine the situation in the ocean sciences and technology as it has existed in recent history. To try to understand what has prevented its fullest development in our current governmental, industrial, and educational environment and only after we look at some of the pertinent problems, will I suggest what the appropriate role for NOAA would be in solving these problems. Before I do so, however, I have to furnish you some background.

My own personal thinking has been very heavily conditioned by the fact that I was very closely associated with the Manhattan Project during the war, and from 1950 to the present time, I was involved with the development of atomic energy (mostly, I must admit, in the laboratory and primarily as a group leader in the Radiation Laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley). Now during most of this period, I was not exactly famous for being an administrator. When you work in the laboratory, no matter how good the administration is, you see it by distorted vision.

In recent years however, I have come to appreciate the fact that the AEC has been a marvelous instrument of government policy; it has been very well organized to carry out this policy and has done a splendid job in all respects. And so to some degree I take the AEC as a model of what it is we can do if we want to. Comparisons and analogies are never perfect, and I would like to stress the one difference that does modify our thinking. When the AEC came into being, more or less by fiat, it had the entire field to itself. Essentially no part of its future activities had been preempted by any other government organization. Nowhere was there a history of involvement in a real sense by any other part of the government. Despite the sudden public interest in the field of the ocean sciences in recent years (and I would like to return to this point shortly), great achievements in ocean technology are not new. I must remind you that the Atlantic Cable is now over a hundred years old, and it will be a long time, given the technological level of the society in being, before we can achieve anything as great.

The Atlantic Cable was a gigantic feat in ocean technology: in the design of a cable for the deep abysses, the handling and the splicing of such a cable, the establishment of working shore stations through the surf, and the general difficult conditions of the beach. It was, in addition to all of this, a tremendous achievement in both theoretical and applied electrical engineering (called physics then) and, in fact, a whole branch of mathematics of the greatest importance was invented in conjunction with the design of the Atlantic Cable. Some of the greatest minds of the era worked on the problem. This is only one of many examples, and so we find the government historically, in many of its departments, deeply involved in many aspects of the ocean for good and sound reasons. Returning to our analogy, we find that the development of the subject is proceeding not at all well, at least for those of us that really know what can be done and what we think needs to be done.

I referred earlier to the general public interest—this is something I cannot very easily explain—but it has been nothing short of amazement for me to watch the exponential growth of public interest in the ocean sciences over the last decade. And when I say public, I mean the worldwide public; I also mean all levels of society: high school and college students, the busi-

nessman, the man in the street, the members of Congress, the international agencies, the diplomatic corps, and people in all countries. They clearly are ready and willing to pay for a major and substantial increase in our involvement with the world's oceans. As a result, those agencies of the United States Government that have been assigned responsibility for specific areas in ocean sciences and technology have indeed accelerated their efforts, have come to the Congress for increased support, and have very often obtained this increased support. I mention such agencies as ONR (in fact, the United States Navy in general), the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, in fact almost every department of the government. Yet what is lacking, in my opinion, is adequate government action in certain areas necessary to maintain the full thrust in the field that apparently is wanted by everyone. These are areas that are normally relegated to inter-agency coordinating councils, when no great steps forward are required, but which never function well when a major change in policy is desired. The first such area is manpower.

To get a feeling for the magnitude of the problem it is worth making a brief review of the situation immediately after World War II with respect to the proposal to develop an Atomic Energy Commission and a nationwide effort in the nuclear sciences. When the war was over, we were left with a heritage of ideas as to the future of the peaceful and military uses of atomic energy.

We also had a fund of manpower on which to draw. By example, as of the 31st of December 1945, there were 5,070 members of the American Physical Society—the majority of whom were active practicing physicists. Solid state research had not yet started its steep climb; the transistor was yet to be invented. No other major national effort was competing for the services of these physicists. With this pool of manpower it was relatively easy to staff not only the administrative aspects of the program—the planning aspects—but the field laboratories as well, and supply faculty and staff for the institutions that would supply the training of the future practitioners in the field. Almost from the outset, this effort was guaranteed a good source of superbly trained manpower. However, the point that is essential to the idea of a technological explosion is that there must be a small group of workers who, in a certain occupational sense, represent the key to that field. In addition, their ranks have to be augmented by large numbers of specialists in other fields. For example, the whole gamut of engineering, as well as medicine, biology, many aspects of chemistry other than the obvious one of nuclear chemistry, the industrial sciences such as banking, management, and so on are needed. But there has to be some central group of people who make one technological explosion different in content, aims, and aspirations from another. In the case of atomic energy, it was largely the physicist and nuclear chemist.

On the 15th of March 1955, the American Physical Society had 11,704 members, but another change took place. Physics was now well represented as a major curricular effort in essentially every university in this country. Its importance as a basic and fundamental science was now recognized on a nationwide basis, not only as an intellectual source and a support curriculum for others but as a basic input to the rapid development of modern technology. This is about the time of the beginning of our Space Program. It is true that in the intervening years there was a tremendous growth in the general area of solid state physics, and its importance to the modern technological explosion was becoming generally well recognized. Even so, there was still an adequate basis of manpower which, when coupled with that supplied from

the aircraft industry, was sufficient to be able to plan and develop a burgeoning space industry.

In fact, a small sub-set of the physicists, known as cosmic ray physicists, were already reaching with their experimental equipment as far into space as they could at the time, and they were a very natural component of the group now loosely called "Space Scientists." Speaking as I am, of course, from the viewpoint of how to develop a major thrust in the direction of ocean exploitation, there is another significant point which should be noticed. It is very clear in the case of the Space Program that it was one whose central theme was very clearly and easily enunciated . . . it was one whose goal could be grasped and understood by people in all levels of our society. That central goal was to put man on the moon by the year 1970.

The fact that the goal could be simply stated in a few words does not make the technological job any easier. As we know, it presented a formidable array of technological problems that had to be overcome. However, we do not underestimate the psychological advantage to a nation that has a goal stated in very simple terms. It is far easier to marshal resources toward such a goal than one which is equally accepted but has to be stated in terms of ten or more goals, as is the case of oceanography. The case of atomic energy was not so easily put, yet again the goals could be more simply put than those for oceanography. The two programs are now largely self-sustaining, and we can note that the American Physical Society membership is 21,870 as of June 1, 1965, which indicates a growth far less than that of the two programs that the pool of trained personnel helped initiate.

The contrast with applied ocean science is clear. The equivalent pool of oceanic scientists is less than one thousand—some informed opinion believes it to be far less. It is from this reservoir of ocean scientists and engineers that we have to look toward for supplying the cadre of trained manpower needed for a major effort. To this cadre we will adjoin the same variety of engineers, medical people, executives, and others of the kind that were needed for the earlier programs. The number one thousand or less, however, is significantly less than in the earlier history to raise serious questions about the feasibility of a rapidly expanding, well balanced program, unless this reserve is used with wisdom, and steps are rapidly taken to correct this deficiency. To underscore this difficulty, we must raise another aspect of the problem, and that is the one related to the diversity of the goals of the program. In terms of the manpower requirements, this can be roughly translated by the variety of disciplines in the organization of the parallel science of oceanography. The conventional divisions include physical oceanography, chemical oceanography, marine biology, biological oceanography, marine geology, inshore oceanography, theoretical oceanography (which is largely fluid mechanics on the oceanic scale). These have become largely distinct disciplines within the field, and they further subdivide the available manpower to levels that are clearly marginal in any of the important fields.

When we examine the origin of this deficiency in detail, we find real institutional blocks against any large output of ocean scientists, and we marvel rather that the pool is as large as it is. We take great pride at Scripps in the fact that so many of the important posts in oceanography are held by Scripps graduates or Scripps trained people. We feel that we have done our job well given the circumstances and the fact that we are largely a research institution.

We have increased our enrollment to 180 graduate students, and other institutions have made corresponding gains, but we are all reaching a saturation in the facilities allowed us for managing this population. The

reasons are largely to be found in the present institutional structure. The University has been built almost exclusively on a departmental basis, and the important departments from the viewpoint of size and support are the basic disciplinary ones. The pertinent ones are physics, chemistry, biology, mathematics, geology, and engineering. This is fundamental for well trained oceanographers for it is to these departments that we turn for our qualified B.S.'s and B.A.'s for admission to our graduate schools in oceanography. However, these disciplines represent a vertical structure in our educational system for the components maintain their departmental characteristics from high school through the graduate school and even beyond into the post-doctoral area. This vertical structure within a discipline develops a synergism between its different levels which leads to a considerable economy in the structure and is particularly appealing to a public that faces mounting pressures from the dizzying rate of growth of the college population. As a result, professional research positions are supported in large part by the undergraduate teaching load, and graduate student support is largely accommodated by the undergraduate teaching assistant requirements. In some disciplines, notably chemistry, it is estimated that on a nationwide basis two-thirds of the graduate student's support derives from his employment as a teaching assistant.

By contrast, the interdisciplinary subjects, such as oceanography and meteorology in the sciences and archeology in the humanities (which we must note are largely in graduate studies), are not able to benefit materially from the undergraduate explosion. They are severely limited in student support, research appointments, and space. In principle, the undergraduate chemist could become a teaching assistant in the chemistry department while working for his Ph. D. in oceanography.

In practice, the chemistry department reserves these appointments for its own graduate students thus cutting off the interdisciplinary graduate department from an important source of student support. This is an important change from the pre-World War II situation where the undergraduate department was large and fed the various professional schools with very little demand by its own graduate division which was relatively small. I can only easily cite the recent experience at Scripps which I believe is typical. This year we admitted only ten per cent of the qualified applicants to our graduate school. It is true that the average upper division grade point average of those admitted climbed to a spectacular 3.62. I feel that the process has become too selective and that we are excluding potential candidates of considerable talent and promise as well by not doing what we can to satisfy legitimate aspirations in a field that needs this talent.

I have dwelt on the manpower problem perhaps too much, but I did intend to go into one of the problems in more detail, since there is a certain commonality to all of them. The second obstacle in the way of developing the full program that is not being overcome today is a lack of specialized engineering groups attached to the major institutions, whose assignment is the development of the advanced technology that is peculiar to the field itself. By way of example, the AEC has well established engineering and planning groups that work years ahead on such problems as high-speed counting, computer technology special to bubble chambers, accelerator operations and, in fact, engineering groups that are designing accelerators for the future. In oceanography we need similar specialized groups independently supported but closely associated with the oceanographic community who work on such problems as advanced instrumentation,



communications, specialized ship computer technology, and similar problems.

Such groups simply do not exist right now, because the method by which support is derived for current ocean exploration and research is mostly on a project basis. By and large, we have no continuity guaranteed in our funding, and we operate primarily on a project-by-project basis. This method goes right up the line to Congress, and, very understandably, the Washington administrator is more anxious to exert himself for project funding for which payoff is more immediate in terms of reputation than in funding for long-range groups whose work is, by definition, never associated with specific research accomplishments—since by the time the research is in progress—he is working five years ahead again, and direct credit cannot be assigned to the agency which did the basic engineering support. As a result, I feel, the average technology in the ocean sciences is backward compared to what is used in other fields such as space and nuclear sciences.

This situation is almost exactly the same with another agonizing problem, that of actual laboratory and office space. I have discussed the problem earlier in connection with normal educational support, and while there was the problem of relatively low priority for global science, the hindrance for support for basic research again is one of the project support mode and the lack of a continuing capital investment. In fact, I could adjoin the building problem to the additional problem of capital investment; that is to say, the national capital investment in ocean science and technology. This is an extremely serious problem. I feel that our capital investment in terms of standard scientific instruments such as mass spectrometers, oscilloscopes, gas chromatographs, winches, cranes, to mention a diverse few, is in very poor shape. The reason is, of course, that the average proposal for a contract is usually not large enough to support the purchase of a major piece of equipment, which often can best be amortized over a variety of rather different projects. I have established a figure to my own satisfaction that a capital acquisition rate of between 10 and 20% of the operating budget is required. The cumulative effect of this continual capital investment represents just as much a measure of progress in the science and technology as capital investment does in any normal industry. In periods of budget cuts, which unfortunately occur with predictable frequency, the first item to go is the capital investment if it is not specifically earmarked as such and set aside. And if the prolonged period of lack of attention to this investment occurs, the technology remains relatively backward.

I have set aside as a special topic that capital investment which represents the oceanographic vessel. I think I can speak with some authority on the subject, since Scripps operates the largest oceanographic research field in the country and almost anywhere on the globe at any time. While the United States Navy, through the ONR and the NSF, has done relatively well under the circumstances in supplying us with vessels, the program has again been far from adequate because of the lack of a central funding agency which makes it its business to see that the nations' oceanographic fleet is adequate, modern, and supported on a long-term and sufficiently funded basis. It has been an extraordinary struggle to even come to where we are—most of the research that has been done in the United States until recently has been done with hand me down, made over vessels left over from World War II. We have been adding to our fleet the first of a series of research vessels designed from the keel up specifically for oceanographic research. The program, however, has slowed considerably, and the prospects at the moment look rather grim.

It is not obvious from what I have said so far that the monies involved in the four

or five problems I have touched on are not very large compared to the overall expenditures in the program—but it is true. At the Scripps Institution, for example, we anticipate this year that our fleet cost would be approximately 15% of the total laboratory expenditures, perhaps a bit on the low side. Of course, without a fleet, we would hardly be oceanographers, or perhaps I should put it another way, someone who claims to be an oceanographer who does not go to sea is simply not one. In a certain sense the total budget is not an adequate measure of the health or the growth of the field. The distribution of these monies, their allocation, and their priorities are of considerably greater significance. The specific items I chose to put forward today represent just those items that always suffer the most when there is not a strong central planning agency with real influence over the funding with the clear responsibility for the overall state of the science.

As you have certainly come to realize, I have preferred to approach the problem by not endorsing NOAA in any blanket way, but rather to point out just those areas which I believe are areas of importance, at this moment almost of neglect, where the concept of a single agency does offer a solution. I dare say that in reviewing these problems (and if you accept these as real problems) other possible organizational solutions could be found rather than a single agency. I must say that I have thought about the problem a good deal, and for a number of years, and I have not been able to think of any other really adequate solution. For example, one could conceive of a centralized agency somewhat smaller in scope than that proposed by the commission, but then its responsibility would be considerably diminished, and its voice would necessarily carry less weight when pleading for its proper budgetary treatment. Also, one could consider creating a separate division within the NSF, for example, which could carry this responsibility, but again this division would be, at least in modern terms, much larger in operation than the rest of the Foundation and could, therefore, present certain serious problems with respect to the Foundation's primary role which is the support of basic science on all fronts. We could go on inventing this way more or less indefinitely, but I for one have found it very hard to escape the conclusion that some agency, similar to that proposed by the Commission, would be required if we are to make a really determined and concerned effort in developing the field of oceanography and applied ocean science.

#### PAY INCREASE BILL FOR VICE PRESIDENT AND OTHER TOP GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Example at the Top," published in the Los Angeles, Calif., Herald-Examiner of May 7, 1969.

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

#### EXAMPLE AT THE TOP

Something incredible has happened. The U.S. Senate has shelved the big pay increase bill for the Vice President and other top government officials.

The House passed the measure in January

and it was expected to have had easy sailing in the Senate. But something happened in the meantime. A huge and growing volume of mail from the constituents back home protested the big hikes in salaries at a time when, as Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia warned, "We are in a period of high inflation. If we're going to get inflation under control there must be an example at the top! What kind of example are we setting here?"

There was no organized letterwriting campaign. The deluge of protests simply expressed the indignation felt by a great many tax-burdened citizens.

The Senate's action should encourage all of us to realize public officials are sensitive to our opinions if we make them known.

Under consideration in the Senate in Sacramento is a bill to boost legislators' salaries 20 per cent. The same advice Sen. Byrd gave for Washington also applies in Sacramento. If inflation is going to be controlled and spending curtailed, there must be an example at the top.

DILLARD'S DR. DENT

**HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 27, 1969*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Albert W. Dent, who has been president of Dillard University for 27 years, is retiring next month.

Dr. Dent has contributed much to community life, race relations, and education during his tenure at the university.

Dillard, which is located in my congressional district, is one of the country's finest educational institutions, and it is regarded so mainly because of the efforts and ingenuity of Dr. Dent.

Our community is proud of Dillard, and it is proud and thankful that we have had a person who bears the credentials of Dr. Dent. I personally regret that he will no longer be an official member of the educational community, but I know that Dr. Dent will continue to be active in educational community affairs.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members an editorial which appeared in the May 24 issue of the New Orleans States, which demonstrates the high regard the community has for Dr. Dent.

The editorial follows:

DILLARD'S DR. ALBERT W. DENT

The development of Dillard University is a measure of its president, Dr. Albert W. Dent, who retires next month after 27 years in office.

Its student body has more than trebled and its facilities greatly expanded during his tenure. It has benefitted from his innovative policies.

One outgrowth is, as a speaker said at this week's testimonial to Dr. Dent, Dillard is not a local institution, it is a national institution.

Yet development of Dillard does not fully measure its retiring president.

Before he came to the campus on Gentilly blvd. he was, as superintendent of Flint-Goodridge Hospital, an innovator who developed a forerunner of today's widely accepted group hospitalization insurance.

He has represented the nation at many international health meetings and has held presidency of national health organizations. Four presidents of the United States have

used his services as consultant on education and health.

In community life, Dr. Dent has variously held office with the United Fund, and worked as a member of the City Planning Commission. By gubernatorial appointment, he is a member of the Louisiana Commission on Human Relations, Rights and Responsibilities.

By no means do all these activities encompass the whole of Dr. Dent's endeavors on behalf of man and his community. But they do give an idea of the stature of the man who shortly turns the reins of Dillard over to another.

#### REMARKS OF GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN

#### HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, Gov. William G. Milliken of Michigan, on May 26, 1969, spoke in St. Clair, Mich., about the opportunities facing the Republican Party. He outlined his suggestions for broadening the base of the party and for making it more responsive to the needs and wishes of the American people. Governor Milliken's remarks relative to our young people are very perceptive indeed.

Mr. Speaker, our new Governor of Michigan has already achieved a remarkable record of accomplishment in the relatively brief period of 4 months. His remarks are worthy of consideration by all persons interested in our two-party system. I insert them in the RECORD as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,  
May 26, 1969

Ladies and Gentlemen: It's good to be here among so many friends, to see so many people who I know can be counted upon to give not only their votes to the Republican Party on Election Day, but also their time and their energy on many other days as well.

I think loyalty is one of the cardinal virtues. It makes me very happy to see so many people here who have been loyal to the Republican Party for many years. I'm glad that we can count on you. I only hope that you will give us not only your allegiance and your time, but also your ideas on how we might strengthen our party and in turn, strengthen our country.

One thing we must do, of course, is to make sure that we don't lose the people we already have. But that is not enough. What I am going to talk to you about tonight is the need to broaden the base of our party, to attract to the Republican Party the kind of supporters who have tended to side with our political opposition.

I think the future of the Republican Party here in St. Clair County, in Michigan, and in the entire nation, is very bright—provided we take advantage of the enormous opportunities that lie before us.

We have some things going for us, after all. For the first time in eight years, we have a Republican administration in Washington. And that administration has made a beginning of which we can all be proud. The President's speech outlining the new proposals to end the war in Vietnam was a landmark of statesmanship. All through the administration, we are seeing the kind of practical approach to problems—cautious, patient, but innovative—which we have come to expect from Republican officials. And in Lansing, while we have big problems ahead of us, we are continuing in power—

continuing the fine work which George Romney began and which completely reversed the fortunes of this state.

I think a great many voters are aware of this progress, and I think many voters who were independents or who were even of the opposite political faith have adopted a new openmindedness and a feeling of curiosity about the Republican Party.

1970 is a year in which Republicans have a golden opportunity to recoup losses where losses occurred, to make new inroads into Democratic strongholds, and to consolidate the gains which we made in 1968.

We could get into an endless debate about the best way to make those advances—the finer points of organization, financing, communication, issues, and so forth. But I think the key to Republican victories in the future is very simple—make a strong thrust into territory that we have long neglected.

And the territory we have neglected the most, it seems to me, is the territory occupied by young people. I won't bore you with the census report because I know you're already aware how the median age of our populace is rapidly shifting to the point where within a very few years, people under 25 will outnumber those over 25.

Why is it that so many young people today are turning elsewhere in search of an idealistic framework for life, rejecting the distinctly American ideals of individual freedom which we so readily accepted and so faithfully retained?

I can't really answer that question. Perhaps you in Ann Arbor, with so many young people around you, have some answers. In any event, I think we ought to look beyond the surface of things—beyond the long hair and the rebellious behavior—in an attempt to find what youth wants, and what we might do about it.

I give a lot of speeches, and I also listen to a few. Every now and then I find time to read one that someone else has given, and sometimes I'm very impressed. One of the most important speeches of recent months was made by Dr. George S. Wald, a Harvard University biologist who won the Nobel Prize. In this speech, Dr. Wald talks about the Vietnam War, the ABM, and some of the political issues of the day. I don't agree with everything he says by any means, but I do believe he reminded us of something very important about today's youth. He reminded us that they are growing up with some *desperately serious problems* that never confronted their elders when they were growing up—the threat of nuclear war and a population explosion that could bring about world famine. And he said:

"I think I know what is bothering the students. I think that what we are up against is a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future."

And then he went on to say:

"Unless we can be surer than we now are that this generation has a future, nothing else matters. It's not good enough to give it tender, loving care, to supply it with breakfast foods, to buy it expensive educations. Those things don't mean anything unless this generation has a future. And we're not sure that it does."

I think everyone in this room realizes that the question whether young people have a future is, in the end, a political question. We all complain about the size and power of government, but the size and power of government is determined by political means. The questions of war and hunger are determined by political means, and that is why it's so important for us to strengthen our political institutions, to open the doors of our party wide enough to allow entry by *people of all ages, by people of all economic station, by people of all races.*

I can't think of another time in recent history when the opportunities were larger for Republicans than they are today. Look at the two groups which have, in the past, tended to

favor the opposition—the young and the Negroes. Many of today's young people, especially college students, are impatient with slow change—they are radicals. But if we look beyond the speed with which they want to move, which is admittedly sometimes hard to do, I think we find that they believe some of the same things that Republicans have always believed.

We believe, as they do, that power ought to stay as close to home as possible, in the community and in the cities and in the states, and not—where it can be avoided—in the hands of the Federal Government.

We believe, as they do, that men must help those who are less fortunate than they are.

We believe, as they do, that every individual has talents and skills and must be allowed the greatest possible expression, and that society ought to be so established as to permit this expression.

We do not believe, as they do not either, that government must drive men to do good works—and there is abundant evidence to support our view.

Republican principles center around the belief that an individual should be free to achieve his full potential, and we do not regard this idea as radical. The foundation of our Republican belief is the inviolate freedom of the individual to pursue his destiny as long as that pursuit is consonant with the common good.

I think many young people would be surprisingly receptive to the Republican Party if we gave them the welcoming smile that they need for encouragement. Many of these young people question what their parents told them, and the truth is that many of their parents brought them on the pabulum of our political opposition.

In any event, the young have a healthy skepticism for a government, a federal government, which has been allowed to grow too powerful. And so do we. That is only one of the ideological islands where we might meet to talk to the young.

No, I do not think the young, or Negroes, or other minority groups reject the Republican Party on ideological grounds at all. I think they have stayed away largely because they have not been very impressed with the warmth of the welcome they received from us.

I believe we must all work much harder to make that welcome really felt by those who knock at our doors.

Together, we have a great opportunity to move Michigan forward, but if our leadership should falter, that opportunity will be lost for us. 1970 will be a tough election year, and we don't have a moment to lose in preparing for it.

We need to begin now to find men and women of ability, integrity, appeal, and dedication to be our candidates.

We need to organize volunteers—to harness the energies of groups and individuals, and especially of youth.

Our job—as a party of principle—is not just to listen to the people and reflect their wishes so that we can win power. Our job is to initiate two-way communication with the people, at every level, and by every means we can; to mold public opinion as well as to reflect it; to involve people directly in the shaping of a better state, a better nation, and a better quality of life. Our party must serve as the vision of the public—not merely its reflection.

Today, when more and more people have a growing sense of alienation, not only from each other but also from the decisions and the decision-makers that ultimately affect their lives, it is *absolutely vital* that there be at least one political party—the Republican Party—working at the grass roots—not just pleading for votes, but fighting for the people's efforts to put meaning back into their lives, involving the people directly in new approaches to the solution of human problems.



As Republicans, we must involve ourselves at every level with the incredibly difficult and complex social, economic, and political machinery that must be kept moving for the common good.

Our task as a broadly-based party must be to take the broad view of our society, its problems, and its opportunities, and to build toward a better future.

We must prove there is a better way.

In this concept lies our real hope for the future of this state and for the future of this party. The future of our party depends upon its ability to attract new people . . . independents, young people, minority groups, older citizens—all segments of our society.

All of us, whatever our age or outlook, will bear the consequences of the decisions which lie ahead.

And I need your help, and I know that I can count on it. I want to thank everybody here tonight for the time and energy you have devoted to your party, and in turn, your country.

**STATEMENT BY GEORGE A. ROEDER  
OF THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK  
ON ONE-BANK HOLDING COM-  
PANY LEGISLATION**

**HON. CHESTER L. MIZE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, during its deliberations on the one-bank holding company legislation, the House Banking and Currency Committee received a wide range of testimony on all the various aspects of the bills before us. For the benefit of Members who are seeking additional information on the issue, I wish to call attention to the statement presented to the committee by Mr. George A. Roeder, Jr., vice chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank. His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE A. ROEDER, JR., MAY 7, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is George A. Roeder, Jr., and I am Vice Chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York.

Our bank appreciates this opportunity to set out its views on the one-bank holding company. We feel that Congressional action on this issue will markedly affect the ability of the nation's financial mechanism to fulfill the complex demands that will be placed on it in the years ahead.

I commend the Chairman and members of this Committee for taking the initiative in seeking a responsible solution to a problem which, by its very nature, has many difficult aspects. In studying the Chairman's bill, as well as the other legislative measures designed to amend the Bank Holding Company act of 1956, I was particularly impressed with the thoughtful approach that was taken in each case.

Rather than commenting on these bills in detail, however, I would like to direct my remarks to five broader questions which, on the basis of your earlier sessions, seem to be of primary concern to the Committee.

The first is: *Why do commercial banks want one-bank holding companies?*

Let me respond by telling you why Chase Manhattan decided to form one. Incidentally, our holding company is not yet functioning but we do have the approval of our stockholders and the Comptroller of the Currency. Final reorganization merely awaits certain tax rulings expected in the next few weeks.

We decided after a good deal of reflection

that a one-bank holding company would offer several advantages. It would enable us to explore new areas of profitable growth, provide greater safety for our depositors, and serve the public interest effectively by helping to meet the changing financial needs of the national economy.

In recent years, commercial banks such as ours have been facing increasing pressures, both internal and external.

Internally, the composition of our resources has shifted strongly from demand deposits to a growing dependence on costly time money. To date, the impact of this trend, plus the steady rise in other costs of doing business, has been offset by higher interest rates which have helped banks maintain their earnings. But bankers realize that this situation will not go on indefinitely and that the cost-price squeeze will continue to be a problem.

In addition, credit demands on banks are increasingly of a longer term nature, while much of the deposit growth is short-term in character. Even the time honored commercial loan is more frequently on a term basis. Short-term financing of business, the traditional function of the banker, has become relatively less important.

Externally, the commercial banks have seen more and more of their familiar terrain invaded by other types of financial institutions not subject to the same restrictions as banks.

For example, many product-oriented companies have formed or acquired captive subsidiaries to finance a growing volume of credit sales. Commercial paper brokers, foreign banks, leasing organizations and factors have also intensified their efforts to serve U.S. business. Equally important, sales finance organizations and small consumer loan companies have financed aggressive expansion programs through the direct placement of commercial paper in competition for resources with the banks. As a result, domestic banks have found themselves in a new competitive environment, both in gathering resources and in lending money. And while most enterprising banks welcome competition, in the present environment they are often at a competitive disadvantage because of statutory or regulatory restrictions.

Faced with the internal and external pressures I have described, the banks have sought an organizational structure that would offer greater flexibility for financing and greater geographical mobility to broaden their service base and strengthen their competitive capabilities.

In this respect, the one-bank holding company provides a useful vehicle.

Through a holding company, a bank can do some things more efficiently and more appropriately than it can by itself. Such activities as equipment leasing and factoring might well have a greater potential, as subsidiaries of a holding company, because of the ability to operate directly over a wider geographical area.

Through a holding company, a bank can position itself more favorably to move into profitable new areas of growth as they develop. Financing of supersonic transport planes, commercial satellites, and the successive "generations" of electronic computers will require far greater flexibility of the kind that the holding company structure offers.

Through a holding company, there is an opportunity to consider a wide range of activities in which risks have traditionally been relatively high. For such activities, more money from investors and outside lenders should be at stake, rather than the funds of bank depositors. Certain types of real estate, leasing and small loan transactions are cases in point.

The restraints currently imposed on banks have limited competition in certain financial areas with resulting losses to the pub-

lic in terms of less competitive rates and less convenience.

The real estate mortgage field illustrates how a holding company can serve the public interest. Looking ahead over the next decade, we at Chase Manhattan see the demand for mortgage funds increasing at a substantially faster pace than either the financial market or the economy as a whole. To meet the projected annual need of some \$80 billion in mortgage money by 1980, vast new sources of funds must be found.

Of course, commercial banks already play a role in the real estate field. It is a limited role, though, and properly so, in view of the risks involved and the fact that banks are using their depositors' money. Yet, somehow, commercial banks must be brought more fully into the mortgage field if the country is to have access to the funds so vitally needed for housing and urban development.

Through the one-bank holding company structure, the same innovative spirit and talents that have in recent years produced significant gains in bank efficiency, a broader range of services for the public, and greater access to these services, can be marshaled to bring enhanced capabilities and competitiveness to mortgage banking and other finance-related fields.

A second question in which the Committee has shown great interest is: *What should be the scope of bank holding companies?*

Chairman Martin and Vice Chairman Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board have emphasized in their testimony the evolutionary character of banking, stressing that this is a dynamic field that is constantly changing. We agree.

The technological and management revolutions in which we are caught up have resulted in banks being called upon to provide services which, not long ago, would have seemed quite remote from the traditional image of banking. Already, within a comparatively few years, the relations between banks and individual consumers have undergone changes that have sharply altered patterns of buying.

Before World War II, most commercial banks shied away from direct consumer lending, preferring to stick to the function of providing self-liquidating short-term credit to business. As our economy broadened, however, banks contributed to new services aimed at helping the consumer enjoy an automobile, a home improvement, or even a vacation while he was paying for it and without jeopardizing the future security of his family. They set up revolving credit plans, developed charge-account banking, established student-aid programs, and financed purchases through overdraft checking accounts.

For the businessman, banks have provided greater access to long- and short-term funds and greater variety in the packaging of these funds. This has been done in the form of secured and unsecured loans, lease financing, factored accounts and other variants. Banks have introduced complex money mobilization systems to speed the availability of funds, payroll deduction plans to eliminate waste and duplication, and a host of computer-oriented services to assist corporate clients with their operations and planning.

As we look ahead, we can see sound reasons for recommending that commercial banks—through one-bank holding companies—be fully competitive in such areas as mortgage banking, equipment leasing, factoring, insurance, property management, land development, computer services, ticket reservation services and other specialties related to the area of finance.

We would suggest that any legislative definition of the scope of banking be made as flexible as possible, consistent with the over-

all public interest, to accommodate the changing needs of our economy. We believe it would be extremely difficult to say with assurance today what activities will constitute banking in the 1970s and 1980s.

The bills before you provide different methods of restricting entry into non-financial fields. Another method which we ask you to consider would be to define what is *not permitted* and leave a good deal of flexibility within the permissible areas.

There has been in Federal banking law since 1919 a model for legislation confining certain types of companies to financial business. This law—the Edge Act—was designed to permit federal incorporation of companies doing international financial business. Rather than beginning with general prohibitions and attempting to carve out a financial exception, the Edge Act permits these special financial holding companies to hold the stock of any international corporation “not engaged in the general business of buying or selling goods, wares, merchandise or commodities in the United States.” This has worked out very well over the years, and a similar approach might be taken to the Bank Holding Company Act.

It would be up to the supervisory agencies to make a judgment on precisely what fields bank holding companies might enter, depending upon the changing needs. Since the supervisory agencies would be reporting to Congress from time to time, the legislative branch would have an opportunity to adjust the regulatory structure as experience required.

A third question which has been raised frequently during these hearings is: *How should the one-bank holding company law be administered?*

Witnesses have discussed the issue of whether authority to determine permissible activities should be centralized in one Federal agency or dispersed in three.

Our preference would be for the three-agency arrangement on the ground that it would not give the total power to any single administrative agency, while still ensuring uniformity of standards.

It is true, of course, that such an arrangement might prove somewhat cumbersome. It might even slow down the process of determining the permissible areas of bank holding company activities. But, in this case, if thorough deliberation leads to sound policy, the economy will benefit and the banking community will not suffer.

We would strongly favor an arrangement under which the approval of two of the three agencies would be sufficient for sanctioning any guideline. Certainly, no one agency can claim a monopoly on highly talented individuals or wise decision-making.

To ask for unanimity in each case could paralyze the evolutionary development of banking and finance. It could dam up the forceful tide created by demands for new services and for more flexible methods of financing.

A fourth question is: *What about a “grandfather clause”?*

Although Chase Manhattan probably would not be directly affected by such a clause, we believe that some provision should be made to allow those holding companies that acquired subsidiaries in good faith to retain them.

To insist upon divestiture of long-established business relationships, which were legal and proper at the time they were entered into, seems to us a harshly punitive measure.

We are not prepared to say what would be the most appropriate cutoff date, but in our judgment it should predate the large-scale movement of banks to embrace the holding company structure.

A fifth question is: *What broad criteria should be considered in drafting the final legislation?*

In this connection, we would offer three specific suggestions.

**Existing laws:** We feel that the Committee should carefully evaluate the operation of present laws before superimposing another layer of restrictions. Many of the problems generally cited as arising from joint control of banks and non-banking companies are, in fact, dealt with by legislation already on the books.

For instance, the problem of conflict-of-interest is covered by Section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act which significantly restricts financial relationships between insured banks and their affiliates including holding company affiliates.

The antitrust laws are aimed specifically at problems of undue concentration of resources, and the fact that the acquiring company also owns a bank should not necessitate special distinctions and controls.

Years of antitrust enforcement by the Attorney General and the courts have shown the vigor and adaptability of the existing statutes. For example, they include appropriate safeguards against tie-in relationships. As the Supreme Court ruled in the recent U.S. Steel case, the extension of credit is clearly a “tying product” whose use may be illegal under the Sherman Act if the person extending the credit has sufficient economic power and a substantial amount of business is foreclosed by the tie. Assistant Attorney General McLaren stated in his testimony here that this decision may well have reduced the need for any such provision in the legislation now under consideration.

**Geographical Restrictions:** It seems to us that no geographical restrictions should be placed on holding company subsidiaries that are not deposit-gathering institutions. It makes little sense to restrict one company to state and banking-district lines because it happens to own a bank, while other companies providing similar services are free to establish offices on a regional or nationwide basis. The policy of Congress and of the states of protecting deposit-taking institutions from competition should not be applied to other services financed in a different way. Such restrictions would eliminate much of the efficiency, effectiveness and added competition inherent in the bank holding company.

**Interlocking Directors:** We believe the provisions of Chairman Patman’s bill regarding interlocking directors and officers between banks and other financial institutions could work a hardship on banks in smaller communities. In these areas there may be a limited number of persons with the training and experience to serve as directors of financial institutions. It may be very difficult for a local bank or insurance company to make up a board without including a person who is simultaneously a director of another financial institution. The suburbs and rural communities would stand to lose the services of valuable people under terms of this provision, and that would be a regrettable loss.

There have been no indications that abuses exist which would require the blanket prohibitions that have been proposed. However, if it is felt that some legislation is desirable, it might be appropriate to apply to bank holding companies a provision similar to the one that now applies to savings and loan holding companies. That is, to require the approval of the appropriate authority before interlocks between bank holding companies and other banks or holding companies would be permitted.

These, then, are some of the considerations we feel the Committee should take into account in drafting legislation which, hopefully, will safeguard one-bank holding companies against abuse without stifling the good that can come from this development if properly directed.

In setting out legislative ground rules, we believe all concerned would be well advised

to look not only at what banking is today but at what it could and should be in the future, to ask not only where banking has been but also where it is going.

We would hope that any legislation growing out of your deliberations would fulfill what we see as vitally important twin objectives: maximum protection for the funds of depositors and maximum flexibility for banking institutions to adjust to the changing needs of our economy and to remain fully competitive.

If these objectives are met, we feel confident that the public interest will be well served.

## SENATOR ROBERT GRIFFIN GAINS IN STATURE

### HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, several recent editorials have paid tribute to Michigan’s extremely able and distinguished junior Senator, BOB GRIFFIN.

Our Nation owes a great deal to this courageous man of principle, and I insert these editorials at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, May 12, 1969]

#### SENATOR ROBERT GRIFFIN GAINS IN STATURE

Michigan’s junior senator, Robert P. Griffin, appears to be moving closer to the designation of a man of great stature in the United States Senate.

Every turn of the wheel of political fortune, and particularly as it involves the strange case of Justice Abe Fortas of the United States Supreme Court, makes Senator Griffin look better.

A rise above the crowd in the Senate is not an accident. It comes only from ability and good judgment—and courage to take the lumps when the going is rough. High integrity and ability must be combined in a man who would make his mark in the Senate. Being a “nice guy” and a vote-getter are not enough.

Senator Griffin came through his trial by fire in a magnificent fashion when he dared to oppose President Johnson’s nomination of his long-time friend and legal adviser to the position of chief justice.

Griffin began a lonely crusade to block the nomination, something which is rarely done in the horse-trading atmosphere of Washington. He was chastised even by the leadership of his own party in the form of Sen. Everett Dirksen. Democrats and assorted liberals jumped on Senator Griffin and accused him of everything from “McCarthyism” to reflecting on the dignity of the high court.

The senator kept his campaign in a low key and avoided extreme charges. He had done his homework and made his point. Many of his early critics, including Dirksen, joined him in blocking the nomination.

Even after the battle was over, Griffin was subjected to sporadic attacks. He played it cool and did not revel in his victory.

The recent revelation of indiscreet conduct by Justice Fortas tends to prove that Senator Griffin was correct in his earlier campaign to block elevation of the Justice to the highest judicial post in the land. Again, he played his hand in a low key.

While many of his fellow senators were grabbing headlines by demands for the resignation or the impeachment of Fortas, Senator Griffin spoke softly. He refused to even make a big thing of reports of threats



against his life because of his role in the Fortas affairs. He mentioned, as he had previously, touching only the "tip of the iceberg" in bringing out the facts about the conduct of the justice.

Again, Senator Griffin is avoiding sensationalism and most certainly is carefully marshaling his facts. His acts are in keeping with what is supposed to be the dignity and the capacity for careful deliberation in the United States Senate.

In this era of hip-shooting headline hunters in every branch of government, the general tendency is to underestimate a man with Senator Griffin's methods.

The Democrats in Michigan made that mistake in 1966 when, as a relatively obscure member of the House, Bob Griffin slaughtered the old "champ", G. Mennen Williams, in the race for the Senate seat.

Dirksen, Johnson, Fortas and Co., underestimated him when he took on the dragon of the "Establishment" in opposing the nomination of Fortas for chief justice.

Fortas and adherents to the political school of thought which holds that indiscretions and impropriety are forgivable so long as no actual laws are violated, again may be underestimating the gentleman from Michigan.

Nice, quiet guys don't necessarily finish last; at least not when they know what they are doing and have the courage to make their valid points.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News,  
May 20, 1969]

#### GRIFFIN'S PRINCIPLED ARGUMENT VINDICATED

One man's fall from grace should never be used to advance another man's place. And any man who would so contrive to feed from the personal misery of another is no man at all.

In politics, however, the cruel game is often played out to the end, whatever the embarrassment.

It is inevitable, therefore, that the resignation of Justice Abe Fortas—forced by public revelation of damaging outside financial connections—produces a dichotomous effect. As Mr. Fortas fades from public life the public servant image of Michigan Sen. Robert P. Griffin is enhanced.

We are certain, however, that in this case Sen. Griffin wishes with all his might that he had been wrong rather than right way back when. To know this decent, principled Senate moderate at all is to know that at this hour his own agony at having been the one forced to carry the battle to bring another down is nearly as great as that of Mr. Fortas.

In this instance, of course, it is undeniably Sen. Griffin who emerges the victor in the ages old battle matching principle against political expediency. "Cronyism" is the word Sen Griffin gave it—and it revived an old cliché that still echoes around the American political scene.

Memories are not so short that recall of the Griffin role in the failure of Abe Fortas to gain Senate confirmation as Lyndon Johnson's choice for chief justice of the U.S. Court escapes anybody. It will have its effect on the American political appointive process for a long time to come.

Nor can one easily forget the tongue-in-cheek and oft times direct verbal put-downs Griffin endured when he arose to oppose the Fortas nomination.

In retrospect, however, the Griffin part in the Fortas tragedy deserves to be kept in clear context. Griffin never opposed Fortas' right to hold a seat on the Supreme Court bench. Nor did he ever try to minimize the Fortas legal competency.

What he did do was stand, when others were content to look the other way, and that was evolving around the selection of a man to hold a job as important as that of the chief justice of the United States.

It looked wrong then to a man of Griffin's legal background for a lame duck President to even exercise that prerogative and it looked even worse for the nomination of Fortas to be tied to the resignation of Chief Justice Earl Warren. Later, of course, Griffin did raise more serious questions about extralegal fees accepted by Fortas for a series of lectures at American University.

We ourselves took a dim view of Griffin's "cronyism" argument and an even dimmer view of subsequent attempts to smear Fortas as a lover of pornography because of certain high court decisions in which he had been involved. Let it be kept firmly in mind, though, that Sen. Griffin's principled cause never hit below the belt. As it gathered ultra-conservative allies it did become somewhat ridiculous and embarrassing even to the Michigan senator.

Unfairly he was linked to the Strom Thurmond-James Eastland ideological approach to things. He did pay a price for sticking to his guns—but stick to them he did. When it became obvious that more serious questions raised by Griffin such as the traditional right of advice and consent and the system of checks and balances were really the transcending issues—not personal vendetta—the Senate did finally wake up and Mr. Johnson withdrew the nomination at Fortas' request.

Subsequent events, which Griffin ironically had nothing to do with, have vindicated the senator's principled reasoning and sound judgment when it comes to passing approval on Supreme Court nominations—good for a lifetime.

In the tough world of politics, where it is all too often the unpopular and unprofitable thing to stand on principle, Bob Griffin looks strong and reliable.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, May 11, 1969]

#### FORTAS COULD COOL CRITICS BY QUITTING SUPREME COURT

(By John S. Knight)

Admittedly, the current imbroglio over alleged improprieties by Associate Justice Abe Fortas is damaging to the Supreme Court and the image it presents to the people.

It will give rise to further public skepticism about the nation's highest tribunal, the quality of its decisions and disbelief in the men who make them.

Notwithstanding, and before angry citizens begin again to despair of our constitutional process, let it be remembered that our Founding Fathers in their infinite wisdom established three branches of government—the executive, the legislative and the judicial.

Thus we were given a government of checks and balances, with each branch serving to restrain the excesses of the other.

The Supreme Court, whose primary role is to interpret the law and rule upon its constitutionality, can likewise find that a president has exceeded his authority.

Congress, as the legislative body, does make the laws. The President exercises the right of veto on legislation he deems to be unwise or improper. In turn, Congress can override a veto by a two-thirds vote. The power of impeachment also resides with the Congress.

The trials and tribulations of Associate Justice Fortas began with his nomination by President Lyndon Johnson on June 26, 1968, to become chief justice of the United States.

Almost immediately thereafter, opposition to the Fortas nomination was mounted by Michigan's Sen. Robert P. Griffin who discovered that Fortas had accepted a \$15,000 fee for conducting a seminar at American University, an act which Sen. Griffin considered to be improper. Griffin also charged that Fortas committed an impropriety in acting as President Johnson's personal ad-

viser after he had taken his seat on the Supreme Court.

In attacking Fortas, the Michigan senator predicted that "we have only uncovered the tip of an iceberg." Subsequent events proved him to be a perceptive legislator.

By early fall, Sen. Griffin's anti-Fortas campaign had so intensified that a Senate filibuster against the nomination could not be broken by administration leaders. The President withdrew Mr. Fortas' name on Oct. 2, 1968.

Recent revelations by Life magazine that Justice Fortas accepted \$20,000 from the Wolfson Family Foundation in 1966 when industrialist Wolfson was having difficulties with the government suggest that Mr. Fortas was sadly lacking in judgment.

The fact that Fortas returned the money 11 months later, following the indictment of Mr. Wolfson for selling unregistered stock, in no way excuses his error. Nor does Justice Fortas' explanation that he performed no services nor rendered any legal advice to the Wolfson Foundation mitigate the mistake.

Canons 4 and 24 of the American Bar Association say in part: "A judge's official conduct should be free from impropriety. . . . A judge should not accept inconsistent duties; nor incur obligations, pecuniary or otherwise, which will in any way interfere or appear to interfere with his devotion to the expeditious and proper administration of his official functions."

To add to the controversy, Knight Newspapers has discovered that no record of the Fortas payment appears in the Wolfson Family Foundation's report of income and expenses for the year 1966, although the Internal Revenue Service has known about this payment for at least two years.

Pending investigation, it is unknown whether there is any evidence which might lead to charges against the associate justice.

But it is no overstatement to say that the Fortas case has hurt the stature of the Supreme Court; that only his resignation can ameliorate to some extent the damage which has been done.

For the record, as they say, I confess to having supported President Johnson's nomination of Justice Fortas.

At the time, the attacks upon him appeared to be politically motivated and engendered by Republicans yearning to pin back Lyndon Johnson's ears. I took the lofty view that politics had no place in Supreme Court appointments; that the President's wish should be honored.

In the light of developments to come, I was wrong. Sen. Robert P. Griffin is to be honored for his opposition to Justice Fortas. He proved to be far more knowledgeable than his critics.

The U.S. Senate's successful filibuster against the Fortas nomination is a classic example of how the checks and balances given to each branch of the federal government work in practice.

For the Senate, by refusing to yield to the will of the chief executive, proved at least in the Fortas case that the Congress need not be a rubber stamp for the President.

And this, under our federal republic, is what government is all about.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News,  
May 7, 1969]

#### FORTAS EXPOSURE JUSTIFIES GRIFFIN CRUSADE (By J. F. Ter Horst)

WASHINGTON.—If it had not been for a fight led by Michigan's Senator Robert P. Griffin, the chief justice of the United States today probably would be Abe Fortas.

And, as such, the nation today would have the uncomfortable knowledge that its supreme legal authority had received \$20,000 from the family foundation of Louis Wolfson, a controversial financier, during the time Wolfson was attempting to avoid eventual conviction as a stock market manipulator.

Fortas was tendered the money in January, 1966, three months after ascending to the high court, according to Life magazine, and returned it 11 months later. Fortas has acknowledged as much, saying the money was to have been used for Wolfson foundation research studies that he did not have time to undertake.

Against the background of the latest Fortas hubbub Griffin now looms as a senator whose anti-Fortas campaign in 1968 has been substantially vindicated. Even pro-Fortas senators are critical of the justice now.

Griffin claims no powers of clairvoyance were behind his decision to oppose President Johnson's nomination of Fortas as successor to Chief Justice Earl Warren.

His grounds then were based on Fortas' longtime friendship with Mr. Johnson—Griffin called it cronyism—and a belief that a post as important as chief justice should be filled by whoever would be elected president in November.

Questioned before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Fortas acknowledged he had, while a member of the court, given Mr. Johnson advice on handling the Vietnam war and the 1967 Detroit rioting.

Asked whether he had engaged in any other off-the-bench activities, Fortas responded that he believed he had made "a full disclosure."

Shortly after that, Griffin declared that the Senate's inquiry into the Fortas case had "exposed only the tip of the iceberg."

Then followed the revelation last September that Fortas had accepted a \$15,000 teaching fee from funds raised by a former law partner from one-time business associates of the justice.

It was this disclosure that finally soured the Senate on Fortas and led to Mr. Johnson's withdrawal of his nomination to be chief justice.

Just why Fortas' involvement with the Wolfson foundation did not emerge then is a mystery to Griffin.

For his part, Fortas apparently did not consider it relevant to the Senate's investigation of his fitness to serve as chief justice—or he did not remember it.

This time Griffin is not leading the hue and cry over Fortas. He can sit back and let others—including some of Fortas' friends of last year—carry on the fight he began.

All the young Michigan Republican has done this time is lend his voice to the demands of others.

Griffin noted that the allegations against Fortas "indicate a breach of the extraordinary insulation which must exist between members of the Supreme Court and private interests in order to avoid even the appearance of impropriety."

And he is supporting the suggestion of Senator Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy that Fortas might want to appear before the Judiciary Committee again to explain the Wolfson case.

Friends of the associate justice think he may very well tender his resignation when the June term of the court ends. Some of his old defenders, as well as old critics, think Fortas ought to consider it.

Editorialized the Washington Post: "Unless Justice Fortas can provide a more compelling explanation, publicly and in some reasonable detail, he can best serve himself, the court on which he sits and his country, by stepping down."

The New York Times declared Fortas' explanation "falls far short of adequacy. . . . The dignity of the Supreme Court requires the most exhaustive disclosure of every aspect of the Wolfson affair."

The Fortas case is perhaps the most dramatic aspect of something that long has puzzled Washington observers. Why do some members of the judiciary, particularly those on the Supreme Court, feel it necessary to have substantial outside activities involving private remuneration?

Members of the Supreme Court, for example, are now paid \$60,000 a year. Their appointments are for life. They are entitled to full-pay retirement at 65 after 15 years on the bench.

Over the years there has been a growing tendency for some justices to take on, for pay, such extra activities as lecturing, teaching and writing. Perhaps the most productive in these fields has been Associate Justice William O. Douglas.

Before going on the bench, Fortas was one of the best-known and most highly paid attorneys in Washington. Mrs. Fortas also is a skilled lawyer. They have no children.

There is talk of enacting a law against outside earnings by members of the court in order to reinforce official integrity. That would be even more palatable, to the public at least, if it also applied to members of Congress.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, May 7, 1969]

#### GIVE A CHEER FOR SENATOR GRIFFIN

Abe Fortas almost became chief justice of the United States Supreme Court last year.

His failure to be confirmed by the Senate—after then-President Lyndon B. Johnson sought to promote his own nominee for the position of associate justice—can be attributed largely to one man, Michigan Republican Sen. Robert P. Griffin.

Mr. Griffin was not even a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which had approved the nomination. But he had a firm conviction and he championed it effectively.

He said on Oct. 1, more than three months, after the Fortas nomination had been submitted, and just before the Senate rejected a motion to cut off debate on the question:

"I took my stand and I have worked so hard to build support for my position, precisely because I am concerned about the Supreme Court as an institution—because I believe the American people should respect the court and hold it in high esteem."

A Senate impasse having been reached, Mr. Johnson then withdrew the Fortas nomination at the request of Mr. Fortas.

In view of the revelations made when that nomination was being considered, and the revelations regarding Mr. Fortas that have since been uncovered, the convictions and the actions of Sen. Griffin have been well vindicated.

That courageous man from Michigan did his duty as a United States senator. He deserves high commendation for the vital part he played in preventing Mr. Fortas from becoming the nation's chief justice.

#### TURMOIL ON OUR COLLEGE CAMPUSES

#### HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, many Members of Congress have individually, and in some instances collectively, expressed their dismay and concern about the turmoil that has spread on college campuses throughout our Nation. We are hopeful that the disorder will not result in the kind of repressive reaction by the Federal Government which would destroy the concept and practice of academic freedom. Yet, we are aware that unless effective and meaningful steps are taken to curb campus lawlessness, academic freedom is threatened by coercive forces from within the college community.

It would seem that the greatest need on the campus today is for college and university authorities to assert their proper role of protecting and preserving order. Administrators and faculties have the power under law and, more importantly, the obligation to end coercion as a means of influencing educational policy. They have a duty to assure our free society, which supports higher educational institutions, that rule by muscle will not be substituted for the rule of reason.

I am pleased that the executive committee of the Association of State College and University Faculties in Pennsylvania has unanimously endorsed a resolution which expresses a strong opinion that action by the academic community to curb campus disorder is mandatory if governmental intervention in college affairs is to be avoided. This resolution is the type of expression which holds out real hope that present crisis in education can be dealt with by educators themselves. I include the text of the resolution in the RECORD at this point:

#### RESOLUTION BY ASSOCIATION OF PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTIES

The Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties expresses its deep concern about the loss of academic freedom which has occurred at numerous colleges and universities throughout the nation. This situation has resulted from the actions of some students and professors who, though in a small minority, have acted in an irresponsible, destructive and sometimes lawless manner to disrupt the teaching, research and administrative functions of their institutions.

Using unjustified coercive methods, this group has overridden democratic processes to force consideration or acceptance of their demands.

We urge administrators and faculties in our institutions of higher learning to take such prompt and effective action as is within their power to prevent such coercion of any or all segments of the college and university community. We believe that only through prompt action will our institutions be able to convince the public that governmental action is not necessary. To remain silent and inactive at this time is to invite intervention by outside forces.

#### PUTTING MINORITY GROUPS TO WORK

#### HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, although our points of view may differ, there is hardly an American who is unconcerned that not all Americans participate in the mainstream of our society. Whatever our individual points of view, I believe each of us will profit by reading a speech delivered March 24, 1969, by Gilbert E. Dwyer, vice president for administration of the Kennecott Copper Corp. at the spring meeting of industrial relations specialists in the mining industry of the United States and Canada.

Mr. Dwyer provides a perceptive sketch of how this situation came about, pre-



sents a realistic assessment of this trial of our times, and then enthusiastically challenges his colleagues to become involved in the solution he offers.

I feel fortunate that Mr. Dwyer's driving address came to my attention, and I heartily commend it to my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF GILBERT DWYER

Within the last two decades we have been witness to a telescoping of time unique in the history of mankind. Never has the speed of political, scientific and social change been so accelerated in our world.

In the speeding years since the conclusion of World War Two, we have seen the rapid decline of all but two of the traditional world powers . . . balanced by the emergence of new nations in Africa and new powers in Asia. The maps of today are vastly changed from those of twenty years ago and reflect an ideological spectrum that often changes overnight.

In 1945 the Age of the Atom burst upon us through a dreadful instrument of war. Today knowledge is brushing away some of the fear and much of the mystery that once surrounded nuclear fission, and that awesome force is being refined into an exotic and useful power source.

In 1954, we had one electronic data processing system in the United States. Two years later there were 59. By 1968 we had 6,000 electronic brains far surpassing the speed of the human mind. In a fantastically short period, the Age of Cybernetics has already undergone three generations of obsolescence and improvement.

The Jet Age has shrunk the world as we know it and made it possible to equate thousands of miles of difference with mere hours of time. The first commercial jet passenger service was inaugurated in 1952; today the convenience and speed of jet travel is taken for granted.

And now, we are attending the birth of a Space Age. In less than a dozen years we will have come from Sputnik to space walks to a man on the moon.

Today, each new age springs into life long before the last has even neared full growth, and the acceleration has only begun.

For most of us, the attempt to fully assimilate the changes which so affect our lives is a battle we are beginning to lose. We have to accept them without being granted the time to examine these changes in terms of consequences. But we can accept them readily, because largely they have been good to us.

As members of the technocracy, we reap more benefits than penalties. We acknowledge the hope inherent in human organ transplants. We enjoy the convenience of jetliner travel. Vicariously, we experience the excitement of space exploration and find practical uses for the scientific fallout. We share in a warm and prideful security as useful participants in our remarkable and affluent society.

But there are Americans who cannot share our excitement, who cannot cope with the bright new world that technology is speedily building around us, because they cannot begin to comprehend it; because they are standing still amidst the rush of progress. In these Americans, the speed of change generates fear and the fear that forced withdrawal and aimless apathy is now beginning to foster fury.

These Americans are the "have-nots," the disadvantaged—the intellectually, socially, and emotionally shortchanged who have no active role in our race into tomorrow, who reap no rewards from the scientific fallout bought, paid for, largely understood and welcomed by those who are the "have" segment of our national society.

The Department of Labor defines a disadvantaged person as one at the poverty level of income, who is partially or wholly unemployed, and has one or more of the following

characteristics: a school dropout, a member of a racial minority, less than 22 or over 45 years of age, or physically, mentally or emotionally handicapped.

It is estimated that 13 million Americans fall within this definition.

Our technological society demands education and skill as the credentials for active participation. As the American society becomes ever more technological in its orientation, more sophisticated in its mechanisms, the requirements for admission become increasingly demanding. And it becomes less and less likely that the disadvantaged, drawing only on their own resources, will pass the entrance exam.

Cruelly, if unintentionally, our burgeoning technocracy has provided the deprived poor with a graphic and constant reminder of how the other part—the affluent part—our part—of society lives. Each day television places the disadvantaged in a reviewing stand from which they can watch a sumptuous parade of all the wonderful things within the reach of most of us: gleaming electric kitchens in geometrically landscaped split-levels; fabulous vacations in Europe or the Caribbean; well-stocked family dinner tables at which the only dispute is which brand of frozen beef stroganoff is best; gleaming new automobiles driven by men in dinner jackets and women in sequined gowns; wholesome, "typically American" families concerned with the solution of rapid problems.

Disadvantaged Americans cannot view this parade without glancing from the world of the haves to the harsh realities of their own lives, framed in squalor, disease, deprivation, and hunger. They know only too well they've been left out.

Constantly reminded that our changing world has no place for them—that it is leaving them further behind as it gains momentum—these Americans in growing numbers are joining that hard core of citizenry who have given up, who are resigning themselves to becoming dependents of our affluent society.

Look at the evidence. In 1961, 45 Federal agencies were concerned with social problems. Their expenditures total \$9.9 billion. Today there are 435 agencies spending \$25.6 billion. Federal welfare costs alone now total \$3.7 billion a year. Add to this the welfare costs of local and state programs . . . another \$3.3 billion . . . and we have an annual welfare bill of \$7 billion. One out of eight New Yorkers is on welfare.

Reliance on welfare often represents the only security left to the deprived American. But he pays a high price in accepting this doubtful security. He sacrifices or warps his sense of pride and ambition, replacing them with bitterness and hopelessness. The welfare recipient also barters away the birthright of his children. The dependency that leads to apathetic membership in the welfare class can become almost genetic.

An alarming parallel exists between today's hard core of disadvantaged Americans and the "mobile vulgus" of ancient Rome. The mobile vulgus provided us with the contemporary word "mob" and a memorable object lesson.

Like many of the modern disadvantaged Americans, the Roman mob was conditioned to rely on the generosity of government. Comprised of the poor of Rome, those without skill or craft, or farmers who had been driven from their lands, this stratum of the Roman citizenry clamored regularly for the bread and circuses provided by the Empire's rulers, the degree of loyalty of the mob to the existing government was based largely on the degree of largesse that government could afford to dispense.

As the Roman mob grew in size and became a social institution, the economic burden it generated became massive. And the mob became a dominant political factor. Violent and volatile, it was a disruptive force that could

topple governments. Eventually, the Roman mob played a not inconsiderable role in accelerating the decline of the Roman empire.

Within the last few years, America has witnessed new and violent expressions of the frustrations felt by its own "mob," by those citizens who live outside the establishment. Our nation's capital has been besieged by armies of the poor. Dissident organizations whose militancy ranges from picketing to full-scale revolution have become active throughout the country. Crime in slums and ghettos is increasing at astronomical rates and spilling over into the middle-class backyards. Nearly all of our major cities have been wracked by riots and looting. These reactions led Time magazine to say last year that the United States seemed to be "verging on a national nervous breakdown."

It doesn't require graduate work in sociology to understand why minority groups comprise that segment of disadvantaged America that is most alarming, demanding, and violent in its protests. The minorities represent that part of our citizenry that is most deprived in terms of housing, education, and opportunity.

The Negro, Spanish-American, and American Indian have been watching our national ballgame through a knothole for generations. Now they want to get into the grandstand and into the game. Everybody else in the country gets a turn at bat.

So let's assume we're going to let the Negro, Spanish-American, and Indian play. What position? The key ones are already held by the insiders. And how do we fit the minority groups into our pennant-winning team without endangering our world championship? The problem is a tough one but solution is essential. The alternative is to turn the ballpark into a fortress and hope the fences will hold—but we know they won't.

The principal way to allow the minority groups into our national ballgame—and to heal the widening rift that is threatening to topple our very way of life—is to help them find dignity and hope for the future. The most obvious way to do this is to provide them with meaningful employment.

But how do you make jobs? How do we take the hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged whites, Negroes, Indians, and Spanish-Americans and work with them to build for them a productive future?

Often we hear a simple solution offered: take all the able-bodied but lazy people on welfare and make them work for their welfare checks. No work . . . no eat.

Even a cursory examination of this approach shows that it is unworkable. The days of the CCC and the WPA are long past. Those were short-term solutions to a massive, worldwide economic problem shared by nearly all. In an affluent society government make work projects are acceptable to neither those who pay for them nor those employed by them. Why should a man do meaningless or demeaning work for a check that he has been led to expect as his right *without* working. Do you stop his welfare payments? Do you starve his family into submission? Or do you destroy the family unit on which our society is based by driving the male out of the welfare-supported home? We've tried them all, and failed, because we've made the critical mistake of assuming that everyone believes in the traditional American veneration of work as an extension of pride.

As an evidence of human dignity, a fulfillment of an ultimate human need. But this is by no means a universally accepted concept. In many cultures throughout the world, it is deplored or derided. Yet we make the critical mistake of trying to force-feed it into the minds of our own minority groups, while denying to them the uniquely American social and economic mobility which makes the concept worthwhile.

The bulk of ghetto-dwelling unemployed Negroes and Spanish-Americans no longer see dignity in work. The daily facts of life in the ghetto or shantytown help convince them that only the suckers work. In their society the real status is granted to those who live by their wits in the slum jungles . . . by the pimps, numbers runners, and drug pushers.

It is an exercise in futility to criticize this culture our own indifference created. We must accept that the unemployed minorities have no environmentally-conditioned respect for work. And we must recognize that the welfare system we developed has compounded this negative concept.

It has become obvious to all that our approach to this growing problem has been a paradoxical blending of repression and charity. The turning point was the 1954 Supreme Court decision to integrate education; the first real ray of light came ten years later with the formation of Plans for Progress. Increasingly, these past three years, the government has come to realize it can't solve the problem alone.

The job of government is to enact the laws to make discrimination illegal, to set up the legal guidelines to make us care, and to enforce those laws and guidelines. It has done and is doing this job exceptionally well.

But to bring its efforts to fruition, it must turn to that sector of our nation that has been most instrumental and successful in accelerating our national progress: private enterprise. Government now has voiced its conviction that only with the assistance of the business community can any real progress be made toward productive integration of minority groups into our society and economy.

Another glance at the history books will show us that we have been successful in the past. We integrated millions of European immigrants into our society . . . and profited by their contributions. But while the integration of the Italians, the Irish, the Germans, and other Europeans stands as historic evidence that we can do the job, we must recognize that doing the same thing for today's minorities is a great deal more difficult.

Times have changed. During the large immigrations around the turn of the century, the United States was fast becoming an urban-industrial society. There was a demand for strong backs to build that society in the cities and to link the cities together into an economic chain. The European immigrants provided the needed unskilled labor. The most menial work was acceptable, because American freedom was worth almost any price to them. Eagerly urged to play a productive and essential role in building the nation, they eventually became an accepted part of the society.

Neither the opportunities nor the spirit that permitted integration of European immigrants into our national structure exists for today's minority groups.

At the same time Negroes and Spanish-Americans began to flock to our cities and towns, the market for unskilled labor was being greatly narrowed. That market has continued to grow smaller as our society grows more sophisticated, more oriented toward technology, with its heavy emphasis on skills, specialization, and mental work. The Negro and Spanish-American are at least fifty years too late to apply for the jobs that were available to the Irish or Italians.

One thing hasn't changed, however. Like the European immigrant, the Negro, Spanish-American, or American Indian is still faced by the towering obstacle of prejudice.

It is essential that we recognize prejudice to be an inescapable influence in American life. The identification of minority groups with their peculiar traits is a base element of American humor and folklore.

We have all been exposed to the caricature of the siesta-loving Mexican, the watermelon-

eating Negro with natural rhythm, the Irishman with an addiction to booze and brawls, the money-loving Jew, the dumb Swede—the list goes on and on. No one in this room would be lost for meaning if I used the words spade, kike, frog, wop, mick, spik, hunkie, kraut, Jap, or polack.

If we are going to become actively engaged in the struggle to assimilate the remaining minority groups into our productive society, and we are, because we have no other choice, we must realize that prejudices exist within ourselves . . . and that they exist in our friends, families, employees, business associates, and the minority groups, themselves.

Let's realize that prejudices are not personality aberrations but are a normal facet of developing human attitudes. As human beings, we must categorize, translate specifics into general concepts. We could not function otherwise. We learn prejudices through years of contact with our culture and environment.

There is nothing unusual about prejudices *per se*. They become a problem when we permit them to exert unreasoning influence on our social or business habits, when we fail to recognize them for what they are—a decision-making convenience. Thus, the problem lies not in recognizing cultural and ethnic traits—they do exist—but in prejudging individuals from an ethnic or racial group, assuming, without knowing, that they will display all or any of the desirable and undesirable traits ascribed correctly or incorrectly to their minority. Conversely, it is just as illogical—today, at least—for the member of the minority to assume he doesn't have a chance because he will be unfavorably prejudged.

Prerequisite to any degree of success in integrating today's minority groups is to gain control of our own prejudices, to understand how they color our thinking, and to gain an understanding of the prejudices of the individual minority group members. In our efforts to bring them into the work force we will have to set aside not only racial or ethnic prejudices, but the employment practices prejudices we have so carefully built over the years.

Standard tests and interviewing techniques are worse than useless. A large measure of the managerial paternalism we fought so hard to rid ourselves of will have to be resurrected, because we must reach out to these people and guide them into our society.

We have evidence that this can be done. Steps—rapid and substantial steps—can be taken to supply meaningful jobs for minorities and to attract them to accept these jobs and hold them.

More than 400 companies are active in Plans for Progress, an organization of businessmen whose mission is the emphasis of equal employment opportunities. Since 1965, Plans for Progress has scored impressive gains in integrating minority group personnel into the work forces of the member companies. The percentage of minority group members employed by the participating companies has increased at a rate of 72 percent—almost twice as fast as the 37% rate for total employment.

The short but impressive record of the National Alliance of Businessmen stands as proof that a partnership of business and government can take great strides in solving minority group unemployment. In cooperation with the Department of Labor, businessmen voluntarily joined in a project called JOBS: Job Opportunities in the Business Sector. A little over a year ago the program began operating in 50 of the nation's largest cities. The target was the hard-core unemployed, heavily concentrated in minority groups. Industry was to provide the jobs. The government would help to identify and recruit the people and provide much of the money needed to train them. At the end of its first year, the JOBS project had placed

125,000 people, exceeding its goal by 25 percent. For the second year, the goal is 200,000 jobs—500,000 by 1971.

The Federal government is doing its part. The Manpower Administration has just kicked off its Concentrated Employment Program which targets 20 cities and two rural areas that are outside the territories covered by the NAB. And they are continuing a series of campaigns aimed at training disadvantaged youth: the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Work Experience, New Careers, Operation Mainstream, and many others.

Foremost in the ranks of the businesses undertaking the industry share of the effort are the manufacturers: companies in the automotive, aircraft and aerospace, electronics, food processors, distributors, and marketers have also accepted a key role.

An examination of what we are doing in the metals industry is both encouraging and discouraging. We have done a great deal. The metals companies have been and are active in philanthropic support of a wide variety of organizations working to better the lot of the minorities. These range from community hospitals to the United Negro College Fund. And the metals industry in the West has moved steadily toward integrating Spanish-Americans into its work force, if not significantly into supervision and management.

But we can and must do a great deal more. The fact that many of us work far removed from the major cities where the problem manifests itself in violent ways, does not mean the problem is limited to urban ghettos. This is a national problem. In some respects it is an international problem. It hurts our entire country. It reaches out from the cities to touch us all. It is ours to solve.

In the mundane world of the businessman, where the frontiers have been relegated largely to the laboratory, what could be more challenging than to become involved in the struggle to integrate this last isolated segment of our population into our society? What could be more exciting than to throw out the rules and find the new ways to develop this vital human resource?

If the challenge isn't enough, there should be a realization that every businessman, as a matter of conscience, should be involved in solving the minority problem. And involvement should not be construed as the lowest possible level of compliance with the laws that outlaw employment discrimination.

While solution of a challenging problem plus the matter of social conscience should be motivation enough for any of us, more hard-headed reasons compel us to begin.

First of all, you and your fellow executives are citizens as well as businessmen. A substantial portion of the taxes you and your companies pay is now being funneled into welfare payments and social improvement programs. We must accept that there will always be some Americans who, because of age or disability, will need financial assistance from the government. But you are particularly well equipped and positioned to effectively help prevent this massive welfare cost from becoming even greater.

Consider that the minority groups are growing at a faster rate than the rest of the country. Unless we help them to join the work force now, we can project our present welfare costs as only a small part of what we will have to bear in the future.

Then, as businessmen, remember that your future is closely tied to the nation's social and economic health. If the country does well . . . you tend to do well. In dollars and cents, perhaps the argument is more convincing. It is estimated that putting 350,000 people to work would add \$1 billion to the national output. It is even more impressive to realize that such a move would cut a like amount from the national cost of welfare. This switch from the debit to the credit side of the national ledger spells a \$2 billion improvement in our economic picture.



And I am sure that everyone here has become increasingly conscious of the tight labor market above the menial or unskilled level. Trained people—both blue- and white-collar—are in great demand. That trained labor market promises to get tighter and tighter. The only logical solution is to train the unskilled now.

There is a final reason for all of us to become involved in creating jobs for the unemployed minorities. It's a very simple and perhaps unpleasant one: The government is going to make you. Today mere compliance with the equal opportunity laws isn't acceptable. The measure of whether you are conforming to the law is not mere compliance but *affirmative action*.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which enforces Title VII of the Civil Rights Act has applied for the cease and desist powers held by other Federal agencies. While these have not yet been granted, the EEOC has received full backing from the courts in expanding its operations.

More EEOC investigators are moving into the field seeking industries or companies that—while they may not practice discrimination in hiring—are making no *active* effort to integrate minority groups into their work forces.

The EEOC has demonstrated a sharp understanding of how helpful the press can be in focusing a critical spotlight on companies who thought they could get by with token compliance.

Witness what occurred earlier this month when the EEOC flew 25 officials and staff to Los Angeles to hold well-publicized hearings on minority-hiring practices of the local aerospace, motion picture and television industries. An electronic calculator was used on the spot to project that it would take 15 years for one company to attain a 3% minority penetration into management. Unacceptable, said EEOC.

The annual EEO-1 report required of any company with more than 100 employees provides government with a handy balance sheet on your employment practices with regards to minorities. They can inspect these reports and readily see whether you are hiring more Negroes or Spanish-Americans than last year—and whether those already on your payroll are moving up the promotion ladder.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance is another key government agency looking over our shoulders. As of July, 1968, this agency required companies who had 50 or more employees and were holding government contracts over \$10,000 to maintain *written* programs of affirmative action applicable to minority group employment.

And these *must* include a timetable for the full achievement of equal employment opportunity goals.

And let's not be misled into believing that the Nixon Administration will take a soft line on the guidelines set during the previous Administration. There is every reason to believe that Washington, in its examination and sorting out of the agencies and regulations, will tend to make them stronger and more effective.

Challenge, conscience, good business, good citizenship—these are the principal reasons why so many businessmen across the country are already deeply involved in helping to solve this critical national problem. These are the reasons why every company represented in this room is going to have to face up to its responsibility to integrate its work force. The unemployed of the minority groups *must* be made productive members of our society. They *must* become a credit rather than a debit in the national economy.

And it is essential, too, that we all become involved now. The fantastic speed of change in the world has made delay a luxury we can't afford. The problem of the unemployed Negro, Spanish-American and American Indian has gone unsolved too long. Further de-

lay can only aggravate and escalate the problem. Conscious delay places us in the precarious position of ignoring the directives of government . . . and being open to attack and criticism, loss of business and public goodwill.

As specialists in the broad field of personnel management and industrial relations, we in this room will play a paramount role in getting our industry more extensively and decisively involved in adding and fully utilizing more Negroes, Spanish-Americans, and American Indians to the work force. You will have to counsel—perhaps even prod—management on the need to get moving. You will have to be prepared to blueprint and build the programs . . . then make them work.

It's going to be an exciting, demanding, frustrating job. You'll not only have to get a man to work, but find the ways to rebuild his hope, his aspirations, his innate desire to believe in his own worth and usefulness so he'll stay with it. You will fail frequently and have to try again. You'll have to bend and break the rules, the employment standards you worked so hard to build up. You'll have to develop pre-entry level jobs to get these people ready to do the kind of work you automatically expect of the average beginning worker. And all the time you're doing this, you will have to cope with your present employees and their unions and convince them that what you're doing is right and fair and necessary.

It's a once in a lifetime opportunity to bring into play every one of your abilities, skills, techniques. Today's greatest problem is a personnel problem, a chance for each of us to prove our worth as professionals. Let's take that chance.

#### JUSTICE FOR MILITARY LAWYERS

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Judge Advocate General's Corps of our military services face a serious crisis today in that they are not able to replace the senior and experienced officer members of their legal staffs. If the armed services could grant incentive and professional pay to military lawyers as they do for doctors, this serious problem could be overcome.

Those who finish their first tours of duty are leaving the legal staffs of our military services for the most obvious reasons. They owe it to their families and themselves to go into private practice or Federal service since their salaries will be \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year more. This is bad enough but when they look ahead, they will see that the gap will widen to \$8,000 a year in Federal service to a figure of \$14,000 in private industry. Each of us in the Congress in private practice should ask ourselves in the same circumstances what we would do? I think the answer is that we would return to private practice.

There is an additional problem and it is a serious one for the armed services. The Military Justice Act of 1968 has increased the responsibilities of the legal profession and the need for a greater number of military lawyers. That act was a promise by the Congress to provide a truly just military justice system. The pressure in all of American society is tremendous and this includes the military. We must be able to meet any confrontation from extremist groups in the military service as well as anywhere else. A truly respected military justice system will protect our Armed Forces from the contagion which extremist groups wish to spread to our military service.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to ourselves to pass H.R. 4296, to do for our military lawyers what we have already done for our military doctors. Professional pay and incentive pay per month is needed to raise the military lawyers pay enough so that an individual who is willing to give up a good salary in military life can at least afford to stay in the military service. We have done this for military doctors. We must do it for military lawyers.

I am offering for the RECORD a copy of table of comparative pay schedules of military and civilian lawyers, I am also introducing a companion bill to H.R. 4296, which I hope will receive consideration from the Committee on Armed Services.

The comparative table follows:

Military	July 1, 1969 military pay and allowances	Civil service grade	July 1, 1969 civil service pay range	Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 1968
0-2 1st lieutenant/lieutenant (jg.)	\$7,409.88	GS-11	\$11,233 to \$14,599	\$12,602
0-3 captain/lieutenant	\$8,868.24 to \$13,079.88	GS-12	\$13,389 to \$17,403	15,283
0-4 major/lieutenant commander	\$9,558.96 to \$14,974.56	GS-13	\$15,812 to \$20,555	17,936
0-5 lieutenant colonel/commander	\$11,050.08 to \$17,600.76	GS-14	\$18,531 to \$24,093	22,152
0-6 colonel/captain	\$13,349.64 to \$21,169.08	GS-15	\$21,589 to \$28,069	28,841
0-7 brigadier general/rear admiral (LH)	\$17,473.62 to \$24,095.84	GS-16	\$25,044 to \$32,559	
0-8 major general/rear admiral (UH)	\$20,425.20 to \$27,275.76	GS-17	\$28,976 to \$32,840	

<sup>1</sup> Industrial average for attorneys as related to civil service grade. U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin No. 1617.

#### AG HALL A PLEASANT TRIP

### HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Hall of Fame, near Bonner Springs, Kans., continues to grow in importance as one of the Nation's tourist attrac-

tions. A recent editorial in the Leavenworth, Kans., Times set forth some of the features of this showplace. With the thought that thousands of people will be traveling through Kansas this year on their vacation trips, I want to place this editorial in the RECORD and call attention to what there is to see at the Agriculture Hall of Fame. We, in Kansas, hope that many tourists will include a visit there in their vacation plans.

The editorial follows:

## AG HALL A PLEASANT TRIP

If you've never visited the Agricultural Hall of Fame you've missed a bet. Located near Bonner Springs, not far from the Bonner interchange on the Turnpike, the Ag Hall is just a short drive from Leavenworth. It has been called a year 'round living memorial and show place for agriculture. It opened in 1965.

So far three buildings make up the museum area where power machines, old time farm implements and exhibits associated with farm life and all phases of agriculture are displayed. On weekends flags from all 50 states are flown along a circle drive. In the summer a steam train takes the small fry for a ride.

The Hall owns 275 acres with the rest of the land owned by Wyandotte County and the State of Kansas. Eighty of the Hall's acres have been turned into a soil conservation area with terraces, grading and seeding, waterways and a lake. The 3,000 Soil Conservation Districts in the U.S. voted at their assembly in 1967 to assist the Hall in developing a model soil conservation program for the entire acreage.

Last year the "Pioneer Village" was started with the acquisition of an old Methodist Church and all its fixtures. A school built at the turn of the century has also been moved to the village. Future plans call for a store, city hall, jail, railway depot and train.

The Agricultural Hall of Fame was brought into being as a national educational and historical corporation in 1960 under a charter granted by Congress.

Its ambitious seven-year program contemplates the construction of 10 buildings at a cost exceeding \$12 million, to bring into being a national tribute to the heritage of farm and ranch. The Center will memorialize leaders in agriculture, exhibit the story and artifacts of rural living and electricity, and exhibit different soils and rock structures to relate agricultural history.

A transportation building will show the history of different means of travel and transporting of farm products. Other facilities will display the story of food and fiber; the care, feeding and breeding of farm animals; the growing of vegetables, fruits and ornamental plants; and items of industry that pertain to agriculture such as oil, steel, paper, lumber, and minerals.

An agricultural library has been started which already has over 7,000 volumes. A model farm is in the plan where actual farm life and operation may be viewed by visitors.

Adjoining the Hall of Fame is the Wyandotte County park with picnic and playground area.

The Agricultural Hall of Fame is well worth seeing now. In a few years it should be a "must see" for all Kansans and thousands of tourists.

Senator INOUE's outstanding address, I include it in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE:  
ON RETURNING TO CHICAGO

Mayor Daley, fellow Democrats, my friends:

I am honored indeed to have been invited to share in this traditional and illustrious occasion. Perhaps you will forgive me if I am a little awed tonight, for at this annual event I am conscious that you have heard from a distinguished parade of great national leaders. Their presences have been in keeping with the magnitude of the contribution this great city has made to our country, and to the seemingly endless flow of ideas and energy in so many fields that have come from Chicago. Mindful of this, I know such good friends will understand the sense of responsibility I feel tonight.

Just nine months ago I stood on another rostrum in this city and offered the keynote address of the 1968 Democratic National Convention. Much has been written and more has been said about the events of that convention, and I do not propose to add to them here. But I suggested on that occasion that our country had entered a time of testing, testing whether this nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to opportunity for all its citizens can not only endure but continue to progress. If the truth of that statement was not fully evident on that August evening last year, I submit it is amply evident by now. And if it were not clear then, it is surely clear now that the events of Chicago in August were hardly an isolated agony. They have been approximated too many times again and in too many places.

Last August I asked that we as a nation reject violence as a means of protest, and with violence those who preach it. If we have had more violence since then, we have also, I believe, grown less patient with it. That is as it should be, and our resolution to reject such tactics and leaders should continue to grow stronger.

But it is to other resolutions that I would like to invite your support tonight. Tonight I would invite your commitment to resolutions aimed more at renewed progress than simple endurance, resolutions aimed at making us one society in healthy motion again, a society that can once again engage the constructive commitment of all Americans. For it is a painfully demonstrated fact that not all Americans feel this commitment today.

During the last nine months the term revolution has become ever more common coin. It is spent increasingly frequently in describing the uprising of the black minority determined to have its equal share in the individual dignity and opportunity we have long preached as our philosophy. This we understand, even if the implementation of our understanding is still grossly inadequate. But revolution is also used to summarize the aims of many in a whole generation, a generation that is predominately white, a generation that is increasingly educated and even affluent in its own right, a generation that will some day be "The Establishment." And this revolution, these revolutionaries—if that be the proper term for them—we do not understand.

On reason we fail to understand this new discontent is because we ourselves have been engaged in a revolution. We and other modern technological societies have been engaged in this revolution for some decades now, and with greater or lesser vigor we are still engaged in it. Simply stated, that revolution has sought to prove in practice that our societies can produce enough material wealth to meet our peoples' needs. And we define those needs rather broadly—to encompass medical care for the aged and education for the young, for example, as well as adequate food, clothing and shelter for all our citizens.

Our revolution has been toward a society in which every man, woman and child, regardless of the circumstances of his birth, should have access to this age-old dream of men and relatively unlimited opportunity to realize the spiritual wealth that we have always assumed would stem from them.

Our revolution has been a success. We have proven that we have the resources and systems to produce what we need. And, having achieved adequacy of production, we are producing the additional margins that make for affluence on a scale the world has never before known. Look at Chicago as one highly conspicuous example. During 1968 your gross metropolitan product climbed nine percent to \$45.2 billions, wages and salaries jumped a record \$1.9 billions, and corporated profits increased by a billion dollars. In fact, only nine nations outside the United States produced more than metropolitan Chicago.

Yes, in so many ways we are a success. But our very success highlights in sharp contrast the areas of failure. If we have proven we can produce enough, we have hardly insured the adequate or equitable distribution of our wealth and opportunity—not with the poverty and prejudice, the opportunity denied that still blots our landscape. Our revolution is hardly an unqualified success when the waste of our affluence litters and pollutes our land, our water and our air. And we are also coming to find that quality in life does not necessarily stem in direct proportions from quantity, nor spiritual wealth and contentment from material well-being.

One thing we have produced in unprecedented and still-growing abundance, however. That, as Yale scholar Kenneth Keniston has noted, is our own critics on a mass basis. These, I am afraid, are our young people of today.

The fact is we are dealing today with not a "new generation" but a "unique generation," the likes of which we have never seen. Back in the Middle Ages, a child was forced into adulthood when he was less than ten years old. That difficult period we now call adolescence was made possible by the mass production techniques of the Industrial Revolution. Now in our post-industrial society, where technology has so sharply reduced the quantitative demands on the work force, we are creating still another, strikingly different phase of human growth and development, a phase characterized by the triumphant fact that today one out of every two Americans of age is going to college. And graduate school, formerly the refuge of the wealthy or scholarly few, has now become so commonplace that many young Americans do not come to grips with the economic exigencies of life until they are nearly thirty.

Spared the necessity of earning a living until then, in many instances spared even the responsibilities of marriage, the student generation has a new freedom to criticize, to assail what he sees as wrong in our society, to protest the unachieved if not to build what is needed. This generation, product of our successful revolution, does not yearn for a decent standard of living as we did; it assumes it because it grew up with it. Its goals, however ill-defined, have moved far beyond those we were raised on.

I am no scholar of this great historical change but even we who are not scholars must understand what has happened. Because if there is one thing clear it is that we can expect more of it. If we have created a new type of generation we can hardly expect it to behave identically with our own at their age. And this in turn means that if we do not open our ears and hearts to the voices of the young we will be condemned to continuous crises, to a perpetual series of fruitless confrontations. And when we realize that by next year there will be no less than 100 million Americans under the age of 25, the magnitude of the consequences for our society becomes apparent.

# SENATOR INOUE'S SPEECH AT COOK COUNTY DEMOCRATS DINNER IN CHICAGO

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last week, Senator DANIEL K. INOUE spoke at a dinner of Cook County Democrats in Chicago, Ill. His words need heeding, not only by Democrats but by all concerned about our country and its future. The problems of youth—and their solutions—received an analysis that is outstanding. For the benefit of those who did not have an opportunity to hear



Listening, then, what do the voices of the young tell us? If there is a single tune it is certainly being sung in the key of impatience. Secure in their unprecedented affluences and educated in idealism, the young are impatient with the areas in which our revolution is incomplete. They are impatient to the point of anger with the pockets of poverty and whole regimes of racism. That our generation has apparently discovered these inequities only recently they see as evidence of our hypocrisy, as they do the ease with which we retire personally from our self-trumpeted battles leaving the waste from our campaigns strewn about us. Insulated from the combat of daily existence, they are disgusted with the intellectual absurdity of war. And more free to express their individuality than any of their forebears, they are nevertheless frightened and frustrated at the prospect of becoming numbers in some vast IBM system manipulated by amoral and faceless forces.

This, I believe, is what we hear if we listen. This is what is being said by the great numbers of our young people who are not the voices of violence. This is what is being said by the best of offspring, who are telling us that affluence is not enough, that there must be more, a deeper meaning. And I wonder, having heard, whether we would entirely disagree with their accusations?

Now most of us, myself included, have criticized the young for their failure to have a positive program for the revolution many of them are proclaiming so loudly. We have asked, "What trees do they plant?" Perhaps we ask too much. Perhaps we are so stung by what we see as ingratitude and even rejection that we in the process have failed to renew and revitalize the leadership the young have always expected of their elders. Whether we think of ourselves as politicians or public servants, that is an epitaph few of us would want on our political tombstones.

I, for one, do not intend to accept that epitaph, nor to abdicate so easily. On the contrary, I believe we should search our minds and consciences for new goals to engage the young and the revolution they will be carrying on after our days have passed. And among these goals I think we must find the following:

First, we must complete our own revolution, pledging ourselves to new vigor in the extension of adequacy and opportunity to all sectors of our society. Simply because we have proved that the job can be done in broad brush, we cannot afford a hiatus in completing the job. Of course, it will take another generation to accomplish. That merely means we have no time to rest in beginning a renewed assault on the intolerable vestiges of poverty and prejudice. Our hungry must be fed, our unskilled educated and trained, and new employment opportunities opened. Our welfare system must be drastically overhauled. And we must begin now.

Second, we must come to terms with our environment that in time our industrialized society may live in harmony with it. We have had assortments of anti-pollution legislation, intermittent though praiseworthy beautification programs, well-intentioned though often catastrophic urban renewal projects, and area-oriented though politically toothless plans. But we have lacked a systematic national plan, we have failed to provide adequate methods of funding and administering such plans as we have come up with. And above all, we have failed to give the rehabilitation and preservation of our environment the attention and priority it must have. I propose we begin the remedy of this neglect with a comprehensive national commission to establish the guidelines for future action. The commission should have both theoreticians and experienced pragmatists. It should, as well, have on it men who can dramatize its findings and its prescriptions for the future. And it should be established

on a continuing basis so that should our attention to this problem lag, it will be dramatically refocused. This is a truly major national program—one that again will take generations to accomplish—but we can hardly look our grandchildren in the eye, let alone our children, if through further neglect we despoil our dwindling natural resources and pollute the environment that sustains us.

Third, we must put a responsible end to the foolish and enormously wasteful arms race. If we and our fellow citizens of this world continue to race pell mell into evermore sophisticated and expensive weapons systems even the wealth of our revolution will eventually be consumed with little left for other urgent programs. Arms control is a well-established dream and in the past five years we have taken some significant first steps toward its realization. But with an annual defense budget that now totals \$80 billion these first steps are not enough. We must look for others that can responsibly be taken and prepare ourselves to accept reasonable calculated risk in executing them. Fortunately, the Congress has an early opportunity to act in this regard through the rejection of the anti-ballistic missile system, the so-called safeguard, that the present administration is proposing. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee for more than six years I am convinced that our security does not demand this system, that its advertised initial cost of \$8 billion is seriously understated, and that the principal effect of its adoption would be to kick off a new spiral in the arms race. We should reject it. The Congress also has an opportunity to participate more fully at the real source of our defense commitments, in more critically reviewing the national commitments we undertake around the world. Again this review will be complex and time-consuming, but I am convinced we as the most direct representatives of the people must give more attention to our responsibilities in this area. We cannot afford to do otherwise.

Fourth, we who have been elected to lead must look anew to our integrity—not merely to the fact of it but to the appearance of it. One of the characteristics of our youthful critics is their skepticism and even growing distrust of our institutions and the seemingly distant men who man them. If we are to progress, we cannot afford this distrust. Neither should we resent publicly demanded guarantees that the great responsibilities of public office are being impartially discharged. For as Thomas Jefferson said, one of the great strengths of our system is that "every man would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern." We need new articulations of the canons of ethics for public servants, whether elected or appointed, and new standards of public disclosure. We can make much progress in this area, and with relative ease. We can begin in the Congress. But others at many levels must join in a new public morality as well. For if we who make, administer or interpret our laws are suspect, then the rule of law itself is crippled. There is no more room for cynicism in this critical area of our society.

Fifth, we must open new channels and new avenues for the voices and feet of the young. For we need their ideas and help as we need their confidence and trust. I do not advocate turning our universities over to communes of students, anymore than we would turn our corporations over to councils of workers. But we must do better than we have to ensure a sense of participation by our young in the decisions that will shape not only their individual minds but the society they will inherit. Again it is far easier to begin than it is to complete the process wisely. But in this day of greatly advanced education, what excuse do we now have for not opening the vote to 18-year-olds, as one pending Constitutional amendment would do?

We in Hawaii have held a constitutional convention at which we lowered the voting age to 18 and the minimum age for holding elective office to 20. However, I am chagrined to tell you it was rejected by our voters. Hawaii could have set a pattern I think could well have been followed in all 50 States.

The youth of America have proved their worth. They are not only better-educated, but better informed and more serious than their parents. They are a concerned, if unruly, generation, which has grown up in the shadow of the atomic bomb. They must be reckoned with, listened to, and their participation not only admitted, but to the best of our ability, guaranteed.

I am neither wise enough nor arrogant enough to claim that these goals—so simple of statement, so difficult of execution—will be enough. But I do strongly believe that they are the very minimum we must espouse. Without our commitment to them, we will see our own achievements eroded in an avalanche of confrontations and the so-called generation gap may become a widening chasm. Committing ourselves to them, however, we can reengage the ideals and energies of the new generations. And, together with our sons and daughters, we can build a society that, as John Gardner has prescribed, is truly capable of continuous renewal.

THE ELIZABETH CITY, N.C., COAST  
GUARD BASE

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of having in my district, the largest U.S. Coast Guard Airbase in the world. Recently, the Coast Guard branch of service, and the Elizabeth City, N.C., base in particular, has received a very high honor, for in 1969, for the first time in its history, the U.S. Coast Guard, an agency of the Department of Transportation, will participate in the Paris Air Show.

Two aircraft from the Coast Guard Air Station in Elizabeth City, N.C., will take part in the U.S. portion of the international show.

A giant HC-130B Hercules four-engine turboprop search-and-rescue plane and an HH-52A amphibious helicopter, make up the Coast Guard entry.

The HC-130B is an all-weather, high-speed, long-range transport plane. It is used for search and rescue far at sea, for transporting personnel, emergency equipment, as well as for aerial observations on the Coast Guard-operated international ice patrol.

The Hercules carries the latest communications gear. It can fly at 350 knots or better at 25,000 to 30,000 feet.

The HH-52A helicopter has been a workhorse for the Coast Guard in recent years. It is a turbine-powered amphibious craft equipped with a special platform designed to facilitate water recovery. It is the first helicopter to be built with a boat hull.

The helicopter can cruise at 98 miles per hour and has a loading capacity of 3,000 pounds. It can fly 190 miles, pick up an injured person with rescue hoist and basket and return to its home base with a 10-percent margin of fuel remaining.

The helicopter will be dismantled and flown to Paris in the big HC-130B. The schedule calls for the craft to leave Elizabeth City, N.C., on May 24. The planes will be on display in Paris from May 29 through June 8.

Elizabeth City is the largest Coast Guard air establishment in the world. In addition to the air station which performs hundreds of rescue missions a year, Elizabeth City is also the location of the Coast Guard's only aircraft repair base.

#### HIGH PRICE OF NEGLECT

### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the major ingredients of understanding is perspective. Too often our thoughts are restricted and circumscribed by our refusal to consider several viewpoints. In attempting to solve some of our societal problems, we are inclined to think only of ourselves, our group, or our special interest. Shortsighted or narrow views can boomerang. The following editorial, from the San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune, points up one specific aspect of this dilemma.

Children are dissatisfied with what their elders spend for their education. Elders are dissatisfied because the expenditures for youngsters' education, welfare, and national security have so inflated the cost of living that the pensions for which they paid and relied upon are not enough.

By attempting to provide every person in America with more and more benefits, we fan the fires of inflation and take away expected benefits of social security.

We cannot afford to neglect any segment of our citizenry—but if we are to have enough resources to satisfy the needs of everyone, then everyone must produce to his capacity and we cannot permit any of our resources to be wasted.

We must not neglect the economic, social, and emotional security of our elder citizens by permitting their expectations of security payments to be diminished. This group is least able to cope with the high price of neglect.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Luis Obispo County Telegram-Tribune, May 13, 1969]

#### HIGH PRICE OF NEGLECT

The point has been made, and with reason, that the harassed taxpayer is ignoring the younger generation with a short-sighted rejection of nearly all school bond and tax measures at the polls. The consequences of such stinginess, we are told, may be even harder to pay than the increased taxes would have been.

The fact is, we may already be paying for a similar indifference to the older generation. We have been shamefully stingy toward our senior citizens, and the rejection of school tax measures may well be one of the consequences.

It is not guesswork to say that many elder Americans, particularly those on fixed incomes, have developed a habit of voting against all local tax increases, for schools or anything else. And there is no need to guess why.

A recent report to the U.S. Senate found three of every 10 Americans over the age of 65 living in poverty. Not merely trying to keep up with inflation, like everyone else, but struggling to survive on incomes of \$100 a month and even less.

The Senate report said that older citizens in general have less buying power now than they did in 1961. That includes some who have always lived in poverty and some who have lived on welfare, but also many who have worked steadily and lived comfortably. The real shame, as pointed out by the report: "Many of these people did not become poor until they became old."

Can this really be what a lifetime of working and paying taxes earns a citizen of the richest nation in the world?

Congress has voted some increases in Social Security benefits, but not nearly enough to provide protection from the constant erosion of inflation. Wage earners find their pay raises nibbled at by the declining value of the dollar, but older people on fixed incomes aren't merely nibbled at by inflation—they're being eaten up by it.

Attempts to make Social Security benefits keep pace with the cost of living have failed, partly because of public indifference to senior citizens, and a misunderstanding of what Social Security is. It is NOT a form of welfare, a handout or a dole. It is a retirement system in which the payments are made to, and the pensions paid by, the government.

The idea that people should not be allowed to collect substantially more in pensions than they contribute in payments is obvious nonsense. A dollar paid into the Social Security fund 20 years ago was worth perhaps twice as much as a dollar paid out in benefits now.

The elders have not taken to the streets to underline their grievances, as students and even some welfare recipients have, but they have been making themselves felt in the classic democratic fashion, at the polls. If they oppose more money for schools and pay raises for public employees, who can blame them? How many of us would react otherwise in their situation?

If the welfare of our youngsters is being neglected in forced educational cutbacks, it is partly because we have too long neglected the welfare of our elders. Our senior citizens deserve a better shake, and the rest of us deserve the consequences of not giving it to them.

#### BIG SHOES TO FILL

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, long before I came to Congress I have had a very high regard for the watchdog work of that great Senator from Delaware.

I was most sorry to hear, that, true to his principles, he was retiring at the end of his present term.

He will be missed by the Congress and by the people of the United States. He leaves big shoes to fill.

If there is anyone with the qualifications to fill those shoes, that person is Congressman BILL ROTH, who, I am happy to hear, has declared for the office.

I am happy and proud of the work the Congressman from Delaware has been doing, especially his momentous work on cataloging the Federal aid programs. Initiative and knowledge are his trademarks.

During his service in Congress, BILL ROTH has distinguished himself in many fields.

As much as I regret the retirement of Senator WILLIAMS, I feel his seat will be well occupied should the people of Delaware see fit to name BILL ROTH as his successor.

And I will be as sorry to see Congressman ROTH leave the House as I am sorry at the departure of Senator WILLIAMS from the other Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in congratulating BILL ROTH for his great contributions and wishing him all good luck in his quest for a Senate seat from the great State of Delaware.

#### THE CHALLENGE OF THE SEVENTIES

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation the remarks made by Mr. John G. Heimann, senior adviser to the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, before the Mortgage Finance Conference, American Bankers Association, on May 5, 1969. I believe that Mr. Heimann's remarks are worthy of attention by Members of Congress, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to insert his statement in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE CHALLENGE OF THE SEVENTIES

(By John G. Heimann)

This nation is increasingly aware of its responsibilities, both domestic and international. As the aspirations of all people increase, so do our responsibilities to these people. Fulfillment of aspirations is the Challenge of the Seventies.

It is popular to remark these days that our problems are outracing the solutions. This I do not believe. In the past, we have faced up to the facts and then designed policies and programs to achieve a public goal.

This meeting is primarily concerned with housing. But we must not lose sight of the fact that what we are really talking about is the quality of living for people. And this is more than housing. It is schools, it is jobs, it is a human environment, it is all of the opportunities and amenities for which this nation is known and for which it can be justifiably proud.

Yet, within this society, there are vast numbers of our people who do not share this prosperity, who do not have opportunities, and who live in surroundings that are, at best, degrading. Our task is to right this deplorable condition. And one of the most important components is the development of decent housing for all.

The dimensions of our national housing needs were spelled out by the Congress in the 1968 Housing Act. These goals—26 million new housing units over the next decade—are necessary, but if the goals are to be realistic we must make adequate plans, now—

Plans for manpower training.

Plans for improving the building process through new technologies, new materials, and new methods of aggregation.

Plans for the rational use of land.

Plans for stimulating local governments to develop imaginative methods of regulations, control over land use and cost, as well



as the development of adequate public facilities and services.

And certainly, plans to finance this growth.

There will be growth, without a doubt, unless all the computers used by all of the demographers have blown a tube. By the year 2000, our population will increase by some 100 million people. This means we will have to build 100 new cities of a million people each, or perhaps a large number of new communities with fewer people. But the quantity of the problem remains the same. Not only must housing be created for our new citizens, but also we must provide the many services required in order to maintain and improve our way of life.

The expectation of this growth certainly gives rise to much economic optimism. In fact, there is some reason to believe that this expectation has been a contributing factor to the recent inflationary mentality. Many of today's businessmen have seen how inflation combined with rapid economic growth washed out past mistakes. This use of inflation as economic absolutism can prove fatal, however, once it becomes a part of business expectation. The expectation of inflation is a poor substitute for sound business judgment.

By 1972, we anticipate a Gross National Product somewhat in excess of \$1 trillion. By 1978, the GNP will be almost \$1½ trillion.

Within this GNP, we believe that the housing industry will grow at even a faster rate. This year, we anticipate that the construction of housing will account for somewhat more than 3% of the GNP. By 1973, if we are to meet the goals set by Congress, housing will account for 4.4% and by the late 1970's, 5% of the GNP.

You may ask what justification is there for housing to absorb an even larger percentage of the GNP? The answer in both human and economic terms is simply that the demand is there. But the demand was there before and it was not filled. Therefore, if we are not to continue this imbalance between demand and supply we must do some hard planning.

Our planning, though, must be different from what we have done in the past. Historically, the housing industry has been used as a contracyclical tool of economic policy. As Secretary Romney recently said in a letter to the Wall Street Journal, "Until homebuilding is regarded as the creator of product to meet basic needs—needs just as fundamental as steel or mining or automobiles—this nation will continue to suffer from an improvident disequilibrium between the supply and demand for housing." It is obvious that this disequilibrium can be measured in terms of human suffering and human waste, and what is more uneconomic than the underutilization of our most precious national resource—its people. I do believe that this nation is sufficiently mature to rethink past procedures in order to satisfy present and future needs.

The Nixon Administration is thoroughly aware of this problem. The request for the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit is an indication of its concern. As noted by Herbert Stein of the Council of Economic Advisers, "It seemed at least to some of us who were involved in the discussions (about repeal of the investment tax credit) that there were more important things at this juncture in history to do with the Federal budget, with the national output, than to make even more rapid a rate of growth, that is already very rapid . . . We now have a number of commitments to the poor, to the cities, to the development of housing and even to allowing middle class people to retain a larger share of their incomes for their own expenditures—which would be somewhat easier to meet if the investment credit were repealed."

It is also important for us to be cognizant

of the incredible effect inflation can have upon the financing of housing. The homes of Americans have been paid for with long-term, fixed-income capital. We have been able to extend these benefits only because we have anticipated a relatively constant economic condition in weighing security against expected risk.

Recently, we have seen a questioning of this concept. If this is the beginning of a long-term change in the public attitude, then we must completely rethink our long-term financial needs.

Frankly, I doubt that excessive inflation will become a continuing way of life. President Nixon's determination to halt this trend is well known. For the first time in many years, we are effectively using both monetary and fiscal measures to dampen the inflationary fires and to curtail the expectation of a continuation of inflation. Therefore, our attention should remain focused on the challenge of the 1970's within an economic system similar to that of today.

We face the beginning of a time of great need for housing with a mortgage market that has many institutional weaknesses. Some changes are underway or proposed, which you will be discussing later on in this meeting, such as the mortgage-backed security, the various provisions of the 1968 Housing Act, the proposed method of creating a secondary market for conventional mortgages, and others. These and many other changes can be anticipated.

As we consider them, let us not lose sight of the complexity of the problem. Too often, we seek the magic one-shot cure and too often we end up only adding to the problems as we build into our system short-term solutions for long-term problems. Perhaps what we need most today is a complete review of the financial institutions serving this nation. These systems have worked well for many years. But, in fact, they were designed in other times for other reasons.

Accordingly, I feel that a thoughtful reevaluation of our financial systems is necessary and in the national interest. It is conceivable that the conclusions of such a study will point the way to but modest changes. Even so, they will have value, since it will mean that we have taken the time and the trouble to make certain that what we have works well.

Within the panoply of the financial system, the role of the commercial banker looms large. The commercial banking system cannot help but be deeply involved in our urban problems and in housing. The question is, how will the commercial banks gear themselves to face the challenges and opportunities of the 1970's in these two areas? For example, some of the following questions must be considered and answered by you:

Should our commercial banking system undertake a major commitment to urban development, or should we rely more upon other financial institutions that can be insulated somewhat from monetary policy?

Through change of the regulatory powers or reserve requirements, should banks be urged into mortgage investment?

These and a host of other questions come to mind. It is important, I feel, for people such as yourselves who are trained and experienced in a broad variety of financial areas to become involved in this dialogue of role and responsibility. Within your institutions you have great financial knowledge and expertise which needs to be shared.

The "Challenge of the Seventies" is often partnered with the phrase "the urban crisis." In order to change the challenge into opportunity, the crises cannot be one of perception or will, for if we fail to objectively comprehend our national needs, then the opportunities will be substantially diminished.

Today we do, indeed, face a challenge. Let us make it into an opportunity.

## TOWARD A SOVIET AMERICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the news that the Soviet-trained labor exploiter, Walter Reuther of UAW, has now taken over the Teamsters is only surpassed by his decree that he will use his new labor alliance to oppose defense of the United States against Communist nuclear missiles, to aid Communist aggression in Southeast Asia, and to foment revolution in our streets. This sounds less and less like a legitimate labor organization.

Perhaps many of the young workers of this generation do not recall that this same Walter Reuther was the man who, while being trained in Moscow in Red labor organization, wrote a letter to associates in Detroit and signed it "Yours for a Soviet America."

That letter best explains his goals, in undermining American defense, aiding the Communist enemy, and organizing for violence and disorder in our cities.

I include an article from the Washington Star following my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 27, 1969]

LABOR ALLIANCE PROGRAM OPPOSES ABM, WAR  
(By Richard Critchfield)

United Auto Workers' Walter Reuther has succeeded in enlisting the relatively conservative Teamsters Union in an apparently wide-ranging social crusade.

Teamster delegates at a founding conference of the Alliance for Labor Action—a partnership formed by the UAW and Teamsters last July—yesterday endorsed resolutions opposing the antiballistic missile plan, calling for an end to the Vietnam war and for a drive to help the poor and the black organize politically.

The 500 delegates attending the conference also unanimously endorsed more conventionally liberal labor causes such as better housing, schools, medical care and full employment.

Reuther also called for an end to "the insanity of the arms race" and for a "tax-payers revolt" led by the ALA.

Apparently responding to press coverage of yesterday's meeting, Fitzsimmons was emphatic today in emphasizing the new coalition is not intended to be a rival of the AFL-CIO.

"I again want to underline and repeat that this is not a rival federation of labor. I am again repeating that we endorse and underline that labor must remain steadfast and one house," he said.

The ALA's function is to organize new workers and carry out social programs and "those purposes alone," he said.

FITZSIMMONS "GOES ALONG"

Apparently going along, at least with Reuther's rhetoric, was Frank E. Fitzsimmons, 61, the soft-spoken Teamster general vice-president who has been running the nation's largest union while James R. Hoffa is serving a prison sentence for jury tampering.

Except for joining in the call to stop the Vietnam war, Fitzsimmons's words were relatively conservative. He urged an organizing drive among government employees, white collar and farm workers and called for repealing the Landrum-Griffin Act.

UNIONS PLEDGE PAYMENTS

Under the new setup, Fitzsimmons will be in charge of the ALA's organizing effort and Reuther of its social action program.

Both unions have pledged to put up 10 cents per member per month to build the ALA's treasury. With a combined membership of nearly 4 million, this could provide a yearly income of around \$4.5 million.

In a speech to the conference, Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., today congratulated the ALA on forming what he called "this great new alliance of our two largest and most influential labor unions." He praised the ALA's stand yesterday in calling for an end to the Vietnam war, deferral of the ABM and an appeal for greater understanding of campus unrest.

Both UAW and Teamsters spokesmen yesterday sharply criticized military spending. Harold J. Gibbons, the Teamster boss in St. Louis, said that by opposing the ABM, "a large segment of the U.S. labor movement" has shown itself against "the stupid kind of path where money and resources are being squandered in a stupid war and a stupid arms race."

Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer, said that "when this dirty nasty war is over" the labor movement must ensure the \$30 billion saved is not spent by "the military-industrial complex."

The key domestic resolution passed was for "community unions" which called for ALA organizers to go into the ghettos and help black communities develop "the skills, organization and economic and political strengths they must have to achieve self-sufficiency and self-direction."

#### WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

#### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Carantouan Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in my district sponsored a project in the Waverly, N.Y., schools designed "to encourage further study and activity in patriotism." The focal point of this most worthwhile project was a student essay contest entitled "What the Flag of the United States of America Means to Me."

I take this opportunity to congratulate the winner, Miss Deborah Crouse, a student at Waverly Junior High School, for expressing in so refreshing a manner what I am sure are the compatible feelings of many of my constituents.

It is with great pride that I command this inspiring essay to the attention of my colleagues.

I include the essay as follows:

#### WHAT THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA MEANS TO ME

The American Flag means many things to many people. To some it is the symbol of freedom. It is just a piece of cloth to others. There are even those who scorn and burn it.

To me, the American Flag has a deeper meaning. As I come to school of a morning and glance up, I see more than a piece of cloth decorated with stars and stripes. In the flag I see a nation young and immature, a nation full of all kinds of people, of all creeds and colors, who have their own feelings and ideas about our nation.

In the flag I see our fathers and brothers fighting under our flag to help another country gain her rights and freedoms.

The Stars and Stripes represent President Nixon, an Afro-American, an Apache Indian and me standing together, giving the Pledge of Allegiance.

Our flag represents every individual and all individuals of America. We are all under one common bond. The flag is this bond.

The flag symbolizes all the freedoms and rights of men which are outlined in the Constitution and Declaration of Independence.

Old Glory represents to me, one nation, indestructible and indivisible. We pray that our nation is under the grace of God and gives liberty and justice to all.

In conclusion, I think our American Flag represents the true goal of every person on earth and every person that has ever lived since the beginning of time. This is the divine goal to which every man has aspired himself.

These are the things which should be and someday, will be in our nation. Then our beautiful flag will float on the breeze in all her true glory.

This is what the American Flag means to me.

DEBORAH CROUSE.

WAVERLY, N.Y.

#### REQUESTING AN INVESTIGATION OF BERKELEY VIOLENCE

#### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, serious events in the city of Berkeley during the last 2 weeks are of national concern. One young man has died, another may be blinded, more than 100 persons have been injured, thousands of people have been gassed, including patients in a hospital, and several hundreds have been arrested, but the tensions in Berkeley continue. I have been told by those on the scene no end is in sight.

The young man, James Rector, who died was from my congressional district. His activities in Berkeley on the day he was shotgassed are unclear, but insofar as I know there is no evidence to indicate he was among the demonstrators. There is clear evidence, on the other hand, that some of the injured were innocent bystanders, on legal business in Berkeley.

The mother of the dead young man has issued a plea, a plea which I believe bears repeating.

No James Rector Memorial People's Park—

She said:

No day of mourning. Just an end to the turmoil that may cause the death of other young men.

I join in her prayer for the end of turmoil in Berkeley and for the end of violence.

For that reason, I am joining with my colleague, JEFFERY COHELAN, of Berkeley, in asking that the U.S. Attorney General's excellent conciliation service take immediate steps to intervene in Berkeley. I also am joining in his request that the National Commission on Violence study and report on the Berkeley situation.

The seriousness of the situation in Berkeley is spelled out in the words of Peter Barnes of Newsweek. The charges he makes are key to the questions I am asking U.S. Attorney General John Mitchell to investigate—

For seven days in May, the effective rulers of this occupied city and university were 3,000 unknown men in uniform, headed by two generals and a sheriff playing war games with real people's lives...

The real danger in California is not the students, nor the tree-planting street people, nor even that handful of genuine revolutionaries that Reagan so piously condemns. It is the uncontrollable use of paramilitary force without responsibility; it is the helplessness of such representative institutions as the Berkeley City Council (whose meeting during the violence was a charade); it is the fearful reluctance of moderate public officials to speak out.

I have written the U.S. Attorney General asking that he investigate and clarify what has happened in Berkeley so that sane conclusions can be reached.

First, I have asked the Attorney General to investigate the circumstances surrounding the death of James Rector, including a determination as to whether he was one of the demonstrators, or an innocent bystander. I am asking the investigation on the basis of whether James Rector's civil rights were violated.

On the same grounds I am asking the U.S. Attorney General to answer, if possible, some other serious questions involved in the disturbance at Berkeley:

First. How many persons were wounded on May 15, and by whom?

Second. Among the injured, how many were arrested and on what charges?

Third. How many of the injured can be identified as having some part in the demonstrations and how many can be identified as being innocent of any involvement in the demonstrations?

Fourth. How many of those arrested May 22 in the widespread sweep were demonstrators and how many were in the area on legal business?

Fifth. Were the civil rights of those arrested, as charged in newspaper accounts, violated and was there any mistreatment of those arrested by the arresting officers?

The answers to these questions through an impartial investigation will, I hope, do much to quiet the tensions in Berkeley.

More is needed both for an immediate cease-fire and for long-term peace on the campus.

An end to provocations is needed on both sides. I would hope there will be a lifting of the ban on the right of assembly in Berkeley, combined with discretion on the part of those who wish to assemble, and to protest.

The national student protest movement was born in Berkeley a little less than 5 years ago. It has spread from there across the Nation.

During the last 3 years a president of the University of California has been fired, new members of the university board of regents have been appointed, presidents of State colleges have been repeatedly changed, budgets cut, and the National Guard has been used. Yet there is no peace on the campus.

The Governor of the State of California has called the situation in Berkeley "war," and used that as an explanation for why innocent people have been hurt. If it is war in Berkeley, then the Governor must bear his responsibility for its increased violence during the last



3 years. I recommend to him the words of our President—

We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at each other—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."

The tensions on campus cannot be solved by shotguns, rifles, bayonets, aerial tear gas bombing, or rocks and bricks.

Instead there must be a serious examination of the issues, a definition of the problems, and the proposal of new answers to solve those problems.

If we do not find these answers, then Berkeley again will be but the first of a series of ever more violent clashes, which can only end in disaster.

#### RISE IN CHILD ABUSE

**HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, last week I placed a series of articles from the Detroit News on the subject of Michigan's battered babies in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These articles pointed to the emotional and physical horrors of child abuse where in Michigan alone last year the reported number of cases totaled 766.

However, child abuse is not only a problem in the State of Michigan but in our entire Nation. Recently, the New York State Department of Social Welfare announced that in 1968 there was a 30-percent increase in the number of reported cases of child abuse. This was discussed in a recent New York Times article entitled "Rise in Child Abuse," written by Howard A. Rusk, M.D. This article stated that in the last several weeks five children have been killed at the hands of their parents and that of the 987 cases reported in New York City last year 36 were fatal. Certainly, I cannot stress too much the importance of curtailing child abuse and that I feel every citizen has a responsibility to report any suspected case of mistreatment of children. This problem can be found today among people of every educational, religious, socioeconomic, and geographical background in America.

At this point, I place the text of the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everyone to read:

RISE IN CHILD ABUSE: PROBLEM REQUIRES MORE TRAINED HELP, MORE FUNDS AND THE COOPERATION OF ALL

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last week the New York State Department of Social Welfare announced that in 1968 there was a 30 per cent increase in the number of reported cases of child abuse.

Certainly the problem of child abuse in New York City has been highlighted by the fact that in the last several weeks five children have been killed at the hands of their own parents.

New York City is not alone in this problem. Similar increases are being reported throughout the country.

There is also no doubt that there is increased professional concern with the problem and less tolerance of the "rights of parents" for those who practice child abuse.

Ironically the law for the protection of animals was enacted before child protection statutes. In fact the successful use of animal protection statutes in behalf of a cruelly abused little girl in 1874 provided the impetus for the founding of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children in 1875.

#### BATTERED CHILD SYNDROME

Professional concern among physicians came from the first study of the problem in 1961 by Dr. Henry Kempe at the University of Colorado Medical Center.

It was from this study that the terrifying and ugly new medical phrase was developed—the battered child syndrome.

In this study, 71 hospitals reported treatment of 302 such cases in a year. Of the group, 33 had been abused so severely they died and 85 others suffered permanent brain damage.

Of the 987 reported cases in New York City last year 36 were fatal.

Before Dr. Kempe's study, California was the only state in which parental abuse of the child was a criminal offense. All states now have such laws. The New York City law was recently amended to attempt to improve reporting.

Effective June 1, hospital personnel, social workers and school officials will be added to the list of those engaged in the healing arts required by law to report cases of child abuse.

The state law required that such cases be reported orally as soon as practicable and that a written report be submitted to local social service officials within 48 hours. Presently the major source of reports is from hospitals.

Unfortunately there was a sharp decline last year of 40 per cent in the number of suspected child abuse cases reported by physicians. The number of cases reported by physicians dropped from 15 per cent in 1967 to 9 per cent in 1968.

One of the reasons for the decrease may be that some physicians hesitate to report such cases because of their belief that the right of privileged communication is violated. However, persons and institutions required by law to make such reports are provided immunity from civil and criminal suits brought about as the result of their reports.

#### AVOIDING INVOLVEMENT

In many instances physicians and other health and social welfare workers simply do not want to get involved in a messy situation.

Commissioner George K. Wyman, New York State Department of Social Welfare, pointed out in last week's announcement that "Disturbing as this figure is, it tells us an incomplete story because there are many other such cases of child-battering—hundreds more—that are not reported by persons aware of them."

He stressed that under-reporting is a serious situation especially if the dead or abused child has brothers or sisters living at home but not protected.

This is underlined by the fact that 14 per cent of the children reported last year in suspected abuse cases were siblings. These 135 children were from 56 families in which two or more children were suspected of being abused.

What such an environment of terror means and does to a child is too horrible even to contemplate.

Studies have shown that parents are the offenders in most instances of child abuse. There are some cases, however, of other persons such as baby-sitters, paramours and siblings as the offenders.

Last week this writer discussed the problem with Dr. Vincent J. Fontana, who has long been interested in the problem. Dr. Fontana is director of pediatrics, St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center, and medical director of the New York Foundling Hospital. He said:

"The child abuse law that we now have in all states in the United States in itself is just the first step that can be taken to protect the abused or neglected child.

"What is more important is what happens after the report.

#### LACK OF COMMUNICATION

"At the present time, from our experience we have found there has been little or no communication between various disciplines that are responsible for protecting the child and assisting the parents. This applies to the physician who does the reporting, the child protective unit that does the investigating, and the judge who makes the determination as to whether the child is to be returned home or goes to an institution or foster home.

"Unless there is mutual cooperation and communication with follow-up under these various disciplines, the job of protecting the child and helping to assist the parents will not be realized.

"In attempting to solve these tragic problems it is hoped that there will arise a mutual respect between the physician, social worker and judge so that a proper decision may be reached to protect the child from further abuse and possible death."

In reality, Dr. Fontana's hope can only be accomplished if there are adequately trained people in the child protective unit, sufficient funds to employ a large enough staff to handle the large number of abused and neglected child problems and an adequate number of judges in the family courts.

The blame is not on any individual but an overwhelming caseload and an inadequate staff.

The reporting of suspected cases of child abuse should not be limited to professional workers in the field of health and welfare. Every citizen has a responsibility to report any suspected case of child abuse.

#### LESSON OF TVA IS IGNORED BY FLOOD-RAVAGED STATES

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a living classroom for thousands each year—not only from this country but for people around the world—who come to the Tennessee Valley to see how a system of dams and power facilities has brought health to the land and a better livelihood for the people.

Marquis Childs wrote in the May 14, 1969, Washington Post that TVA's lesson is being ignored by many flood-stricken States.

I would include this article in the RECORD at this time.

#### LESSON OF TVA IS IGNORED BY FLOOD-RAVAGED STATES

(By Marquis Childs)

The rivulets, the small streams, the great rivers run brown with the precious soil that each spring is lost forever. This is a heedless waste of the capital of a land ravaged by the quick-buck builders and the highway promoters who will not be satisfied until the whole country is covered with concrete.

It has been going on for a long time. As predictable as the first crocus, appeals come to Washington for help under the Federal disaster act to repair flood damage. The total so far this year is \$12,750,000 which is little enough alongside the vast sums this capital deals in.

Yet, as a measure of the cost of putting back bridges, restoring roads and sewage plants and providing temporary homes for the homeless, this says a lot about the cost of years of neglect and indifference. Of the total, California, where the builders have stripped steep hillsides and perched houses and apartments on perilous slopes, got \$8-million. The balance went to Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota and Iowa. While last January's prolonged rainfall on the West Coast and the heavy snows in the Midwest increased the likelihood of serious flooding, there is no reason to believe that the same thing will not happen next year and the year after that ad infinitum, with the same demands on Washington to pay for a patching job again.

On a recent tour of the Tennessee Valley this reporter saw an example of the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority that has gone a long way toward eliminating floods and restoring the health of the land in that region. The contrast showing what can be achieved by not shying away from that scare word, planning, is striking.

Oliver Springs, Tenn., a town of 3600 had a severe flood in July, 1967. It was in the nature of a flash flood, as storm water roared down Indian Creek, which runs through the town. Oliver Springs has had 16 major floods since 1905, 11 occurring after the construction of nearby highways.

As the town surveyed the devastation to schools, roads and homes in the steamy aftermath of the flood, TVA came in. They did not say, "Okay, we're going to put in some dams and fix things up for you." The first move in accord with long-established policy was to enlist support from the townspeople themselves. They were asked by TVA representatives, "Do you want to join in a common effort to rebuild the town and try to insure that there will be no more flooding? If you do we're prepared to help."

Mayor J. H. Burney, a quiet-spoken Tennessean who is a guard at the nearby Oak Ridge atomic plant, saw what an opportunity this was. He started in at once to get understanding and support for a comprehensive plan to which local citizens contributed ideas. Cooperating with Burney was Jim Point, a part-time TVA consultant working for a graduate degree in city planning at the University of Tennessee. Point showed remarkable skill in beating a patch through the jungle of Washington agencies involved in one way or another with the project and pulling them together.

The result was a redevelopment program that will cost \$5,700,000. TVA will spend \$1,920,000 including the share to be put up by Oliver Springs. The balance is from the gaggle of Federal agencies—Housing and Urban Development, the Water Pollution Control Administration, the Appalachian Regional Commission—that have a finger in the pie. When the work is completed total benefits on an average annual basis are put at \$1,344,600. This is broken down in flood prevention, the enhancement of land values, public housing, recreation and the savings in transportation as a result of rerouting highways.

Nothing could better illustrate TVA's primary goal—to build up the region so that people will want to stay rather than migrate to the cities. With seven Southern and border states in the region, including Mississippi and Alabama, TVA claims the rate of migration for Negroes has been cut in half over the past three decades. At the start of the experiment in reconstructing a whole area two-thirds of employment was in agriculture, with 12 per cent in manufacturing. This is reversed today, with 30 per cent in industry and 12 per cent on the farms.

Strict conservationists grouse over some TVA decisions where favorite trout streams and a bucolic setting are the issue. But TVA has built 22 major lakes that are a source

of pleasure and profit to hundreds of thousands not only in the area but for visiting vacationers.

Denounced as socialism at its inception, TVA by the year 2009 will have repaid the Government all money invested in power facilities through appropriations, and the properties will still be Government-owned. Today Federal expenditures in the area are only 60 per cent of the national average and that includes Oak Ridge and the space installation in Alabama. While the TVA pattern might not fit another region, the lessons are there to be learned as America's rivers elsewhere run brown with irreplaceable topsoil.

## LOG EXPORT PROBLEM

### HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House have expressed interest in the log export problem in our national forests and Bureau of Land Management lands. During February, when the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies held their hearings, I asked the U.S. Forest Service to explain their procedure and in the nature of the selection of areas for exportation. I have received a reply dated May 16 from Mr. M. M. Nelson, deputy chief, which outlines the procedure. For your information I am placing it in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
FOREST SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1969.

Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. HANSEN: This is in further response to your inquiry of February 28, 1969, relative to the distribution of exportable volume under Part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968. We are pleased for the opportunity to review the procedures developed to implement export controls from the National Forests.

Part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968 restricts export of logs from Federal lands west of the 100th Meridian to 350 million board feet per year, through 1971, except for minor species found to be surplus to domestic need. At time of signing the Act, the President assured the Government of Japan that "we will give full consideration—bearing in mind United States domestic requirements—to Japan's desire to have the law administered in a manner least harmful to our trade relations."

Allocation of the exportable volume under the Foreign Assistance Act continued the pattern established by the joint action of the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture in April 1968 when they required domestic processing of all timber offered for sale from the National Forests in western Washington and western Oregon, from selected National Forest areas east of the Cascade Divide and all Oregon and California Grant lands in Oregon. The Secretaries provided that 290 million board feet of timber sold from the National Forest land and 60 million board feet of timber sold from Oregon and California Grant lands would be exempt from the domestic processing requirement during the ensuing period ending June 30, 1969.

High level discussions between the Governments of Japan and the United States led to the joint understanding that the basic patterns already established as to areas and species of timber would be maintained in im-

plementing the domestic processing requirements. Guidelines for allocating exemption volume under the Secretary's regulations for domestic processing were based on these understandings.

The pattern of log exports was established by examining exports for a 3 year period, 1965 through 1967, from the Washington Customs District (all ports north of the Columbia River excluding the Columbia River) and the Oregon Customs District (all Columbia River ports and all other ports in the State of Oregon). During that period, 67 per cent of log exports to Japan from the Pacific Northwest originated from the Washington Customs Districts and 33 percent from the Oregon Customs Districts. Exemption allocations between the Agencies and to the various National Forests were based on established trade patterns and estimates of log export supply sources. Other factors were also considered in allocating the exemption volume to National Forests:

Amelioration of anticipated adverse impacts of the domestic processing requirements on dependent local timber using industry, established exporting industries and ports.

Relative volume of species accepted in export trade during previous years.

Where export trade pattern was not established but feasible, exemption allocations were evaluated in relation to species and volume needs of local industries.

Application of these guidelines resulted in 60 percent (174 million board feet) of the 290 million board feet of exempt volume being allocated to the National Forests from which logs had been shipped through the Washington Customs District and 40 percent (116 million board feet) to the National Forests from which logs had been exported through Oregon Customs District.

The timber sales programs covering fiscal year 1969 from the National Forests in Washington and Oregon were published in June, 1968. These announcements indicated the volume by individual sales exempted from the domestic manufacturing requirements. Total exemption quotas and allocations to individual sales were discussed at timber purchaser meetings. The timber industry apparently accepted the allocations as being equitable; none protested the allocation of exempt volume under the Secretary's Regulations.

Part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act was implemented on January 1, 1969. It embodied the restrictions already imposed by regulations of the Secretaries, including the 350 million board feet exportable volume limitation, but it enlarged the area to include all Federal lands west of the 100th Meridian. Total allocations of the exemption remained unchanged, with 290 million board feet assigned to the Forest Service, 60 million board feet to lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

Export activity intensified in California following the April 1968 domestic processing requirements imposed by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior. As a consequence, 15 million board feet (about 5 percent) of the Forest Service allocation of 290 million board feet was moved from the Pacific Northwest to California at the time Part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act was implemented.

Tentative Forest allocation of the remaining exemption volume to the National Forests of Oregon and Washington was based on 95 percent of that allocated under the Secretary's domestic processing requirement. Some adjustments were made as a result of comments from Forest Supervisors. The adjustments recognized the reduction in the allowable cut on the Mt. Baker National Forest resulting from establishment of the North Cascades National Park. The final result was that 162 million board feet (59 percent) of the 275 million board feet exemption was allocated National Forests from which



export originated to the Washington Customs District, and 113 million board feet (41 percent) to National Forests from which export originated to the Oregon Customs District. Provision was made to assign some of the exemption quota allocated the Olympic National Forest to the Shelton Federal Cooperative Sustained Yield Unit.

Exempt volume allocations were discussed by Forest Supervisors at timber purchaser meetings held in February 1969. Allocation to National Forests, to individual sales and procedures for administering the requirements of Part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968 were fully discussed at these meetings. The point was made that assignment of exempt volume to a particular sale does not require such volume be exported. Rather, the decision to export rests with the purchaser. Reaction of timber purchasers at the February meetings indicated satisfaction with the allocations and procedures established to administer Part IV of the Act.

### HELLO COMPUTERS, GOODBYE PRIVACY

#### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, since the 1966 hearings of our special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, the Nation has become aware that the efficient whirl of the computer may, in reality, be the sound of man's dignity and privacy being shredded. While most Americans acquiesce to the request not to fold, mutilate, or spindle computer cards received from impersonal organizations, they do not receive a corresponding reassurance that they themselves will not be folded, mutilated, and spindled.

This potential danger caused by the recognized and essential benefit of computer applications is the subject of numerous scholarly reviews. Virtually every college and university in the country now has seminars and courses on the impact of technology on the individual. Harvard University's program on technology and society, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences working party on the social implications of the computer, and the National Academy of Sciences' computer science and engineering board privacy group are but three of the major efforts now underway to plow a parallel row to that first laid out by our special subcommittee. Two brilliant books, "Privacy and Freedom," by Dr. Alan Westin, and the soon-to-appear "The Death of Privacy," by Dr. Jerry Rosenberg, soberly amplify the concerns our privacy investigations have uncovered.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence that we are disclosing a deeply personal issue has been the attention given to computer privacy by magazines not normally associated with discussing the impact of congressional investigations. The May 1968 Playboy contained a superb description of the controversy surrounding the suggested national data bank by Dr. Westin. Now Cosmopolitan has published what is undoubtedly the best written account of computer privacy to appear since the preface of the Com-

mittee on Government Operations August 1968 report, "Privacy and the National Data Bank Concept."

"Hello Computer, Goodbye Privacy," in the June 1969 Cosmopolitan presents an entertaining view of the ramifications of computer technology and does so in terms which everyone can understand and enjoy. The author, Mr. Richard Boeth, has created a sprightly and stimulating piece of journalism.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Boeth is obviously a very talented and very funny writer. There are those who would reject the importance of his work because they believe that only the ponderous can be meaningful, that only the boring can be significant. I would like to publish the statement made in response to that pompous opinion by the man who heads my privacy investigation staff, Charles Witter:

Let's reach an understanding: You don't regard me as stupid because I am witty and I won't regard you as intelligent because you are dull.

Ignoring the arrogance of that remark, I believe Mr. Witter makes a valid point and one that should be kept in mind particularly by those who must wade through the insipid goo of much governmentally generated prose.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Boeth writes so clearly, so well, and so amusingly about the issue of computer privacy that I am delighted to enter his article in the Record at this point:

#### HELLO COMPUTERS, GOODBYE PRIVACY—OR, 1984 IS JUST AROUND THE CORNER

(By Richard Boeth)

Back in the comparatively rustic and uncluttered world of the early 1960s, officials of the huge, California-based Bank of America woke up one morning to discover a problem looming. Statisticians had figured that by 1970, in order to service the banking needs of all the people of California, the Bank of America would have to employ all the people of California as clerks. The paperwork was piling up that fast, and there was no way to stop it. Since this all-inclusive hiring program held no appeal for anyone, the bank called in General Electric, one of the builders of large electronic computers, and in due course most of the bank's routine operations were "computerized." That is, large and incredibly fast electronic machines took over the clerical jobs of recording, storing, and giving back on request all the mountains of data pertaining to the bank's billions of transactions with its depositors, creditors, and the rest of the American banking system.

It is difficult to rant and rave too much about the importance of those electronic machines. Without them the Bank of America—and in short order most of the other banks in America—would have choked to death on paper. One cannot imagine the banks of the nation going out of business, of course, but they would have been so impeded and finally so shackled by the blizzard of paper that the whole nature of the American economy, and hence American life, would have changed drastically, and presumably for the worse. Exactly the same thing is true for scores of other major industries as different as insurance and the airlines, the latter of which could not handle anywhere near their present number of bookings without computers to tell them which seats were available on which flights. The Federal Government would collapse without computers; the credit-card empire would not have existed at all. Wall Street got along nicely without computers for two centuries, and thought it could continue to get along without them. In the past two

years it has been so inundated with paper that it had first to close one day a week and finally shorten its trading time by an hour a day.

The lesson, then, is that these electronic machines, which can pull out stored information at the rate of 100,000 numbers or characters per second, are not a mechanical convenience at all but a flat necessity, and their impact is being felt in every sector of American life. In the words of Dr. Robert M. Fano, an M.I.T. professor, computer scientist, and one of the few persons around who looks at men and machines with equal knowledge-ability: "The effects of the computer on society will be more important than those of the printing press."

All this startles those of us who have always thought of computers as endearing little metal things that whirled, clanked, beeped, and, finally—*tapockataqueep*—projected the (wrong) Presidential winner on the basis of partial returns from three districts in Nutley, N.J. True, true, if pressed we could probably have identified those unfolded, unspindled and unutilized punch cards that come in every month from Con Edison, the Diner's Club, and Texaco as having been upchucked from a computer, but even so they are surely only bookkeepers' helpers.

Not so. Those punch cards, in fact, may well have coaxed us into a false sense of complacency, a deadly unawareness of what computers are capable of. For example, the monthly bill comes in from Esso, right, and it's been sent to you by way of Formosa, and you are damned if you are going to pay the 47-cent penalty for "lateness" when it was their fault. So you enclose a brief, witty note with your check, explaining that they sent the bill via Formosa and that you're not going to pay the 47-cent lateness penalty. And then the next bill comes in—maybe via Formosa, maybe not—and there is no reply to your letter, no acknowledgement of it, either, only the 47-cent lateness penalty noted in the usual box. And so you write more letters, longer and angrier, the last going by registered mail to the president of Standard Oil, and you don't care about the 47 cents but you just want to know if there is anyone in the whole company who can read and answer a letter. And, of course, all you get back is another punch card, which you rip up along with your Esso credit card (I went through this ordeal a few years ago with Esso, obviously, but everybody's been through it with one company or other), and you vow never to have anything to do with that idiot company again. So far, fine. You're just reacting as any red-blooded American would. But then we all make our basic mistake: We assume the computers must be stupid. We also assume that the people who install and use them must be stupid, and we may be right or wrong about that, but we are fatally wrong and extremely foolish to think that the machines are dumb. Because the next step is to think that because machines are dumb they are not to be taken seriously by bright, sophisticated folk such as ourselves. And the next step after that is that the machines throw us all in prison and dissolve the key with a laser beam.

The truth is that these machines are incredibly bright, capable, and powerful, and we cross them at our peril, even when they send us someone else's department-store bill. The best *aide-memoire* in dealing with computers is REMEMBER THE ASTRONAUTS. Whether you are inspired or appalled by the effort and cost of the moon venture, it is all a scientific and engineering marvel ranking right up there with the first atomic bomb and Joe Namath's right knee. Billions and trillions of calculations went into the design of the spacecraft, its engines, and its flight plan (including an unprecedented bit of celestial navigation), and this work could not have been duplicated without computers even if you had armed the entire population of Japan with abacuses and set them to work for one hundred years.

So the people who know a little something about computers don't make jokes about computer mistakes. One reason is that the machines themselves don't make mistakes more than about once in every two or three billion calculations. The odds are astronomical (in favor of the computer) that any computer error is really a *programming error*; i.e., that the machine has been given the wrong information in the first place or instructed to do the wrong things by the entirely human being who use it. (These mistakes can be expensive; a single programming error wiped out Mariner I, a moon-shot rocket, at a cost of \$18,000,000.) A second and just as important reason why people don't make jokes about computers is that large batches of knowledgeable people, from computer builders to members of Congress, are getting to be frightened of computers and the uses that are already being made of them. It is not easy to be succinct and direct about these fears, because they derive from what Dr. Alan Westin of Columbia University, in his landmark book entitled *Privacy and Freedom*, calls the "accidental by-product of electronic data processing." This problem—the terrible fear—was summed up as best it can be by former Representative James C. Oliver of Maine: "It's my impression," he said, "that these machines may know too much."

That's the only *real* worry, then—just that machines may know too much, and that they can spill it all too fast. What people who know anything about computers are not worried about is the kind of computerized apocalypse that grips the popular sci-fi imagination, in which the machines go berserk, say, and bring down nuclear war on our unwilling heads. The leader of a nuclear nation must still *order* the atomic strike himself. (Of course, the computers can feed him misinformation horrendous enough to lead him astray. In October of 1959 our newest computerized Early Warning System in the Arctic flashed an increasingly baleful sequence of warnings all the way up to Emergency, the last step. It turned out that the computers had not been programmed to discount the effect of the moon's reflection on high ocean waves, and one bright night they reacted to this reflection exactly as if they were "seeing" an all-out Russian air strike. President Eisenhower, fortunately, had other information that contradicted the computer's moonshine, or we should all be algae.)

But why should knowledgeable computer people worry about the computers' knowing too much? Isn't that what they're there for, after all? And the answer is a vibrant yes—but! The danger is that the computers, in tandem, will collect so much information about all of us that they will have accomplished what amounts to a monstrous invasion of a whole nation's privacy. The process is already well under way. As Bernard Benson, a California computer manufacturer, has pointed out, the machines have already stored away an enormous amount of information about us—"your FBI record, childhood diseases, and the attitudes of your parents; school records, employment and tax records, contributions to charity, and even the records of your charge accounts and credit cards."

So far, at least, most of these records are stored in different places—in files belonging to the schools, employers, Census Bureau, Internal Revenue Service, etc. But what would happen if all these records were pulled together and filed in one place with *your name on them*? Just from the collation of existing data, the file would show all the pertinent and impertinent information about who you are, how much you make, where you go, how much you pay in taxes, which bills you're slow in paying, how much you spend at the liquor store, and which people you check into what motel with. As we move closer and closer to the day when we use

no cash at all and do everything on credit, we move closer and closer to the day when our every move will leave its telltale bit of data behind. Collect all the data in one electronic machine and you've given the collector the key to your private life! "Where information rests is where power lies, and the concentration of power is catastrophically dangerous," computer manufacturer Bernard Benson has said. So it isn't the computer itself that will be dangerous—no, it is not mischievous or venal or able to have "motives." "We will all be at the mercy of the man who pushes the button to make the machine remember," says Mr. Benson.

There is no chance, of course, that this sort of power would ever be allowed to lie around without a great many people trying to latch onto it. And sure enough, the U.S. Census Bureau, with the enthusiastic approval of the Commerce Department, Internal Revenue, and half a dozen other Government agencies, has been pushing with enormous eagerness for a National Data Bank that would file in one place everything that's known about everybody—taxes and medical histories, farm loans and Army discharges, fishing licenses and jail sentences. Now this data would be of vast *legitimate* use to sociologists, demographers, statisticians, and Government and industrial planners of all kinds. But there could also be a computer-wise bureaucrat somewhere back in the bowels of the building who could push a button and find out (from the spoor of computerized creditcard data) that you spent the weekend of February 1-2 skiing at King Ridge, in New London, New Hampshire, and that you charged your stay at the New London Inn on the same night as Porfirio Schussboom, the playboy diplomat who is being deported for moral turpitude with ski bunnies. Even if this information were true—and there is no guarantee that it would be—it is hardly any of that bureaucrat's business.

The prospect of the Data Bank has alarmed a lot of people, in and out of Government, in and out of the computer industry. The most potent force against the Bank so far has been a Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy in the U.S. House of Representatives, headed by New Jersey Democrat Cornelius E. Gallagher. In a series of hearings over the past couple of years, the Gallagher committee has turned up disturbingly large mounds of evidence that these machines already "know too damn much," and also that their unique data-gathering, -storing, and -disseminating abilities are already sometimes being used for unsavory purposes. Among Mr. Gallagher's piquant exhibits:

A large New York firm was brought on the carpet by the Fair Employment Practices Commission for discriminating against blacks in its hiring policies. The company replied that this was impossible, since it used computers to screen and select employees. After a great deal of trouble, it was discovered that the man who *programmed* the computers was a bigot and did indeed fix the machines to weed out all blacks.

All the names of people who wrote into an early, computerized dating system were sold to a pornography peddler. The names could have been sold anyway in a manual system, but only the computers' speed could make the name-selling economical.

A large insurance company upped the rates for burglary insurance the minute a community acquired a certain percentage of blacks or Puerto Ricans. Once again, only computers have the speed and memory to keep track of neighborhood patterns quickly and cheaply enough to make this kind of discrimination possible.

It is known that the dangers of unrestricted computerization came to the White House's attention during Lyndon Johnson's tenancy. Johnson appointed a distinguished Midwestern professor to a Presidential com-

mission—a crime commission, in fact. Routinely, the professor's name was sent off to the appropriate Government agencies for security clearance, and, routinely, the agencies' computers swallowed the name, blinked, and tapped out a message: "Associates with known criminals." Appalled, the Federal gumshoes ran the crime commissioner's name through the computer again, but the machine stuck by its guns: "Associates with known criminals."

When this information was passed along to Johnson, he erupted with several rangy, wide-open oaths, the gist of which was that the professor in question was a longtime goodbuddy and the blinketyblank computer people had just better find out what the hell they thought they were talking about.

Laboriously, by hand, in the old-fashioned, time-consuming way, the computer analysts checked back to see what their baby had been talking about. And sure enough, there was the evidence: Every Saturday during the football season, the professor phoned his local candy store and got down a \$10 bet on his alma mater's football team. The candy-store owner was tied into the gambling syndicate in his minuscule fashion, the cops had a tap on his phone, and the next thing anybody knew, the security computers in Washington were disgorging the raw information that the distinguished professor was "associating with known criminals."

Fortunately for the dist. prof., he had earlier spent several years associating with known Presidents, and the ludicrous accusation was run to ground. But the incident is bemusing—not because it was rare but because it is so *common*, not because it happened to a highly placed friend of the White House but because such incidents may soon be happening every day to all of us. The National Data Bank is not a reality yet, but several states, including California, have pretty good junior models of it.

The most insidious snooping now being done is conducted by the country's 2500 credit bureaus, with their embarrassingly detailed files on you and 160,000,000 other Americans. Many of the larger local credit bureaus, with tens of millions of names on file, are already computerized; by 1973 the whole system will be linked into one huge computer network, so that a department store in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at which you might like to open a charge account will be able to find out immediately that you refused, eight years ago, to pay for a bathing suit you'd bought in Akron, Ohio. Maybe the bathing suit disintegrated on the beach the first time you wore it and you were right not to pay—the credit bureau's report will take no notice of this, but will simply mark you down as a troublemaker and a deadbeat.

The credit bureaus are apparently so far out of line that two Senate subcommittees are vying with Gallagher's House subcommittee in trying to expose them and get some legislation written to control them. In the course of a clutch of hearings over the past two years, the Senate committees turned up some lulu in the abuse pattern. In Baton Rouge, a Raymond Maurer, successful commercial photographer, was unable to open a charge account at a hardware store last year because the credit bureau "remembered" some financial difficulties he had suffered when *starting* his business twelve years before. In Norfolk, Virginia, an insurance adjuster collected \$1000 for slander after his company erroneously told a credit bureau he had been fired for taking kickbacks; the credit bureau, naturally on the side of its informer, got its revenge by marking the adjuster down as dangerous because he was "litigious," meaning that he'd take you to court for slander.

The credit bureaus keep very *diverse* information about the 160,000,000 individuals in their files—not only bank references, bill-paying habits, and incomes but such data



as job progress, divorces, debts, bank balances, and any and all legal actions (without recording whether you were in the right). And every bit of this information is open to any creditor who pays the \$10 to \$50 yearly fee, as well as to any Government agency.

"Credit bureaus," says credit executive Edward Kennedy, "have regarded cooperation with police, FBI, and other Government agencies (read Internal Revenue Service) as routine business and an obligation of good citizenship." To prove how easy it is for any snoop to dip into credit bureau data, Professor Westin had a staff aide at Columbia write the Greater New York Credit Bureau asking for all the dope on a girl in the office, saying only that they were thinking about promoting her. The credit bureau complied immediately, both on the telephone and in writing. When Westin told Congress how easily he obtained the information, the bureau's executive manager yelled at the "shocking abuse of the name of Columbia University"—thereby missing the point entirely. In the first place, what's so noble about Columbia University that its name should inspire an immediate opening of private files? In the second, what if the credit bureau in its wisdom was similarly inspired to invade privacy in the name of some less scrupulous organization?

The only person who has any major trouble getting at the data—including the hearsay and downright errors—in the credit bureau files is the victim himself. The bureaus will not allow citizens to look for possibly false charges in their files, and even if someone knows that his file contains misinformation, the credit bureaus are feisty about making changes. A woman in Mississippi learned that a local credit bureau had inserted into her file, without comment, the raw gossip of her neighbors that she was "peculiar," "scatter-brained," and "neurotic or psychotic." The woman had a fierce struggle, costing her a good deal of time lost from work, just to get the undocumented pejoratives "neurotic or psychotic" removed from the file.

The credit bureaus offer at once the most blatant and the most illuminating example of what can happen in a computerized society run amok. Personal information, obviously, has always been available to anyone who wished it, provided he was willing to put out enough money, time, and effort to get it. With the use of day-and-night surveillance and liberal bribes, plus a patient study (and possible purloining) of business, financial, tax, and travel documents gathered from a hundred different sources—using all of these sources and spending enough time—the Government or any interested private party could pull together a comprehensive dossier on just about any citizen this side of Howard Hughes. (Most European governments, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, do go to the trouble and expense.) But unless national security were on the line, or a major corporate coup in the offing, or a rich spouse about to be spayed in divorce court, it just wasn't worth the trouble for the Government or anybody else to gather private records about private citizens in such detail.

The computer has changed all that. When we say this, we don't blame the computer any more than we blame the Wright brothers for the London blitz. And when we say this, we don't overlook the fact that one has a bona fide scientific miracle on one's hands, just as the science writers have been telling us. With the technology already at hand, computers can do the work of all the world's libraries, all the world's schoolteachers, all the world's automobile drivers (as well as train, bus, and airplane drivers), and all the world's accountants, and they can cause cash money to disappear from the face of the earth. They can run all the assembly lines in all the factories of the nation, and then judge how well the work has been done

and make the necessary corrections. They can get out the nation's bills, meet the nation's payrolls, and very nearly run the nation's homes. Stupendous. The trouble is that they can also make Big Brother tyranny of Orwell's 1984 arrive right on schedule, which is to say fifteen years from now, unless we take measures to insure that we don't turn over our freedom to the computers. As Lee Loevinger, a former member of the Federal Communications Commission, put it, "If it were not for the privacy issue, there would probably be no need to regulate the computer industry."

So what is an electronic computer anyway that it causes so many technological gasps and so much humanistic nailbiting? Well, it is a very large, very complex, very accurate, and very fast adding machine, with three basic new wrinkles. One wrinkle is that it is able to follow a set of instructions fed into it by punch cards or magnetic tape; the second is that it is able to store huge numbers of earlier calculations for use when needed, and the third is that it is able to electronically call forth the proper bits of information from its memory and do its new calculations in the proper sequence to lead to a solution instead of a meaningless conglomeration of figures. Everything else flows from these gifts. All the other mathematical functions, for example, are simply different kinds of addition, subtraction being upside-down addition, multiplication repeated addition, etc. Furthermore, all data and all concrete ideas can be expressed as numerical symbols. All your employment records in your current job can be encoded and stored in the computer as a series of numbers (a very long series of numbers, to be sure, but because of the computer's speed this is no problem). The machine can then be fed instructions which prompt it to search its memory for your file (your series of numbers), compute how long you have been with the company, for instance, refer to your salary level, and, finally, do a last computation according to a formula already given to determine how much vacation you get this year and, by matching your seniority against everyone else's, when you get it.

What makes all this storage of data possible is a revolution in electronics that began with the invention of the vacuum tube in the 1920s. A vacuum tube can be "fired"—or serve its part in an electronic relay—in a microsecond or one one-millionth of a second, making possible computations a thousand times faster than those of the most advanced mechanical computers. Strangely enough, it was not until fifteen or so years after the invention of the vacuum tube that anyone needed that sort of superfast computation. Then, in the middle of World War II, the Army found itself "desperate" for accurately computed artillery tables, which it wanted by the millions. Thus prodded, an engineer named Dr. J. Presper Eckert and a physicist, Dr. John Mauchley, took the familiar vacuum tube—thousands of them—and built ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator and Calculator), the world's first wholly electronic computer, which went into service for the U.S. Army in 1946.

After that the deluge. As Jeremy Bernstein has written in *The Analytical Engine*: "If there is one world that characterizes the history of computers since 1950, the word is probably 'proliferation.'" Remington Rand delivered the first commercial computer, the famous UNIVAC I, to the Census Bureau in 1951 (it was honorably retired to the Smithsonian in 1963). Another UNIVAC, the first designed for ordinary business data processing, was delivered to General Electric in 1954. Today there are 51,000 digital computers in operation in the U.S. (more than twice as many as in all the other countries of the world combined); their total worth: about \$22,000,000,000.

Today's computers are faster, more sophis-

ticated, and a great deal more compact than the relatively lumbering ENIACs and UNIVACs. The "basic machine time" for one operation is now a nanosecond—a billionth of a second—instead of a microsecond. The new machines can do 100,000 additions a second, can read data from magnetic tapes and store it at the rate of about 100,000 characters a second. The bulky vacuum tube has been replaced, first by transistors and now by tiny silicon "chips" and tiny magnetic memory cores. Perhaps more important, the computers are becoming more accessible to their users. Until the new, third-generation computers came along, man could "talk" to the machines—give them instructions—only by translating his wishes into one of several artificial "languages," known by such names as FORTRAN or ALGOL. The computers, in turn, came ready-programmed to be able to translate FORTRAN into the billions of electrical impulses, all in proper sequence, which would lead to the solution of a mathematical problem or the name of a scow or the firing of Apollo's retrorockets. Now the third-generation machines permit users to speak to them directly, using something very close to straight English and eliminating the need to use specialists—computer programmers—as translators.

The machines have gotten so fast that here and there they have had to be slowed down intentionally to keep within the perspective of their users. The telephone company in New York, for instance, now uses computers for "intercepts"—the process whereby the operator, when you dial a number that has been changed, cuts into the line, looks up the new number, and gives it to you. Now the operator (a live girl) punches the old number into a computer, which searches for it in its "memory," finds it, plus the new number, and flashes the new number to the operator—all in one-tenth of a second. The trouble is that the operator's consciousness needs seven-tenths of a second to take in the fact that she has punched the last digit of the old number; so as far as she is concerned, the computer has given the new number before it knew the old number, and the computer must therefore have made a mistake! At the phone company's request, the machine was slowed down.

It is interesting that the two most widely predicted—and feared—results of computer technology have not come to pass at all. The first was that man would lose control over the "intelligence" of his creation and end up with a Frankenstein monster on his hands, an independent, powerful, indeed superhuman, electronic intellect that would cackle fiendishly and foreclose on the human mortgage. Not so. Of course, the argument is semantic in many respects, and some computer champions argue that the machines are getting so much better in so many intellectual functions that they can be said to be approaching human intelligence. But the commonly accepted ultimate measure is the Turing test, in which a computer, in conversation with a skilled human interrogator, must successfully pass itself off as another human being—and by this measure the computers aren't making progress.

The second worry—"nightmare" is more like it—was that the proliferation of computers would eliminate so many jobs that we would have the worst depression—and most abject unemployment—in history on our hands. This frightening prognosis was a favorite of the late Norbert Wiener, otherwise known as "the father of automation," and about a decade ago the press was full of what seemed like justified scare stories. As with every other major technological advance, however, the computer has created more jobs than it has destroyed, though not necessarily more of the old kinds of jobs. Right now there is a howling need for tens of thousands of people to service and program the computers themselves!

For this and other reasons, the computer industry is in a pretty disheveled, not to say chaotic, state as it faces its glorious future. One major trouble is that while everyone knows pretty well what computers can do, no one is really sure what they should be asked to do. "All the sci-fi marvels are already within the state of the art, except that we can't go faster than the speed of light," says Dick Brandon, president of Brandon Applied Systems and one of the more out-spoken young swashbucklers in a swashbuckling industry. "But if the way we've used computers in business is any harbinger, boy are we in trouble! Not more than 50 percent of the computer installations are successful economically, for three reasons. One: People are buying them who shouldn't be—for prestige, whether or not they need them. Two: People are buying computers who don't know how to use them. Three: People underestimate their cost and overspend."

Brandon himself is eminently successful economically, having grabbed a modest but measurable capital chunk of an industry (computers) that did \$18,000,000,000 worth of business last year, the fifteenth year that it could be called an industry at all. Dutch-born, Columbia educated, and only thirty-four, Brandon founded his own company four years ago and now says that he is "worth five or six million on paper and have \$300 in the bank." Like all of his compeers, he thinks that the computer avalanche, with all its waste and abuses, is thundering along too fast to worry about such niceties as the destruction of the population's right to privacy. "We could build safeguards into the systems, but it wouldn't be profitable," he says.

Up at M.I.T. in Cambridge, Professor Fano agrees, with mingled enthusiasm and anguish, that there is no stopping the avalanche. "You can never stop these things," he says. "It is like trying to prevent a river flowing to the sea. What you have to do is to build dams, built waterworks, to control the flow." Dr. Fano is building his own dams in several directions. He's just finished conducting M.I.T.'s first seminar on the implication of computers to society, to see if he cannot instill in his students an awareness of all those privacy problems that Congress and the Federal Communications Commission are now disturbed about. "I'm coming essentially to the conclusion that it can't be dealt with by different disciplines," Dr. Fano says. "There is a terrible gulf of knowledge between society at large and the scientific elite, and this is enforced by the system itself. How is the individual even to know that the system is operating as it's supposed to? How can you generate a new breed of people who will be equally responsive to the needs of technology and humanity? We know that knowledge is power, but this means not only having the data at hand but having the ability to extract the relevant data. If this is limited to a few technological high priests in the Government and the large corporations, then the gap with the public will be immense and we are heading straight to 1984."

#### CIVIL DEFENSE OFFICER LAUDED

### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens work long and hard for their community and their country. Some of them receive plaudits and become famous. Others work quietly and receive little recognition, although their con-

tributions are often very great. Such a man is Lt. Lawrence Petry of 177 Walton Avenue, Uniondale.

Lieutenant Petry served for 20 years in the unheralded job of Auxiliary Police officer with the Uniondale Civil Defense Unit 122. He recently retired, following long years of dedicated, loyal service as the unit treasurer and training officer.

I wish to commend Lieutenant Petry for his honorable and faithful service, which is an example to all of us who enjoy the benefits of a free society.

#### MISS MARION L. STUART HONORED AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the world does not know of Marion L. Stuart, but the Olney community, which takes in a substantial part of my Fourth Congressional District, knows her very well. She is a schoolteacher—a remarkable lady in every sense of the word.

It was my pleasure on Thursday, May 22, 1969, to attend a testimonial dinner in her honor given by the Olney community. Supporting organizations included, but were not limited to, the following:

American Legion, Olney Post No. 388.  
AMVETS, Olney Post No. 77, 512 West Ruscomb Street.

Barton Home and School Association.  
Big Four Fathers' Association.

Catholic War Veterans, St. Helena's, Post No. 424.

Cook Junior High Home and School Association.

Creighton Home and School Association.

Feltonville Civic Association.  
Feltonville Home and School Association.

Finletter Home and School Association.

Golden Age Club of Olney.

Greater Olney Community Council.

Kiwanis Club of Olney.

Lindley-Olney Lions Club.

Lowell Home and School Association.

Lower Olney Civic Association.

Morrison Home and School Association.

Olney Business Men's Association.

Olney Elementary Home and School Association.

Olney High School Alumni Association.

Olney High School Home and School Association.

Olney neighbors.

Olney Symphony Orchestra.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, Raymond T. Osmond Post No. 1692.

The faculty of Olney High School.

Financial institutions.

Community Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Fidelity Bank.

Founders Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Girard Bank.

Olney Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Olney High School has had many problems, but under Marion L. Stuart's capable leadership, there was no problem that has not been intelligently and effectively handled. Her plaudits are best summed up in the program book which accompanied the testimonial dinner, as follows:

#### TRIBUTE

With appreciation, the Olney Community acknowledges the vital and dedicated services Miss Marion L. Stuart has given the Olney High School since its opening in February, 1931, first at a teacher, later department head, Vice Principal and since 1953, as Principal. She is the first woman Principal to direct a co-educational comprehensive high school. She has capably directed the school of over 4000 pupils with its faculty of several hundred teachers and an all male administrative staff of five vice-principals and eight department heads. Though slight of body, she is a bulwark of strength and energy. A prodigious and indefatigable worker she has given unstintingly of her time, her very life, especially to foster good human relationship and understanding among pupils, teachers and parents. She is magnanimous of heart and mind, and is the embodiment of graciousness and refinement and culture. With restraint, she carries all confidences, disappointments and heartaches. Hysterical reactions are foreign to her nature. She is a creative and positive thinker, hopeful that right will prevail. She has indeed been a noble servant and leader of Olney High, an educator of first rank.

Thankfully the Olney Community pays tribute to Miss Marion L. Stuart for her devoted service of 50 years with the School District of Philadelphia, her interest in all community activities and for her exemplary life.

We feel confident that all who know her outside of our community join us in this tribute.

The entire Olney Community hopes she will be richly blessed in the years of her retirement.

#### OUR MEN

### HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 25, I had the privilege of attending a ceremony in Hutsonville, Ill., to honor the war dead of that community. This was truly a community endeavor, and I was greatly impressed with the public spirit and participation which resulted in this memorable dedication program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a poem which was recited at the ceremony. The poem was written by Gary Cox, a Hutsonville High School student:

#### OUR MEN

(By Gary Cox)

We live in a land that is mighty and free.  
Our land is more powerful than any could be.  
Everything we have is in abundance, and more,  
Our land has everything we can ask for.  
But without our men, just where would we be.  
We would not be a land that is mighty and free.  
From the old Revolution, to the modern day war,  
They have fought side by side, both the rich and the poor.



It made no difference, colored, or white,  
These men did not care, they continued to  
fight.

These were tough men, and our hardships  
they bore,  
So that we could have everything, we could  
ever ask for.

These men who attended Hutsonville High  
Were no different, do you know why?  
They went to fight, for their wonderful land,  
And while fighting were struck down by the  
enemy's hand.

Indeed a great debt to our men do we owe,  
Who fought for their country, the land they  
loved so.

Nowhere on earth could greater men be,  
Then the men who fought, so that we would  
be free.

### THE INSPIRING LIFE OF THE LATE HARRY GALPIN STODDARD

**HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the poet  
writes:

Lives of great men all remind us  
We can live our lives sublime,  
And departing leave behind us  
Footprints on the sands of time.

Last Wednesday, May 21, 1969, the life  
of a great man, Harry Galpin Stoddard,  
resident of my home city of Worcester,  
Mass., ended. His passing brought deep  
sadness to all our local citizens and  
throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. Stoddard was a nationally recog-  
nized industrial executive who pro-  
foundly believed in and practiced the  
basic principles of our American free  
enterprise system.

He was a wise and compassionate man  
possessed of uncommon vision and an  
extraordinary capacity for leadership. He  
was intensely dedicated to the progress  
and development of the people among  
whom he lived and our Worcester com-  
munity has been the grateful beneficiary  
of his goodness and genius over many,  
many years.

Particularly in this troubled and rest-  
less era of our national history, the story  
of his life sets forth an inspiring exam-  
ple that is preeminently worthy of more  
universal study and imitation.

At this point, I am pleased to include  
an editorial and excerpts from other  
articles appearing in the May 23, 1969,  
issue of the Worcester Telegram news-  
paper, describing Mr. Stoddard's unique  
career and presenting special tributes by  
some of his distinguished fellow Ameri-  
cans who valued his friendship and his  
counsel:

#### HARRY GALPIN STODDARD

Harry G. Stoddard's achievements in busi-  
ness, industry, civic affairs and philanthropic  
endeavors are well known in Worcester and  
Massachusetts, and are touched on in some  
detail elsewhere in today's Telegram.

For the moment, it is Harry G. Stoddard  
the man whom we wish to remember here.

Mr. Stoddard loved people. He liked to mix  
with them and talk about what concerned  
them. Yet, for all his notable accomplish-  
ments, he was reserved and self-effacing. Al-  
though he could not help play a role in pub-

lic and philanthropic affairs, he did not seek  
the spotlight. Many of his good works re-  
ceived no publicity at all, and he preferred it  
that way.

There is no way to count the hours that  
Mr. Stoddard spent on community causes.  
The Worcester Community Services organi-  
zation could not possibly be the tremendous  
agency for good that it is today had it not  
been for the enormous contributions of Mr.  
Stoddard—both in time and money—over the  
past half century.

The YMCA, the YWCA, the Worcester Mem-  
orial Auditorium, the Red Cross—these  
were the sort of endeavors that won Mr. Stod-  
dard's unswerving support. He was of course,  
a pillar of strength to his own church, First  
Baptist, especially during the trying months  
after its building burned down in 1937.

Harry G. Stoddard was never one to talk  
much about his religious faith, but there is  
no question that the example of his father, a  
Baptist minister, was a strong influence on  
his whole life.

Those who knew Mr. Stoddard closely will  
long remember him as a man both of the  
strictest integrity and of warm human feel-  
ing. Although he took life and its responsi-  
bilities seriously, he was able to look at him-  
self with a quiet, self-deprecating sense of  
humor.

Our community will long be indebted to  
him.

#### H. G. STODDARD DIES AT AGE 95

Harry Galpin Stoddard, 95, of 7 Massachu-  
setts Ave., former president and chairman  
of Wyman-Gordon Co. and The Telegram  
and Gazette died late Wednesday night in  
his home after a long illness.

He was a leader for many years in Wor-  
cester's civic, industrial and lay religious  
life.

Educated in the public schools of Wor-  
cester, and an 1891 graduate of the old Wor-  
cester High School, Mr. Stoddard held  
honorary doctorates awarded by Worcester  
Polytechnic Institute, Clark University, Holy  
Cross College, and Springfield College.

#### BORN IN ATHOL

He was born in Athol on Sept. 13, 1873,  
son of a Baptist minister, the Rev. Darius  
Hicks Stoddard, and Emma Azuba (Galpin)  
Stoddard. He came to Worcester with his  
parents when he was 11 years old.

He took secretarial courses at Becker  
Business College following his graduation  
from high school in 1891, and was hired as  
an office boy at Washburn & Moen Manu-  
facturing Co., pioneer wire-making concern  
here.

Mr. Stoddard soon afterward became  
stenographer and clerk in the company's  
order department, and later a salesman.

#### MADE ASSISTANT

In 1896, he was made assistant to Philip  
W. Moen, general manager.

Mr. Stoddard married Miss Janett Waring,  
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Waring,  
on June 28, 1898. She died June 23, 1963.

Washburn & Moen joined other independ-  
ent local companies in 1899 to become Ameri-  
can Steel & Wire Co.

Mr. Stoddard was made assistant manager  
of the new company and works manager in  
1902.

#### YOUNGEST PRESIDENT

Two years later, he was transferred and  
left Worcester to serve for seven years as  
president of Trenton (N.J.) Iron Works, wire  
manufacturers employing several thousand  
workers, now American Steel & Wire's Tren-  
ton Works. Then only 31, Mr. Stoddard was  
known as the youngest president of an in-  
dustrial concern of this size in the nation.

Mr. Stoddard returned to Worcester in  
1911 to become vice-president and general  
sales manager of Wyman & Gordon.

He rose successively to the positions of  
treasurer and general manager.

#### ASSUMES OFFICE

In 1931, 20 years after returning from  
Trenton, Mr. Stoddard succeeded George F.  
Fuller as Wyman-Gordon Co. president.

Ranking as the nation's top producer of  
forgings, the company acquired an outstand-  
ing record of World War II achievement un-  
der Mr. Stoddard's leadership, winning re-  
peated Army-Navy "E" and other awards for  
production excellence.

#### NAMED GOLDEN RULE FUND

Fully as active in civic life as in industry,  
Mr. Stoddard was a charter member of Wor-  
cester Welfare Federation, later Worcester  
Community Chest, and in 1920 was general  
chairman of its first Golden Rule Campaign.  
It was he who originated the name of the  
Golden Rule Fund as a distinctive feature of  
the Worcester agency program.

In 1938, after serving as a director and on  
the budget and special gifts committees, he  
succeeded the late Dr. Homer Gage as Com-  
munity Chest president. He headed the or-  
ganization until 1946.

The Municipal Memorial Auditorium also  
is in large part a measure of Mr. Stoddard's  
community spirit. He was a member of the  
commission that chose the sloping orchard  
of the old Stephen Salisbury farm as the  
Auditorium site in 1929. He also was one of  
15 persons who joined to buy it.

#### SURVEY COMMITTEE

Mr. Stoddard was appointed to the repre-  
sentative Citizens Advisory Committee for  
the huge New Salem Street Redevelopment  
Project in 1957.

He was a longtime member of First Baptist  
Church and one of its most active and influ-  
ential laymen, particularly in the critical  
years just after 1937 when fire destroyed its  
third edifice at Main Street and Ionic Ave-  
nue.

Mr. Stoddard was made a member of the  
parish's rebuilding survey committee, and  
was chairman of its finance committee when  
that board endorsed the new location at  
Salisbury Street and Park Avenue.

He presided at the 1938 cornerstone laying,  
and formally accepted the keys to the new  
church at its first worship service Sept. 10,  
1939.

It was in 1939 that he was elected to the  
first of six successive one-year terms as mod-  
erator and administrative committee chair-  
man of the parish.

He received his honorary degrees from  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1941,  
Clark University in 1945, Holy Cross College  
in 1955 and Springfield College in 1958. The  
Holy Cross honor came after he had been  
chosen for the college's first "Distinguished  
Citizen of Worcester" award.

Stoddard Hall at Andover Newton Theo-  
logical School in Newton Center honors Mr.  
Stoddard, who was a trustee of the school for  
20 years. Ground was broken recently for  
Stoddard Residence Center at Worcester  
Tech.

During World War I, Mr. Stoddard was a  
leader in Red Cross relief and U.S. War Loan  
committee work.

He long exercised a personal interest in  
Goddard House, formerly Worcester Home for  
Aged Men. He was elected to its corporation  
in 1917, was made a director the following  
year, and served as president and finance  
chairman for 14 years.

Mr. Stoddard was the third Worcester resi-  
dent to win the annual Isaiah Thomas  
Award of the Advertising Club, conferred in  
recognition of "distinguished community  
service." He was the 1952 recipient.

Worcester State College honored him as  
"one of Worcester's finest citizens" at its 12th  
annual scholarship tea in the spring of 1953.

Among awards from veterans of the armed  
services, Mr. Stoddard received in 1950 the  
Southern Cross Pin and an honorary mem-  
bership from Worcester Chapter, American  
Division Veterans Association, for "distin-  
guished service as a citizen of Worcester."

Mr. Stoddard was the father of the late Lt. Col. Lincoln W. Stoddard, who received five decorations and numerous citations for heroism as a veteran of 44 months of heavy combat service with the Army's famed Americal Division, in World War II in the South Pacific.

Mr. Stoddard was also honored in 1956 when he was the sixth person to receive the award of Worcester Post 105, American Veterans of World War II and Korea (AMVETS), for "outstanding and meritorious service to the veterans of the City of Worcester."

His "outstanding contributions to the Armed Forces Reserve program" brought Mr. Stoddard an Award of Merit from the Armed Forces Dinner committee in May of 1957.

#### HONORED BY AIR FORCE

In the same month, he received simultaneous honors from the Air Force and the Reserve Officers Training Corps program at Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

In personal politics a Republican, Mr. Stoddard was a presidential elector in 1956, being chosen in June of that year as one of the 16 Massachusetts members of the U.S. Electoral College. He was chosen president of the Bay State electors.

Mr. Stoddard was honorary chairman of financial campaigns of the YMCA and of the YWCA, two groups in which he had displayed much interest for many years.

#### CARDINALS JOIN IN TRIBUTE TO PUBLISHER-INDUSTRIALIST

Tributes from leaders in industry, business, civic, political and religious life were voiced yesterday to mourn the death of Harry G. Stoddard, former chairman and president of Wyman-Gordon Co. and The Worcester Telegram and The Evening Gazette.

John Cardinal Wright of Pittsburgh, Pa., who was first Roman Catholic bishop of Worcester, said "This Christian gentleman brought firmness, integrity and great love to his work for all of Central Massachusetts."

#### CITES INFLUENCE

"His influence went far beyond the wide world of industry and publishing in which he was a leader. Those of us who enjoyed his friendship still radiate into our sphere of influence the lessons learned from him. We pay part of our debt to him by our grateful prayers on his behalf."

U.S. Rep. Harold D. Donohue of Worcester characterized Mr. Stoddard as one "intensely dedicated to the progress and development of this community and its people."

"He had a gift for pointed and truthful expression when he didn't like a particular proposal. But his attitude was one of unflinching good humor and his counsel was always respected."

"Above all he was a wise and compassionate man, possessed of uncommon vision and an extraordinary capacity for leadership."

U.S. Rep. Philip J. Philbin of Clinton called Mr. Stoddard "a leader of which any community might well be proud, combining common sense, ability and wisdom with zeal for his work, strong public conscience and devotion to his family. By his unflinching industry, untiring attention to his duties, and insistence upon highest personal and public standards he set an inspiring example for all."

"He was a generous, considerate friend to many causes and to many people and his passing leaves a great void in the constructive, dedicated leadership of our time."

Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston said of Mr. Stoddard:

"He was great in business and civic affairs and in philanthropy. May God rest his noble soul."

#### OTHER TRIBUTES

Other tributes published in yesterday's Evening Gazette came from Milton P. Higgins, chairman of the board of Norton Co.;

Leverett Saltonstall, former U.S. senator and governor of Massachusetts; U.S. Sen. Edward W. Brooke; Gov. Francis W. Sargent; U.S. Sec. of Transportation John A. Volpe, former Bay State governor; Rev. Dr. Thomas S. Roy, pastor emeritus of First Baptist Church; Ladd Plumley, chairman and president of State Mutual Life Assurance Company of America; Harry P. Storke, president of Worcester Polytechnic Institute; City Manager Francis J. McGrath, and Robert D. Harrington, chairman of the finance committee of Paul Revere Corp. and vice chairman of Avco Corp.

#### QUIPPING PROF COMMUTES FROM NEW YORK

### HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit an article written in the Twin City Sentinel of Winston-Salem, N.C., about one of my constituents, Dr. Arthur Jasspe.

The article follows:

QUIPPING PROF COMMUTES FROM NEW YORK: WRITER, MUSICIAN REVEALS FORMULA FOR SUCCESS

(By Scherer James)

Dr. Arthur Jasspe commutes 1,136 miles each week to his job at Winston-Salem State College.

The new professor of English flies into Winston-Salem every Sunday night and flies home to New York City every Friday afternoon. In between flights he makes his transient home at the Carolina Hotel.

The airlines offer no commuter tickets. "They're taking all my money," he complained, chewing on a cigar.

Why not move to Winston-Salem? "I have to keep attached to my roots," he said. And the weekends provide time away from school to work on his plays and novels.

His wife, Myrtle Marguerite, is a social worker and assistant chief of training in the Bureau of Child Welfare in New York.

Interviewing Jasspe is like trying to find your way through the funhouse at the fair with a practical joker at your elbow.

"This is an interview New York style," he said, propping his feet on a desk. "You get the raw data."

Try to find out his age, and he'll tell you "I was born on my natal day."

A short, stocky man with bushy gray eyebrows, he wears a "union blue" suit and a black tie with a skull and crossbones design, which he calls the "school tie of the Sir Henry Morgan University of Corleaus Hook."

And while he talks, he likes to pull out and wave the Library of Congress card listing his only published book, "Critical Theory and Playwriting Practice of Contemporary American Playwrights, 1920-1940."

Jasspe also has written several plays—"Amertyl," a vampire tale in verse; "The Tarleton Story" about the Oedipus legend transcended into modern terms; "Seven Days Hath December," an anti-war play—but none of them have been produced yet.

"Seven Days Hath December," whose hero Edward Everette Kilroy, the third, jr. goes before the Security Council to prevent a war, will be produced by students at Winston-Salem State "sometime this year."

Although he proudly lists his membership in the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans, he wrote the play "because I don't want other guys to lose their hearing like I lost mine in World War II." He now wears a hearing aid.

Jasspe even has a mathematical formula for a successful writing.

Which means "work equals the artistic components times the social and psychological components divided by the author's individualism times talent to the Nth power . . ."

Which means "the guy with the most talent will create a work of art."

Jasspe also is a composer and a member of the American Federation of Musicians. He has written several symphonic pieces, a string quartet, a solo horn piece.

"I write the best kind of music," he said.

He came to teach at WSSC through the Southern Education Program in Atlanta, which provides a placement service for Negro colleges in the South. Several other faculty members have been hired through the same program.

So far Jasspe likes teaching and likes his students.

"The best part is watching immature adolescents turn into mature adults under your very guidance," he said.

But his impressions of Winston-Salem, which he will not make public, are not as favorable.

"If you wrote down my comments, nobody would like them," he said.

"Anything I like in Winston-Salem is either illegal, immoral, fattening or costs \$7.95 and three cents tax."

#### THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to build a "thin" anti-ballistic-missile system makes no sense and instead would be a costly provocation to escalate the arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States. Some of the best scientific minds in the United States have pointed out the failures of the proposed system. In addition they have made clear that the system would not strengthen the defenses of the United States.

President Nixon in his presentations has outlined a time schedule which also makes clear the lack of need for an immediate decision on the ABM. We can safely delay construction of the ABM until we determine whether those negotiations will be fruitful. Many of us, including Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, as well as a number of Republicans, share these sentiments.

Further, I am opposed to plans to test the multiple warhead missile system—MIRV—this year. This system is an even greater provocation than ABM. Once it is tested, the arms race must continue because both sides will know the weapon can be deployed without warning. Present detection systems, which can detect the deployment of missiles, cannot detect whether they are single or multiple warheads.

The United States now has weapons enough to destroy all life on the planet earth many times over. We do not need new, costly, and more deadly weapons. Our defenses are strong, let us now concentrate on arms reduction.



PROFITABLE MERCHANT FLEET  
VITAL TO AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, the Under Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Rocco C. Siciliano, spoke before the Propeller Club's annual Maritime Day dinner of the Port of Washington at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. On this occasion, Mr. Siciliano took note of the President's strong belief that a profitable merchant fleet is vital to America's economic welfare and defense capability. He made particular reference to the need to halt the deterioration of the past years, and to revive our maritime industry. "The difficulties of years past," he said, "have taught us that if we are to err, we would prefer to err on the side of action and initiative instead of on the side of indecision and reaction. Nor will there be any lengthy delay in coming forward with a program to achieve this."

I join with the Secretary's expressed optimism of a new hope for the future of the American merchant marine. I, therefore, offer to all of my colleagues in the House the text of the remarks made by Mr. Siciliano at the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington on May 21, 1969:

I am delighted to be here on this Maritime Day among so many friends and colleagues of the maritime industry.

President Nixon in his Maritime Day proclamation said, "A strong and profitable merchant fleet is vital to America's economic welfare and defense capability. The American flag on merchant vessels on the high seas and in foreign ports is a symbol of the Nation's dedication to peaceful trade throughout the world." I assure you that these are not just words. They are a statement of policy on the part of this Administration.

Traditionally, Maritime Day provides opportunity for the shipping industry to pause for a moment in the daily routine of meeting and solving individual problems, to take a look at the overall condition of the American Merchant Marine. There has certainly been far more "viewing with alarm" than "pointing with pride" on the part of industry and government commentators alike over the past several years. I agree that the alarm has been justified.

It would be hard to be proud of the fact that over two-thirds of the merchant ships of the richest and most powerful nation in the world are over 20 years old.

We can hardly boast of the fact that the world's greatest trading nation carries less than 7 percent of its own foreign trade—or about as much as, say, Belgium and New Zealand carry of their own trade.

It is no great cause for self-congratulation that a nation with a Gross National Product of over \$887 billion spent only about \$285 million—or 3 hundredths of 1 percent—of its total GNP on new merchant ships last year. This amount was equal to about four-tenths of 1 percent of our total foreign trade.

It would seem that the protection of \$67 billion worth of trade would warrant the expenditure of sufficient funds to provide a merchant marine that would meet the requirements of our long-standing national policy—a fleet adequate to carry our domestic and a substantial portion of our foreign

waterborne commerce and to serve as a military and naval auxiliary in case of war or national emergency.

As Under Secretary of Commerce, I have a prime responsibility for the promotion of U.S. trade and the support of our commerce. From personal work experience, I know that the American Merchant Marine is vital to our foreign trade, and makes an important contribution to our domestic prosperity. I have mentioned the very small proportion of our trade carried in U.S. flag ships. The share carried by our ships in every category—liner, non-liner and tanker—has been steadily decreasing over the past ten years, and the number of privately owned ships in service has also decreased.

The share of our liner cargo carried by such U.S. ships dropped from 32.3% in 1958 to an estimated 23.6% in 1968. U.S. non-liners, which carried 8.4% of such cargo in 1958, transported only 3.2% in 1968. U.S. tanker carried 7.6% of tanker tonnage in 1958 and only 5.4% in 1968.

Had our ships carried only the total of 12.2% of U.S. cargoes that was theirs 10 years ago, they would today be handling 70% more cargo, for in that ten-year period, our total waterborne trade has increased by that much. Had they carried 30% of our foreign trade, a figure which President Nixon has suggested as a reasonable goal, they would be carrying more than 4½ times as much cargo as at present. Think what this would mean to the future of our seamen, our longshoremen, our ship operators, our shipbuilders—the entire industry!

Is this impossible? I do not believe so. There are many indications it could be achieved. The advent of big, fast, efficient container ships in U.S. service, both subsidized and unsubsidized, is capturing for U.S. ships a good beginning of this high value cargo.

The ability of some unsubsidized lines to share in this trade through use of converted vessels without government operating aid is clear indication that U.S. flag ships can compete when they can use their advantages effectively—low-cost capital, American know-how, organizational efficiency, a highly advanced inland transportation complex.

The enormous increase in bulk trade, indicated by the doubling of non-liner cargoes in the past ten years, offers an opportunity to U.S. flag shipping that it would be negligent to miss. Bulk trade lends itself to efficient transportation, as witness the development of water transport of bulk cargo on the Great Lakes, with its low cost and fast turnaround. Bulk ships are being designed that will be at the same time specially adapted to certain bulk cargoes and will also have enough flexibility to carry more than one type of cargo, in order to avoid empty backhauls. Such ships lend themselves to standardization of construction, which should also decrease building costs.

The outlook for tankers is suddenly bright, with the discovery and exploitation of oil reserves in Alaska. If the Northwest Passage over the top of the world is found to be feasible, there will undoubtedly be an upsurge of tanker building for U.S. flag operation. Tankers, too, lend themselves to standardization, and to economies of scale in size and numbers.

I know that President Nixon is determined to restore our merchant fleet to the preeminence it once held among maritime nations. Yet we all know, also, that the difficulty experienced in the past in developing a new maritime policy has been only partly due to lack of available funds. Partly it has been due to past administrative restrictions on the use of appropriated funds. A serious drawback, too, has been the turmoil within the industry itself, its inability to agree on at least a few basic principles on which a maritime policy could be built.

Inherent in the divisions of the maritime industry are the divisions among maritime labor, which have resulted in several serious and prolonged work stoppages. These have caused great losses to the maritime and other industries, and have had the further unfortunate effect of alienating shippers on whose goodwill and patronage the merchant marine depends.

I know something about labor problems, having spent a good part of my life in jobs concerned with labor relations. I must admit that when it comes to complexity, it would be hard to equal the maritime labor situation in any other industry.

Means must be established by which labor and management can communicate with each other on a continuing basis, so that serious problems could be discussed and worked out before both sides became frozen into immutable positions.

Obviously, everything will not be smooth sailing. There will be many disagreements, some disappointments and failures. In order for maritime labor to cooperate with management, there must be mutually satisfactory goals—that is, labor will share in rewards as well as in sacrifices.

Not long after I joined the Pacific Maritime Association in 1965, PMA undertook an extensive—and expensive—permanent training program for longshore and maritime workers designed to meet the needs of increasingly mechanized methods in cargo handling and ship design. This attempt to foresee and to meet intelligently the changes that were coming was, I believe, a badly needed development in an industry which too often reacts to change only after it has taken place.

West Coast companies were among the first to develop container service and to work out practical agreements with other modes of transportation in an effort to establish a land-bridge across the United States for containerized cargoes. We tried to foresee and to ride the wave of the future, rather than to let it catch us unaware and drag us down.

There must be flexibility in the development of the labor-management agreements if shipping is to successfully meet the challenge of rapidly expanding population and trade in the area, as well as cope with the upsurge of cargo shipments caused by the Vietnam war and reactivation of reserve fleet ships to carry military cargoes.

I am pointing out that it is not an inevitable fact of life that no rational means of settling maritime disputes can be found. In contemplating the collective bargaining sessions now under way with seamen's unions, I am hopeful over the statement by several major East Coast seamen's unions giving assurance that they will not strike at expiration of their contract in mid-June if progress is being made in working out new agreements. I am also encouraged by assurances given on the West Coast that in spite of the serious problems that have arisen over container handling, differences will be worked out through bargaining processes without a work stoppage.

I have addressed myself to some comber areas of the merchant marine on what should be a festive occasion because I am convinced that we hold here the key to the future of the U.S. merchant marine.

The Nixon Administration is hard at work preparing a long-range maritime program. Secretary of Commerce Stans has placed the prestige of his office behind the effort to encourage U.S. shippers to use American ships. Maritime Administrator Gibson has been hard at work to put new maritime proposals into practical working form. Once devised and thereafter approved by the Congress, the plans must be then implemented. And this final implementation—in order to be successful—must be achieved by the industry itself.

How well they will work in the years ahead will be largely dependent on the officials who head up the major management of the steamship lines and the maritime unions. Between them, they must insure that there will be no serious disruptions of U.S.-flag service, for a merchant marine consisting of idle ships is no merchant marine at all.

The Nixon Administration intends to provide the leadership in attempting to solve the problems of the Merchant Marine on a basis that will provide the means for rebuilding our merchant fleet. But in the final analysis, the future of U.S. shipping will be what you—the management and labor that comprise the industry—make it.

I must view the future with optimism. When you are as far down as you can go, there is nowhere left to go but up!

In the short time I have been back in Washington, I detect a similar note of optimism within all segments of the industry.

I want to emphasize one point—it is that, as long as the Department of Commerce has the responsibility for the Maritime Administration and for contributing to the formulation of merchant marine policy, we will be giving these matters the high priority they demand. Maritime policy will not be a poor stepchild at the Department of Commerce.

We have other-related activities concerned with the development of the merchant marine and the exploration and utilization of the ocean's resources.

Some of you may not know that more than half of the total budget and personnel at Commerce is devoted to science programs in one form or another. The Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—is combining science and technology to make the oceans of the world an expanding frontier. We now have the support of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 and the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966, both of which are designed to improve our capabilities and performance for training and research in marine sciences and engineering.

Through the use of the Weather Bureau's satellites, we have vastly improved our ability to determine the state of the seas and the conditions of weather. The activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey contribute information on tides and navigation, charts and maps, and other forms of data of use to shippers. The Bureau of Standards is working in the area of containerization; the Bureau is also the second largest governmental producer of technical publications affecting the sea and commerce. The Maritime Administration, of course, is involved in wide-ranging engineering operations calculated to increase our use of ocean resources.

Thus, we at Commerce recognize that if we are to prepare for the future, we must turn our attention seaward in the quest for food, fuels, and minerals—while, at the same time, protecting the natural beauty of the seashore and the waterways. We, in the Department of Commerce, have the coordinated resources to lead this effort.

There is no question in the White House, the Commerce Department, the Maritime Administration, or elsewhere as to the need to halt the deterioration of past years, and to revive our merchant fleet. There is full recognition of the immediacy of the need to do so. The difficulties of years past have taught us that if we are to err, we would prefer to err on the side of action and initiative instead of on the side of indecision and reaction. Nor will there be lengthy delay in coming forward with a program to achieve this. Such a program will be presented to the Congress for its consideration this summer—not, we hope, during the Indian summer.

My hope is that all elements of the industry will then join us in pulling on the anchor chain.

## TIME BOMB TICKING

## HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have in the last several years developed a keen interest in the problems of Japan and Japanese-American relations. Over this period I have had the opportunity to discuss with Japanese officials and elected politicians their concerns. With few exceptions these conversations included reference to the Japanese-American Mutual Security Treaty and the future status of Okinawa.

Unfortunately, Americans are much too ill-informed of moods and events in Japan. This ignorance of Japanese concerns has allowed the question of Okinawa to be largely overlooked by Americans. However, from time to time there do appear in the press insightful articles on the troubles surrounding our retention of Okinawa. One such article appears in today's New York Times under the byline of columnist and Washington Bureau Chief Tom Wicker.

Mr. Wicker quite correctly points out that continued obstinance by the United States with regard to the reversion of Okinawa could well lead to the loss of our strongest Asian ally.

There are of course military advantages to both Japan and the United States from the operation of Okinawa. But whether the United States must store nuclear weapons there and must retain the right to conduct military operations from Okinawa without prior consultation is open to serious question.

I commend Mr. Wicker's article to the readers of the Record, and insert at this point:

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1969]

GENERAL'S DREAM, POLITICIAN'S NIGHTMARE  
(By Tom Wicker)

TOKYO, May 26.—Okinawa is a general's dream; it could not be better if Curt LeMay himself had selected the site and arranged the conditions. Within a radius of 1,700 miles, existing American aircraft can reach any Asian nation with which the United States has a security agreement, including Thailand, and could also cover every important area of mainland China; yet, unlike Taiwan, Okinawa is far enough out to sea to give its defenders sufficient "reaction time" against attack from China or Korea.

With no mountains, industrial smoke or snow, and almost never any fog, Okinawa also affords the best flying conditions in the Pacific. It has even better deep-water ports than the home islands of Japan, and because the United States took administrative control of Okinawa after World War II, there are no legal restrictions on the military operations that can be launched from this remarkable base.

No wonder, then, that the American military think Okinawa is the greatest thing since Hannibal discovered the elephant. American control of the island is, nevertheless, a political time bomb ticking away at the heart of the Japanese-American security arrangement, which in turn is the central pillar of the United States position in the Pacific and East Asia.

## THE HEART OF THE MATTER

For that reason, the military may well have to relinquish what many prize most about

the Okinawa bases—American freedom of action. It is that freedom which allows B-52's to take off unimpeded for bombing attacks in Indochina, and which permits the United States—though the fact is never conceded—to stockpile nuclear weapons on the island.

This freedom of action is at the heart of the trouble. Actually, the reversion of Okinawa to Japanese administration is conceded, in principle, by everyone; the real problem is whether the Okinawan military bases will have a special status or whether they will be governed by the same conditions that now apply to American bases in Japan proper—including prohibition of nuclear weapons and of offensive military operations, without the prior consent of the Japanese Government.

So heated is Japanese and Okinawan nationalist and pacifist sentiment that when Foreign Minister Kiichi Aichi leaves this week for talks in Washington he is expected to be picketed by firebrands who do not even want to negotiate on the issue. Okinawa's militant Reversion Council, which demands "immediate, total and unconditional reversion" (political jargon for the actual removal of the bases) has passed a formal resolution against the Aichi visit, and the one planned for next fall by Premier Sato.

In this kind of climate, Japanese political analysts insist that Sato must come home from Washington with both a specific date for reversion (sometime in 1972 or 1973 apparently would suffice) and "homeland conditions"—that is, the same rules for the Okinawan bases as for those in Japan.

## U.S. PRESENCE IN JEOPARDY

Anything less might topple the Sato Government; and whether or not the Premier fell, his Liberal Democratic party would be greatly weakened for the 1970 elections. If those elections then brought a coalition of leftist parties into power, which is regarded here as a live possibility, the Japanese-American security treaty and the American presence in Japan would be placed in great jeopardy.

Even if the Liberal Democrats, who generally support the security treaty, remained in power, once Okinawa became fully Japanese the Sato Government would have no legal power to agree to military conditions for that particular island that the treaty would not permit elsewhere in Japan. Hence, if Washington will not agree to "homeland conditions," Sato would have no choice but to ask the Diet to approve amendments to the treaty for Okinawa—and that, too, would open the treaty itself to abrogation or more radical amendment.

That would be a far higher price to pay than yielding some degree of military flexibility on Okinawa. After all, as one important Japanese official put it, control of the island is proposed to be returned not to an enemy but to an ally; and since the bases are there in large measure to protect that ally, it would make little sense to cling to freedom of operations on Okinawa at the cost of the alliance itself.

## PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

## HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Maritime Day in May of each year provides an excellent opportunity to take an overall view of our maritime policies and to lay plans for future ac-



tion. Propeller Clubs all over the country usually take the lead in arranging special affairs to observe the occasion and much is said about the progress, or lack of it, being made by our merchant marine.

The Propeller Club, port of Washington, was extremely fortunate in having as its speaker, at their dinner on May 21, the Honorable Rocco C. Siciliano, the Under Secretary of Commerce. In his message he presented the administration's views on our maritime problems and some directions for the future. Since this is a matter which concerns the entire country, I know all of you will be most interested in learning what Mr. Siciliano had to say and therefore I am including his remarks in the RECORD for your information:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE ROCCO C. SICILIANO

I am delighted to be here on this Maritime Day among so many friends and colleagues of the maritime industry.

President Nixon in his Maritime Day proclamation said, "A strong and profitable merchant fleet is vital to America's economic welfare and defense capability. The American flag on merchant vessels on the high seas and in foreign ports is a symbol of the Nation's dedication to peaceful trade throughout the world." I assure you that these are not just words. They are a statement of policy on the part of this Administration.

Traditionally, Maritime Day provides opportunity for the shipping industry to pause for a moment in the daily routine of meeting and solving individual problems, to take a look at the overall condition of the American Merchant Marine. There has certainly been far more "viewing with alarm" than "pointing with pride" on the part of industry and government commentators alike over the past several years. I agree that the alarm has been justified.

It would be hard to be proud of the fact that over two-thirds of the merchant ships of the richest and most powerful nation in the world are over 20 years old.

We can hardly boast of the fact that the world's greatest trading nation carries less than 7 percent of its own foreign trade—or about as much as, say, Belgium and New Zealand carry of their own trade.

It is no great cause for self-congratulation that a nation with a Gross National Product of over \$887 billion spent only about \$285 million—or 3 hundredths of 1 percent—of its total GNP on new merchant ships last year. This amount was equal to about four-tenths of 1 percent of our total foreign trade.

It would seem that the protection of \$67 billion worth of trade would warrant the expenditure of sufficient funds to provide a merchant marine that would meet the requirements of our long-standing national policy—a fleet adequate to carry out domestic and a substantial portion of our foreign waterborne commerce and to serve as a military and naval auxiliary in case of war or national emergency.

As Under Secretary of Commerce, I have a prime responsibility for the promotion of U.S. trade and the support of our commerce. From personal work experience, I know that the American Merchant Marine is vital to our foreign trade, and makes an important contribution to our domestic prosperity. I have mentioned the very small proportion of our trade carried in U.S. flag ships. The share carried by our ships in every category—liner, non-liner and tanker—has been steadily decreasing over the past ten years, and the number of privately owned ships in service has also decreased.

The share of our liner cargo carried by such U.S. ships dropped from 32.3% in 1958 to an estimated 23.6% in 1968. U.S. non-liners, which carried 8.4% of such cargo in 1958, transported only 3.2% in 1968. U.S. tankers carried 7.6% of tanker tonnage in 1958 and only 5.4% in 1968.

Had our ships carried only the total of 12.2% of U.S. cargoes that was theirs 10 years ago, they would today be handling 70% more cargo, for in that ten-year period, our total waterborne trade has increased by that much. Had they carried 30% of our foreign trade, a figure which President Nixon has suggested as a reasonable goal, they would be carrying more than 4½ times as much cargo as at present. Think what this would mean to the future of our seamen, our longshoremen, our ship operators, our shipbuilders—the entire industry!

Is this impossible? I do not believe so. There are many indications it could be achieved. The advent of big, fast, efficient container ships in U.S. service, both subsidized and unsubsidized, is capturing for U.S. ships a good beginning of this high value cargo.

The ability of some unsubsidized lines to share in this trade through use of converted vessels without government operating aid is clear indication that U.S. flag ships can compete when they can use their advantages effectively—low-cost capital, American know-how, organizational efficiency, a highly advanced inland transportation complex.

The enormous increase in bulk trade, indicated by the doubling of non-liner cargoes in the past ten years, offers an opportunity to U.S. flag shipping that it would be negligent to miss. Bulk trade lends itself to efficient transportation, as witnesses the development of water transport of bulk cargo on the Great Lakes, with its low cost and fast turnaround. Bulk ships are being designed that will be at the same time specially adapted to certain bulk cargoes and will also have enough flexibility to carry more than one type of cargo, in order to avoid empty backhauls. Such ships lend themselves to standardization of construction, which should also decrease building costs.

The outlook for tankers is suddenly bright, with the discovery and exploitation of oil reserves in Alaska. If the Northwest Passage over the top of the world is found to be feasible, there will undoubtedly be an upsurge of tanker building for U.S. flag operation. Tankers, too, lend themselves to standardization, and to economies of scale in size and numbers.

I know that President Nixon is determined to restore our merchant fleet to the preeminence it once held among maritime nations. Yet we all know, also, that the difficulty experienced in the past in developing a new maritime policy has been only partly due to lack of available funds. Partly it has been due to past administrative restrictions on the use of appropriated funds. A serious drawback, too, has been the turmoil within the industry itself, its inability to agree on at least a few basic principles on which a maritime policy could be built.

Inherent in the divisions of the maritime industry are the divisions among maritime labor, which have resulted in several serious and prolonged work stoppages. These have caused great losses to the maritime and other industries, and have had the further unfortunate effect of alienating shippers on whose goodwill and patronage the merchant marine depends.

I know something about labor problems, having spent a good part of my life in jobs concerned with labor relations. I must admit that when it comes to complexity, it would be hard to equal the maritime labor situation in any other industry.

Means must be established by which labor and management can communicate with each other on a continuing basis, so that serious

problems could be discussed and worked out before both sides became frozen into immutable positions.

Obviously, everything will not be smooth sailing. There will be many disagreements, some disappointments and failures. In order for maritime labor to cooperate with management, there must be mutually satisfactory goals—that is, labor will share in rewards as well as in sacrifices.

Not long after I joined the Pacific Maritime Association in 1965, PMA undertook an extensive—and expensive—permanent training program for longshore and maritime workers designed to meet the needs of increasingly mechanized methods in cargo handling and ship design. This attempt to foresee and to meet intelligently the changes that were coming was, I believe, a badly needed development in an industry which too often reacts to change only after it has taken place.

West Coast companies were among the first to develop container ship service and to work out practical agreements with other modes of transportation in an effort to establish a land-bridge across the United States for containerized cargoes. We tried to foresee and to ride the wave of the future, rather than to let it catch us unaware and drag us down.

There must be flexibility in the development of the labor-management agreements if shipping is to successfully meet the challenge of rapidly expanding population and trade in the area, as well as cope with the upsurge of cargo shipments caused by the Vietnam war and reactivation of reserve fleet ships to carry military cargoes.

I am pointing out that it is not an inevitable fact of life that no rational means of settling maritime disputes can be found. In contemplating the collective bargaining sessions now under way with seamen's unions, I am hopeful over the statement by several major East Coast seamen's unions giving assurance that they will not strike at expiration of their contract in mid-June if progress is being made in working out new agreements. I am also encouraged by assurances given on the West Coast that in spite of the serious problems that have arisen over container handling, differences will be worked out through bargaining processes without a work stoppage.

I have addressed myself to some somber areas of the merchant marine on what should be a festive occasion because I am convinced that we hold here the key to the future of the U.S. merchant marine.

The Nixon Administration is hard at work preparing a long-range maritime program. Secretary of Commerce Stans has placed the prestige of his office behind the effort to encourage U.S. shippers to use American ships. Maritime Administrator Gibson has been hard at work to put new maritime proposals into practical working form. Once devised and thereafter approved by Congress, the plans must be then implemented. And this final implementation—in order to be successful—must be achieved by the industry itself.

How well they will work in the years ahead will be largely dependent on the officials who head up the major management of the steamship lines and the maritime unions. Between them, they must insure that there will be no serious disruptions of U.S.-flag service, for a merchant marine consisting of idle ships is no merchant marine at all.

The Nixon Administration intends to provide the leadership in attempting to solve the problems of the Merchant Marine on a basis that will provide the means for rebuilding our merchant fleet. But in the final analysis, the future U.S. shipping will be what you—the management and labor that comprise the industry—make it.

I must view the future with optimism.

When you are as far down as you can go, there is nowhere left to go but up!

In the short time I have been back in Washington, I detect a similar note of optimism within all segments of the industry.

I want to emphasize one point—it is that, as long as the Department of Commerce has the responsibility for the Maritime Administration and for contributing to the formulation of merchant marine policy, we will be giving these matters the high priority they demand. Maritime policy will not be a poor stepchild at the Department of Commerce.

We have other-related activities concerned with the development of the merchant marine and the exploration and utilization of the ocean's resources.

Some of you may not know that more than half of the total budget and personnel at Commerce is devoted to science programs in one form or another. The Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—is combining science and technology to make the oceans of the world an expanding frontier. We now have the support of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 and the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966, both of which are designed to improve our capabilities and performance for training and research in marine sciences and engineering.

Through the use of the Weather Bureau's satellites, we have vastly improved our ability to determine the state of the seas and the conditions of weather. The activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey contribute information on tides and navigation, charts and maps, and other forms of data of use to shippers. The Bureau of Standards is working in the area of containerization; the Bureau is also the second largest governmental producer of technical publications affecting the sea and commerce. The Maritime Administration, of course, is involved in wide-ranging engineering operations calculated to increase our use of ocean resources.

Thus, we at Commerce recognize that if we are to prepare for the future, we must turn our attention seaward in the quest for food, fuels, and minerals—while, at the same time, protecting the natural beauty of the seashore and the waterways. We, in the Department of Commerce, have the coordinated resources to lead this effort.

There is no question in the White House, the Commerce Department, the Maritime Administration, or elsewhere as to the need to halt the deterioration of past years, and to revive our merchant fleet. There is full recognition of the immediacy of the need to do so. The difficulties of years past have taught us that if we are to err, we would prefer to err on the side of action and initiative instead of on the side of indecision and reaction. Nor will there be lengthy delay in coming forward with a program to achieve this. Such a program will be presented to the Congress for its consideration this summer—not, we hope, during the Indian summer.

My hope is that all elements of the industry will then join us in pulling on the anchor chain.

#### HARVARD'S TRAGEDY: TOO ARROGANT—THEN TOO COWARDLY

**HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER**  
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of the commencement address of Mr. Al Capp, the author of the cartoon strip "Li'l Abner," delivered to the graduating class at Franklin Pierce College in Rindge, N.H., on April 27.

I commend it to the attention of the Members and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### HARVARD'S TRAGEDY: TOO ARROGANT—THEN TOO COWARDLY

(By Al Capp)

(The following is the text of the commencement address Mr. Capp, the author of the cartoon strip "Li'l Abner," delivered to the graduating class at Franklin Pierce College in Rindge, N.H., April 27)

I live in Cambridge, Mass., a stone's throw from Harvard—but if you duck you aren't hurt much—and I know you'll believe me when I tell you I'd rather be speaking here today. It's safer, and it's at your sort of college that I can use the commencement speaker's traditional phrase.

I can say you're the hope of the future without bursting out laughing, as I would if I said it at a Harvard commencement—assuming, of course, that there will be a commencement there this year. They haven't heard from the Afros or the SDS yet.

Three or four of the Afros may decide that commencements are racist institutions, and then five or six SDSers may decide that commencements are a CIA plot, and then of course the entire faculty, administration and student body of Harvard, with the courage that has made them a legend, will replace its commencement by some sort of ceremony more acceptable—something they know the boys will approve of—say, a book burning; they loved that at Columbia, or a dean killing; they never quite accomplished that at University Hall. Dean Ford let them down by having recuperative powers they didn't count on.

But the fact that you can have a commencement here without getting down on your knees to a student wrecking crew, or without calling up the riot squad, is mainly luck. You enjoy advantages Harvard doesn't.

For one thing, you have the advantage of not being so revered for the wisdom and courage of past generations of administrators that you haven't noticed the moral flabbiness and intellectual flatulence of the majority of your present generation of administrators and faculty. You show me any institution with such a glorious past that anyone presently employed by it is regarded as retroactively infallible, and I'll show you a collection of sanctimonious fatheads.

But the greatest advantage Franklin Pierce has over Harvard is that you are not rich enough to hire three such famous professors as Rosovsky, Galbraith and Handlin and not extravagant enough to waste the wisdom of the only one of them with guts and sense—Handlin. All three were world-renowned historians. All three this week have helped make history.

Prof. Henry Rosovsky was born in Danzig. When the young Nazis invaded the University of Danzig in the '30s and beat up its professors and disrupted its classes, Rosovsky's family gave up their citizenship and fled to the United States. In the '60s, Rosovsky was teaching at Berkeley. When the young Nazis invaded there, Rosovsky gave up his professorship and fled to Harvard. When the young Nazis invaded there the other day, Rosovsky gave up the chairmanship of his department and started packing.

Prof. Galbraith, as national chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, was the intellectual leader of the Democratic party in the last election and one of the nation's few political thinkers over 19 who mistook Sen. McCarthy's menopausal capriciousness for high-principled statesmanship.

Prof. Handlin has won the Pulitzer Prize and other honors for his histories of those groups who, so far, have risen from their ghettos by sweating blood instead of shedding it, by shaping up instead of burning down.

Although Harvard is the home of these three wise men and hundreds more, it was

the only bunch in town that was dumfounded at what happened there. Everybody else in the community expected it. We had all watched Harvard for the last few years educate its young in the rewards of criminality. We had watched Harvard become an ivy-covered Fagin.

We saw it begin a couple of years ago when Secretary of Defense McNamara was invited to speak at Harvard. Now, it is true that McNamara was a member of a despised minority group, the President's Cabinet, but under the law, he had the same rights as Mark Rudd. Harvard's Students for a Democratic Society howled obscenities at McNamara until he could not be heard.

He attempted to leave the campus. The SDS stopped his car, milled around it, tried to tip it over. McNamara left the car. The SDS began to club him on the head with the poles on which their peace posters were nailed. If it hadn't been for the arrival of the Cambridge police, who formed a protective cordon around McNamara and escorted him through a series of interconnecting cellars of university buildings to safety, he might have been killed.

The next morning Dean Monroe was asked if he would punish the SDS. And he said—and if you want to know where the malignancy started that has made a basket case of Harvard, it started with this—Dean Monroe said that he saw no reason to punish students for what was purely a political activity.

Now, if depriving a man of his freedom to speak, if depriving him of his freedom to move, if damn nearly depriving him of his life—if that's political activity, then rape is a social event and sticking up a gas station is a financial transaction.

Now there's nothing unusual about a pack of young criminals ganging up on a stranger on their turf as the SDS ganged up on McNamara; it's called mugging. And there's nothing unusual about a respected citizen, even a dean, babbling imbecilities in an emotional crisis; it's called a breakdown.

Both are curable by the proper treatment, but there was something unusual, and chilling, too, about seeing the responsible authority, Harvard, treat a plain case of mugging as democracy in action and a plain case of hysterics as a dean in his right mind.

Well, after Harvard taught its young that the way to settle a difference of opinion is to mug anyone who differed with them, it was no surprise that they'd soon learn that shoving a banana into an instructor's mouth is the way to win a debate and bringing a meat cleaver to a conference is the way to win a concession. Because that's what's happened at Harvard in the last month.

When its militants stormed into the opening class in a new course on the causes of urban unrest and stopped it because they found it ideologically offensive, the instructor attempted to discuss it with them. So one of the militants shoved a banana into his mouth. This stopped the instructor, of course; he stopped the class and then Harvard dropped the entire course.

This week the *Crimson* published a photograph of a black militant leaving a historic conference with the administration—historic because it was here that the administration granted black students, and only black students, hiring, firing and tenure powers equal to that of any dean. The militant was holding a meat cleaver. The next day, President Pusey said that Harvard would never yield to threats. Shows how silly a man can look when he doesn't read his local paper.

President Pusey said that, by the way, at a televised mass meeting advertised as one in which all sides of the question would be fairly represented. The Harvard student body was represented by a member of the SDS (numerically, they are less than 1 per cent). The average resident of the Cambridge community was represented by a black militant graduate student who lives in Roxbury and



commutes in a new Cadillac. And anyone who'd call that unfair representation would have been mean enough to say the same thing about the Chief Rabbi of Berlin being represented by Adolf Eichmann.

And so when Harvard was raped last week, it had as much cause to be surprised as any tart who continued to founce around the fellas after they'd unbuttoned her bodice and pulled down her panties.

What surprised the world was Harvard's response. Nowhere in the world was Mayor Daley's response to precisely the same sort of attack by precisely the same sort of mob more loftily denounced than at Harvard. Yet in its moment of truth, Harvard responded in precisely the same way Daley did.

Pusey called for the cops just as Daley did, and the cops treated the criminals at Harvard just as firmly as they treated the criminals in Chicago. The Harvard administration applauded President Pusey's action to a man. There is no record that they ever applauded Daley.

That either proves that the Harvard administration believes in the divine right of kings to act in a fashion that, in a peasant, is considered pushy. Or it may prove that President Pusey is just as Neanderthal as Mayor Daley. Or it may prove that President Pusey learned how to handle Neanderthals from Mayor Daley. At any rate, if they're looking for a new president of Harvard, I suggest they teach Mayor Daley to read and write and offer him the job.

Let's forgive the president of Harvard for not having the grace to thank the mayor of Chicago for teaching him how to protect his turf; they aren't strong on graciousness at Harvard this year. But as a member of the Cambridge community, what alarms me is that Harvard doesn't have the brains to protect itself, and the community, from further, more savage and inevitably wider-ranging attacks. And I feel that I have the right to speak for some in the Cambridge community, possibly equal to that of any resident of Roxbury who parks his car there for a few hours a few days a week.

I've lived in Cambridge over 30 years. My children and grandchildren were born and raised in Cambridge. I help pay the taxes that support Harvard. I help provide Harvard with the police that it will increasingly need to protect it from the once-decent kids it has corrupted into thugs and thieves, and the worst kind of thugs and thieves—the sanctimonious kind.

I ask, and my neighbors in the Cambridge community are asking: If a horde of howling, half-educated, half-grown and totally dependent half-humans can attack visitors in their cars, and deans in their offices, and get away with it, how long before they'll widen their horizons a block or two and attack us in our homes?

If they can use clubs and meat cleavers on the Harvard community today and get away with it, who stops them from using clubs and meat cleavers on the Cambridge community tomorrow? Certainly not the Harvard community.

If it was necessary last week for Harvard to organize a round-the-clock guard to prevent the untolled-trained pups they've made into mad dogs from blowing up the Widener Library and the Fogg Museum, must we of the Cambridge community prepare to defend ourselves from the pack Harvard has loosed among us? Or should we all pull a Rosovsky and take off to safe, sane Saigon where it's legal to shoot back at your enemy?

When the president of Harvard proved that, in a crisis, he was the intellectual equal of the mayor of Chicago and called the cops, it was his finest hour. Although it was true that he had presided over the experimental laboratory that created the Frankenstein's monster that stomped mindlessly into University Hall, fouling everything in its path, he did, at long last, recognize what he had wrought and took the

steps to rid his university and our community of the filthy thing.

After throwing the SDS out physically, the next sane move was obviously to keep them out officially, and expel them. And leave them to the criminal courts to educate, or to the Army, or to the gutters of Toronto, or to the rehabilitation centers and public charity of Stockholm. Their few score places at Harvard, and those of their sympathizers, could have been instantly filled by any of the tens of thousands of fine youngsters, black and white, they had been chosen instead of.

And Harvard could have gone on with pride and strength as an institution of learning, as an example of the vigor of the democratic process to other universities, instead of degenerating into the pigpen and playpen it is today. But after the president of Harvard made the one move that might have saved Harvard, the Harvard faculty, in the words of San Francisco State President Hayakawa, betrayed him.

And that brings us back to Rosovsky and Galbraith, and to Handlin.

Rosovsky, whose family had given up and fled when the German Nazis invaded the University of Danzig, who gave up and fled when the California Nazis invaded Berkeley, gave up the chairmanship of his course and started packing when the Cambridge Nazis invaded University Hall. And all over this country—at Cornell, in New York—other professors are using the Rosovsky solution: giving up and running away. The only trouble with it is that, sooner or later, you run out of places to run away to.

Now, the Galbraith solution is one that is bound to be popular with his fellow puberty-worshippers: those who have just achieved puberty, and those who worship those who have just achieved it as sources of infinite wisdom and quite a few votes. But I'm not criticizing Galbraith's religious convictions. What I say is, in this country, any professor who is panting to get back into public life is free to worship the SDS chapter of his choice.

Galbraith's solution is to promptly restructure our universities—and Harvard more promptly than any other, because, in Galbraith's opinion, those who administer Harvard have "little comprehension of the vast and complex scientific and scholarly life they presume to govern." Well, now, who does Galbraith presume to replace them with?

If those who created Harvard, and made it into the vast and complex scientific and scholarly structure it became, must be restructured out of it because they have too little comprehension, who has enough? The only ones who claim they have, and who will shove a banana into the mouth of anyone who denies it, are the student militants.

And so the Galbraith solution is a forthright one: Let the lunatics run the asylum.

Well, I'm going to tell Galbraith the news: they've already tried your sort of restructuring, Ken. They tried it at Berkeley; they tried it at Cornell; they tried it at Harvard all last week, and the result was that, on Friday, a mob of militant students, of a Harvard frenziedly restructured to suit their wildest whims, marched into the Harvard planning offices.

They shouted obscene charges at Planner Goyette. When he attempted to answer, they shouted him down with obscenities. They demolished the architectural model of Harvard's building plans, they kicked over files, they hurled telephones to the floor. And while Goyette cowered and his secretaries screamed, they marched out, uninterfered with by the six policemen who were summoned there presumably to see that they remained uninterfered with, unrebuked and, of course, unsatisfied.

And they won't be satisfied until Harvard is restructured the way they restructured Hiroshima. They'll be back, on another day, to another office. Possibly Galbraith's.

Well, those were the voices that prevailed at Harvard, the resigners like Rosovsky, the restructurers like Galbraith. (Prof. Galbraith, it seems, has decided on the Rosovsky method for himself. He has announced that he is taking off for Trinity College at Cambridge University for one year while the restructuring goes on.)

There was another voice, however, the voice of Oscar Handlin.

Prof. Handlin said he was appalled at the argument that the students' takeover of University Hall, their attack on the deans, their destruction of private property and their thefts from personal files were unwise but not criminal. It was criminal, said Handlin, by every decent standard.

If Harvard had not chickened out, said Handlin, if it had had the courage to recognize the criminality on its campus over the last few years, beginning with the beating up and silencing of McNamara and continuing through innumerable other incidents of the brutal deprivation by its mad-dog students of the rights of those who dared to dissent with them, it "would not be in the position it is in today—following the road that Berkeley has followed, following the road that has destroyed other universities."

Oscar Handlin urged Harvard not to go down that road. That was last week. This week Harvard has gone so far down the road that it can never turn back. In this last frantic, fatal, foolish week, Harvard has reversed the civil rights advances of the last 20 years.

Today at Harvard, any student with the currently fashionable color of skin is given rights denied to students of the currently unfashionable color. Harvard, which educated the President who brought America into the war that defeated fascism, today honors and encourages and rewards its fascists. Harvard, which once turned out scholars and gentlemen, now turns out thugs and thieves—or let me put it this way: now, if you are a thug and thief, Harvard won't turn you out.

Once people were attracted to the Cambridge community because Harvard was there. Today, because Harvard is there, people are fleeing the Cambridge community, even Harvard's own.

Harvard's tragedy was that it was too arrogant to consider that it too might be vulnerable to the cancer that is killing other universities. And when Oscar Handlin diagnosed it as malignant, Harvard was too cowardly to endure the radical surgery that could save its life.

And that's why I can say that colleges like yours, as yet too unproven to have become arrogant, and too determined to prove yourself to be anything but courageous, are the hope of the future. Because I believe that America has a future.

It has become unfashionable to say this; it may be embarrassing to hear it; but I believe that America is the most lovely and livable of all nations. I believe that Americans are the kindest and most generous of all people.

I believe that there are no underprivileged Americans; that even the humblest of us are born with a privilege that places us ahead of anyone else, anywhere else: the privilege of living and working in America, of repairing and renewing America; and one more privilege that no one seems to get much fun out of lately—the privilege of loving America.

#### ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, once again I am asking the citizens of Ore-

gon's Fourth Congressional District for their views on major issues facing the Congress. My annual questionnaire is being distributed to 162,000 households in the district.

The questions cover direct election of the President and Vice President, volunteer Armed Forces, the ABM system, lower voting age, and restrictions on wage earnings for persons on social security. I also ask constituents to number in order the six areas—out of 20 named areas—which they consider the highest priority areas of national concern.

This list of 20 areas encompasses a great many of the important and complex problems which confront our Nation. Each day the Congress and the administration must make critical decisions as to which of many important issues will receive initial emphasis. I hope that this questionnaire will not only give me the help of the thinking of the district, but will also help citizens realize the tremendous difficulty of setting national priorities.

The questions follow:

	Husband		Wife	
	Yes 1	No 2	Yes 1	No 2
Do you favor—				
1. The direct popular election of the President and Vice President?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Placing the Armed Forces on an all-volunteer basis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The President's recommendations concerning an antiballistic-missile system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Lowering the voting age to 18?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Eliminating all restrictions on wage earning for a beneficiary drawing social security benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please number in order the 6 of the following which you consider the highest priority areas of national concern:				

	Husband			Wife		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. ABM system						
2. Agriculture						
3. Conservation						
4. Crime						
5. Defense budget						
6. Draft reform						
7. Education						
8. 18-year-old vote						
9. Electoral reform						
10. Exploring space						
11. Housing						
12. Inflation						
13. Pollution						
14. Poverty						
15. Race relations						
16. Social security						
17. Student unrest						
18. Tax reduction						
19. Tax reform						
20. Vietnam						
Other						

	Husband			Wife		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Personal data (optional):						
Age: (1) 21 to 45; (2) 46 to 65; (3) over 65	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Political affiliation: (1) Republican; (2) Democratic; (3) Independent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Graduate of (1) grade school; (2) high school; (3) college	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Husband's occupation: (1) businessman; (2) farmer; (3) professional; (4) hourly; (5) other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## CAMPUS DISORDER

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure today to read two addresses delivered May 22 and May 24 in Missouri by my able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD H. ICHORD, chairman of the Committee on Internal Security.

I was most impressed by his May 24 speech at Waynesville in which he discussed the priorities facing this Nation, including problems of the war in Vietnam, the problems of the cities, and the problems of rural America. He spoke with concern about our educational system—high school and college—and its struggle with the big issue of campus disorders.

For Missouri, he cited the question of disorders, riots, and dissent as the greatest problem since the battle for the school foundation program.

I commend to your reading a most interesting portion of his comments at Waynesville and the entirety of his comments made before the 1969 graduating class May 22 at Dixon High School, Dixon, Mo.:

### EXCERPTS FROM MAY 24 ADDRESS AT WAYNESVILLE, MO.

Where once our colleges and universities were the gateway to success, our colleges and universities are fast becoming the gateway to revolution and violence, intolerance and totalitarianism. The hinges on the gates are beginning to creak and sag?

Why? Many rationales are offered. Proponents of college opportunities for all those who are capable point that the 11 per cent of our black population get only 2 per cent of the jobs at the top, 4 per cent in the middle and are forced into 16 per cent at the bottom—indeed, into as much as 40 per cent of the jobs at the very bottom. In a recent study of 80 integrated state universities, less than 2 per cent of the students were black. Even at Harvard, less than 3 per cent of the undergraduates are black. But, is it a question of blackness?

Another rationale. The public is becoming increasingly critical of military spending and defense proposals, including the research for the programs and the training of men in work connected with the spending and defense. But, is this the issue?

A third rationale, one which I feel is stronger than ever in this country: We know the most technologically advanced are the leading nations of the modern world. We know we are leading the world in our orbiting of the moon. It may be that space accomplishments may replace defense capability as the international symbol of prestige and power—but there are many who object when the replacement is accomplished at the expense of the poor, the hungry, and the poorly educated.

A fourth rationale. One close to the hearts of every American, every Missourian, who knows what death means, who knows what war means, who knows what honor and dishonor mean: Americans doing their fair share whether in peace or in war. American colleges and universities are becoming not a symbol of advancement to superior jobs and a superior way of life. Instead, our campuses are becoming a symbol as a haven for the guilt-ridden, the guilt-obsessed, the

young man dodging the draft, dodging his responsibility to his country, regardless of the real role he is playing or the real reason for his being in college.

It is this factor, beyond almost all others, which is making our colleges and our universities creak, which are turning our high schools into prep schools—for what?

I am firmly convinced our state colleges are provided by the people of this State for educational purposes and any activity which is in conflict with this purpose has no place on any of our campuses.

I am as firmly convinced our public schools, our high schools and classrooms, are for the same purpose. They should be kept open and students, faculty or outsiders should not be permitted to interfere with the orderly conduct of the educational process.

I am similarly convinced the laws of this state and this country should be observed on the campus and in the schools in the same manner they are observed in the community. The campus should not, and I repeat, should not be a sanctuary against the law.

In the violence, on our campuses, those shouting the loudest are those most authoritarian and most destructive of cooperative efforts to solve problems of education. They have distorted the image of education, especially their college attendance, bending it to serve their purposes of intensifying frustrations, undermining authority and escalating violence.

A few days ago, Dr. Glenn S. Dumke, chancellor of the California state colleges, speaking to a Congressional subcommittee on educational environment, made the comment:

"There is much that is good in current student movements. They perform a valuable service in shaking us out of our complacency. Who can say that we aren't outmoded in our teaching, that we don't have racial injustice in our schools and in our communities, that poverty and war have to always be with us. The bulk of our young activists are challenging us to re-examine our attitudes, our values and our goals. They say that our existing institutions, whether they be education, government, religion, business or politics must be made relevant to the solution of today's problems and the social needs of our times."

I cannot disagree with this evaluation. I would agree with him that the nature of our response to this challenge is crucial. If we ignore the social problems underlying much of today's student activism and instead pass nothing but punitive legislation, the ferment will either grow to a point where we are running little more than armed camps, or that this generation of young people, among the brightest, most promising we have ever known, will simply continue to withdraw from society and tune us out.

As Dr. Dumke said, "We badly need their fervor, their idealism and their energy in these troubled times. It would be a tragedy if we allowed the actions of a few revolutionaries or nihilists to destroy our social perspective."

It is in this latter category that I as chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security have been especially concerned. It is this concern which has propelled the Committee into an intense investigation of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), a militant New Left organization that is considered the sire of the atmosphere of crisis now sweeping the campuses of the United States.

We are scheduling a hearing into the operation of this organization in the next few days; indeed, we will get preliminary hearings underway the first week in June. As you know, SDS was considered the leader of last year's disastrous riot at Columbia University and supposedly has played a major role in disturbances at Harvard, Cornell,



Princeton, Georgetown, Kent State and Lincoln.

At its national council meeting this March in Austin, it was reported that SDS reaffirmed its announced goal that universities should continue to be its primary targets on grounds they are "instruments of repression" and "tools of the ruling class."

It also agreed SDS should seek recruits among blue-collar classes and urged its communicants to join "work-in" programs in industrial cities this summer. But, George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, has been quick to inform them: "If they try to interfere with the livelihood of workers in the plant, something is likely to happen."

It remains to be seen if SDS will find the same fertile ground among the labor unions as it has found among the colleges and universities and is now seeking among our public high schools and their students.

And it is here I worry—will our high schools become the arena for future battles? The answer may be, "Yes." Tom Hussey, head of the SDS chapter at Suffolk Community College on Long Island, was quoted by *Newsday* as recently as January 4 as saying: "High schools are our big area where the next confrontation will be."

This public announcement by an officer of the SDS followed a regional SDS meeting at which plans were laid for "organizing" in the high schools in the suburbs of a large Eastern city.

Then, we must realize this regional organization was only carrying out a national SDS policy first spelled out in October 1968 at an SDS National Council meeting in Boulder, Colorado, where those in session adopted a special "High School Resolution" calling upon all college and non-student chapters of SDS, as well as all SDS regional offices, to "make high school organizing a large part of their programs."

And what was to be the purpose of the "high school movements" which SDS sought to create?

Not for reform of our educational system! Any idea that SDS efforts might be directed toward overdue reform is quickly dispelled by reading the resolution by the National Council. High schools only prepare students for life in a "sick society," the resolution declared, and "the school cannot change to the extent we want unless we change the system which uses it." Therefore, "We will organize in the high school to move students to overthrow that system . . ." SDS announced.

The "Yes" is now becoming commonplace. A recent survey conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals shows three out of five principals reporting some form of active protest in their schools, with most protests, both disruptive and peaceful, appearing to be nonracial.

In a four-month period, November through February, Dr. Alan F. Westin, director of the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties at Columbia University, counted 239 "serious episodes" of disorders—strikes, sit-ins, demonstrations, riots or other violence—in high schools. During the same period, 348 high schools in 38 states underwent some form of disruption that was reported in the newspapers studied.

All these were not in the cities. In fact, in suburban schools across the country, students organized protests against everything from the food in the cafeterias to lack of toilet paper in the rest rooms. Nor was the protest confined to the high schools, whether urban or suburban. One of the surprises of the survey was the fact that protest is almost as likely to occur in junior high schools as in senior high schools. Among junior high schools, 56 per cent reported protest activities.

The politics of education are changing. In black neighborhoods in our cities, blacks are clamoring for black control of black schools.

Why? In a large part, because they feel the curricula are not responsive to the needs of the children and the community. In non-black neighborhoods, students are clamoring for changes in curricula and teaching and learning atmosphere, for the same reason: The curricula are not responsive to their needs and the needs of the community.

Objecting parents who seek to intervene on their children's behalf, by and large, receive sharp, persuasive rebukes which force them to double back upon themselves. Much of our educational system today is a series of archaic arrangements in the educational establishments that educate teachers and pupils alike, raising the very serious question: Are our schools providing real opportunities for learning or have they ceased?

It is this question which has set the stage for the unrest on our campuses, both college and high school. And, as the bright and promising student rebels—unconsciously, rarely really knowing why—the radical revolutionary moves in, garnering the benefits of his discontent, leaving him to reap the whirlwind of the rebellion and the permanent mark against him in the annals of society.

A kind of vicious circle is developing, the denial of the humanity of the student which can only result in a dehumanized teacher, a dehumanized school, and a dehumanized community. . . . Unless something is done!

SDS has a proposal, a blueprint which sets radicalization of the high school student as its goal. Distributed in Chicago in March, 1968, under the title, "High School Reform: Toward a student movement," the pamphlet says:

"Our first task, then, is to show the students that we are on their side, and have many of the same concerns they do. One method is to begin agitation around issues students are already concerned about. We should be in the forefront of any student protest against administrative action."

It concludes with advice to its readers: ". . . we must build a community; a community of resistance. If we really wish to change people, and not institutions, we shall have to struggle, for conflict radicalizes us, and through it we may establish our own identities as human beings, and not numbers. The most radical demand we can make is the demand to be taken seriously."

Hence, I must argue, SDS has a plan. If we are to prevent that plan from being effected, we must solve the problems of our educational system and separate the revolutionaries from our campuses.

Then I must argue, then I must offer to you: What has the present Administration proposed? Very little has been presented to the public for consideration. Very little priority has been given to the solution of the problems giving birth to the conflict. Even less to the would-be combatants. I agree that our schools cannot be run by the Federal Government. This is a local responsibility. Yet, if the problem goes unsolved, the progeny of it will be as numerous as the fleas on a blue tick hound in hunting season—and the shape as deformed as some of the scrub blackjack which covers these hills.

For I am firmly convinced, unless we solve the problems of our schools and colleges, all the handy things which have been predicted for the year 2001 will be of little avail:

We will have no need for the nice square tomatoes which will be easier for housewives to store.

We will have little need for rain-on-demand.

We will have little need for pipelines to ship our farm goods to the big city markets and even less need for the markets.

All these advantages will be of little use, if we let go by default the kind of society we want, because we dare not to take the steps on the local and national levels to solve our educational problems.

#### TODAY'S STUDENT IN AMERICA

(Address of Congressman RICHARD H. ICHORD before the 1969 graduating class, Dixon High School, Dixon, Mo., May 22, 1969)

It is always a pleasure to be back home in Missouri.

And for me it is a deep honor to address this graduating class, their teachers, their parents, their friends.

For you, it is a time of mixed emotions. Some see it as the end of the most wonderful years of their life. Some see graduation as the door of the future, when tomorrow you begin the role you have planned for a life's work.

Others of you, I know, are planning to go on to college, perhaps Stephens and Christian and the University of Missouri at Columbia, or Westminster and William Woods at Fulton, Lincoln at Jefferson City or the University at Rolla—a variety of colleges and universities awaits you. Now is the moment of decision—where will you go?

You will consider many factors, not the least of which will be costs and nearness to home, to family, to friends. In the minds of parents and students today there are other questions—campus disorder, the opportunity for study and research in an atmosphere of peace and quiet, the right to study and live without fear of injury or destruction of property—all involving the question of dissent, whether peaceful or violent, legal or illegal.

Most of you, I feel, are not opposed to dissent legitimately employed, for it was the factor that gave birth to this country and which has inspired us to build a country second to none.

All of you know George Washington was a dissenter. He disagreed with the colonial government of the British. And he didn't like war, either, or killing or violence. But, he knew if you didn't like one rule of law, you had to set up another rule of law to replace it. He had a goal, a plan. He knew that the law is the rule, and out of rules come order, and out of order—peace and tranquility, the atmosphere in which great colleges and universities flourish and in which great minds are developed which form the leadership of our country.

Our country has grown much from the days of Washington. From a predominantly agricultural nation, we have become the most highly industrialized country in the world. Our population, only 76 million in 1900, now exceeds 200 million.

As this population expands, the land available for production or recreation remains relatively static. For this reason, our public lands must be used prudently and wisely. And they must be used to meet the needs of a country decidedly different from what it was in 1860, 1900, 1950, even 1960.

This nation is a far different nation than when Horace Greeley said, "Go West, young man, and grow up with the country." In the 19th century there were fanciful tales of American land so fertile that the turnips grew to the size of tree stumps and each pumpkin had to be hauled out of the field in its own cart. Corn was so high the stalks could be used for firewood or building logs and cucumber seeds sprouted so fast the vines sometimes strangled a farmer while he slept.

Those were good stories, but I know they weren't talking about Texas County where I grew up and I don't think they were talking about much of the land around here except perhaps in the river bottoms. But, now, if they were talking about the people—I'd have to agree they really weren't stretching the story much, for those are the kind of people this country has been producing. Those are the kind of people that settled and have made Missouri the great state that it is.

This is the real definition of the pioneer. Men and women who moved out and dared

to conquer the land . . . the mountain men, the soldiers, the farmers, the miners, the ranchers, the lumbermen, men and women who dared to dream of the land, tame it, and cultivate it.

No doubt, many of our earlier settlers were broken by the land, gave up and died poor. But others endured; they were strengthened by their trials and tribulations and they became the backbone of this nation—building a nation renowned throughout the world for its accomplishments in government, in education, in peace, but, most of all, for its respect of the dignity of the individual human being.

Today, most of the great lands of America have been parceled out, to various individuals and institutions, from railroads to educational institutions. For example, the Homestead Act of 1862 offered 160 acres to any man who was willing to live on his grant and improve it. Many of our great educational institutions, including the University of Missouri, got their start through land grants from the U.S. Government.

What did this mean? It meant that our country believed that public land should belong to any man who was willing to give it enough time and sweat to make it productive. It means this nation believes the best people to use the land are educated people and government has a responsibility to provide that education.

Today, only about one-third of the original public domain still remains—most of it in Alaska and the Far West—some 425 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management plus some 160 million acres of public land reserved within our national forests and administered by the Forest Service. Not much land, when you realize how rapidly the population of this country is growing and how few of these acres will be available for use for such an expanding nation.

The needs of society today are changing and changing rapidly. Pioneering is no longer the hunters and trappers moving through icy creeks and streams for beaver skins, fighting the Indians in the winter and the insects in the summer. Pioneering is no longer the rush for land as bounty for war-time service as followed the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. For the veterans of World War II, the Korean conflict and the War in Vietnam, the bounty of public land was replaced with the gift of training and education.

Today, there is a new pioneer—the pioneer who looks beyond the physical touch of the soil, to find new ways to develop our sons and daughters to find new ways for them to continue to build the kind of country our forefathers dreamed for their families.

Today's pioneer, either as a student learning or the teacher teaching, needs to seek new ways to insure the avenues of change are kept open without resorting to the techniques of the criminal—to keep reform, not reformatories, as our goal.

As to the need for reform, I would be the first to admit some of the policies used to run our schools and colleges need reform. And I realize many of our administrators and our faculties may be procrastinating—delaying, perhaps unduly, some changes sorely needed. But, in the main, efforts—real efforts—are being instituted to effect reform.

But, even if this were not so, can one really believe the best way to reform a college, a university or a high school is to tear it down, stick by stick, stone by stone? Can one really believe lawlessness is the best way to further educational goals.

I don't. I am sure you don't. But these are some of the issues facing students, parents, educators and administrators today, who must decide which instrument will be used to effect change—naked force and lawlessness or reason and scholarly achievement.

To me, attack by our students from with-

in the high school, college and university structure is, for the large part, a fleeting thing as measured in the life of our educational system. For, in the main, our educational system has within itself, the means of self-adjustment, of self-correction, of self-analysis and improvement. In only the rarest of cases, will the system be unable to right itself and carry on the purposes for which the institutions of education were founded.

It is in these "rarest" of occasions that government, in committees such as my own House Committee on Internal Security, should and does stand ready to give assistance to the educational system.

The community, the educational system and government working together can keep the winds of dissent and the storms of riots from blowing our institutions off course. We can separate the mass of our students from Pied Piper leaders who would lead them down the criminal trail to oblivion.

How can we? Let us look at some of the things we can do. We can establish speakers bureaus on campuses to bring leaders to debate the issues of our times. We can establish training institutes for our educators and administrators to help equip them to meet their problems.

We can keep the people informed with relevant materials on issues and problems. We can seek effective ways of communicating with students. We can investigate radical movements on campuses to separate those who would use the brilliance and capabilities of our students for their own purposes.

Most of all, we can return to the ideals of fairness that have marked our country—to insure that the classrooms and services of our schools and colleges belong to all the students and do not become the private preserve of a disruptive minority. We can go a step further—we can exert our influence to see that administrators establish a policy of firmness in dealing with those in our schools who flout the law and invoke violence, all under the guise of dissent.

In this regard, I do not think our schools should be run by students any more than I think they should be run by politicians. Educational institutions, whether public secondary schools or colleges, should be run by experts—expert educators, who are charged with the responsibility of developing the most important resource of this nation or any nation—our youth.

Too long this country has suffered from the results of permissiveness. Rules should be fair but the enforcement of those rules must be firm and administrators must have the intestinal fortitude to act decisively. Suspension and expulsion are still effective tools of discipline if they are wisely and timely used. And, I might observe, timely discipline in nearly all cases requires action long before a campus explodes into firebombings, the seizure of buildings, and other forms of violence.

In the case of Congress, we must re-evaluate our draft laws. Personally, I have come to believe our draft laws are one of the primary underlying causes of campus disorder. The draft should be changed so that those who have not fulfilled their military obligation and fall within the prescribed age group will take their chances by lottery. I believe we committed a grave error when we allowed college deferments in a time of armed conflict. The lottery method, I recognize, is not the best way to muster our manpower requirements, but it should be employed at a time we are faced with the problem of answering the question: Who is to serve when all are not required to serve?

Such a law would not mean that more of our boys will be drafted than are presently drafted. The numbers drafted would not change. It would mean that all who attend college would be primarily motivated by the desire to receive an education and no student will have a guilt complex brought about by his present preferred status.

This, of course, is a change of position for me but not a change to incur political popularity for I am quite certain there is no political mileage to be gained from such a position. Nor am I motivated in the least by the desire to punish the small minority who have torn our campuses apart, as so foolishly suggested by one of my critics. I do firmly believe that every effort must be made to bring the Vietnam war to a conclusion and until a conclusion is reached this is a policy that should be pursued to remove one of the underlying causes of our campus disorders. The hour is too late; our problems too serious for me in good conscience to pursue any other course.

Another and very significant thing we can do—we can achieve balance and perspective in the coverage of news events on campus. There is a direct relationship between the intensity of violence in a campus confrontation and the number of TV cameras and the number of reporters on the scene.

And, most of all, we must cease to confuse legitimate dissent with criminal action. I am firmly convinced we need to improve our enforcement of existing laws much more than we need new laws.

These are some of the steps we should take so that our graduates tonight can go on and upward. In an atmosphere marked by order and a climate for study and research, you can learn and develop and become the kind of leaders the pioneer world of tomorrow will demand.

But this, we must not forget: Freedom is not just a privilege. It is a test and those who cannot pass the test will be denied it. Welcome, then, to the proving grounds. Bring with you courage, vitality and determination. Bring all you can muster.

You are going to need the full measure, just as your State and your Country are going to need the full measure from you. Be proud of yourselves. You are Dixon's finest products.

## COLLEGE VIOLENCE

**HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, because of the great concern that the Members of this body have about violence on our college campuses, I am taking the liberty of bringing to your attention the following excellent editorial which appeared in the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., on Wednesday, April 23, 1969:

## COLLEGE VIOLENCE

Acts of violence which administrators fail to deal with, in colleges or other schools, have stirred law-abiding citizens and students to the point where it is likely that the schools and colleges will suffer themselves, instead of the handful of responsible militants.

This may shock some of our liberal leaders who cry for tolerance of all demonstrators, regardless of their tactics.

The protest, this time of the majority of students and other citizens, was accelerated this week with circulation of pictures of armed dissidents striding triumphantly from a Cornell building they had seized. This happened after capitulation of Cornell officials to demands of the militants.

The capitulation was reversed soon thereafter as other students and faculty members condemned the surrender and there was an opportunity for alumni and other "outsiders" to react to the news pictures.

There had to be a point at which the outraged majority would be heard and respected.



Hopefully, this point is being reached before voters and legislators (the ultimate power in a representative democracy) start denying public funds to the educational centers.

That this will be limited to colleges is unlikely. High schools which fail to meet the problem lawfully and effectively, may be expected to have the same problem.

The violence, whether carried out with fire bombs and weapons or done by forceful occupation of public property, will have to be dealt with soon, or it may be expected to spread like wildfire. Already the timidity and indecision which marked Columbia's reaction a year ago have caused the violence to spread into other institutions, often under the leadership of the same non-students who participated at Columbia.

Only a few college officials have taken the firm stand needed, among them Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame and Dr. Hayakawa of San Francisco State.

The time has come for school administrators to start protecting the rights of all their students instead of a small group which uses force to intimidate teachers and other students. Else the ultimate loss which the educational institutions must suffer will be out of proportion to what should be imposed on the few students, faculty members and outsiders really responsible.

#### FEDERAL CONTRACT SCRUTINY

**HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join the growing bipartisan list of cosponsors of H.R. 11576 as introduced by Congressman PODELL. This measure would provide for an annual review by GAO of all Federal contracts and would require the GAO to report to the Congress at the close of each fiscal year any failures to meet contract completion dates and any cost overruns exceeding 110 percent of the contracted price.

I have noted with increasing concern and alarm the number of instances which have come to light involving such contractual failures and I am especially dismayed by the fact that the Congress apparently has no systematic way of periodically identifying these failures. How can we responsibly fulfill our oversight function if all we have to rely on are occasional agency leaks and journalistic disclosures?

The most glaring abuses of contract agreements are in the area of defense procurement. The most recent example of this is the costly \$2 billion overrun on the \$3 billion C-5A transport contract. A recent Brookings study traces the long history of such overruns and reveals that initial costs estimates for major weapons systems in the 1950's and early 1960's were exceeded by amounts ranging from 200 to 700 percent. I would suggest that this is no way to run a business, much less a government.

I do not hold with those who suggest that all this is a result of some sinister conspiracy by the so-called "military-industrial complex." I do not view these abuses as justification for an all-out attack on the military which is providing this Nation with the best security possible. I do think that the current mood

of questioning, probing, and criticizing is both healthy and long overdue. But at the same time, I am most concerned that in our frustration over Vietnam, inflation, and high taxes we do not carry this mood to an excess that would jeopardize our national defense and security.

I think a fair analysis of the problem would reveal that we all share in the blame for the mismanagement that has resulted in such costly mistakes. We in the Congress must accept our fair share of the guilt for not exercising a closer scrutiny over the Government contracts we have authorized under various pieces of legislation.

That is why I am joining in the support of H.R. 11576 which I consider an important first step in regaining proper control over the purse strings we have been entrusted with.

I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the May 26 Washington Post. In this article, columnist George Wilson explodes the myth of a military-industrial conspiracy and assesses some of the root causes for the procurement problems we are experiencing today:

#### NATION'S TOP SOLDIER PUTS IN A WORD FOR HIS MEN

(By George C. Wilson)

The Nation's top soldier stood up the other day to assure the people that "there is no malignant, semi-autonomous, conspiratorial grouping dedicated to foisting off uneeded weapons on our fellow countrymen."

The fact that Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, felt compelled to speak out that way evidences his deep concern about the overkill in current attacks against the "military-industrial complex."

To General "Buss" Wheeler—a man who has won the admiration of civilian bosses as different as Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and Defense Secretaries McNamara and Laird—there is "a necessary relationship" between those who make weapons and those who use them.

But, as Wheeler said in his plea for fair play, such a relationship should not be regarded as an evil conspiracy. "If I'm in a conspiracy," the General said, "I have yet to meet my fellow conspirators." And since Wheeler is no bomb-thrower, but an honest soldier Presidents have listened to, perhaps it would be worth taking a hard look at some of the anti-military criticism in such high fashion these days.

Sen. Charles E. Goodell (R-N.Y.) got into the swing early this year by flying out to the Air Force museum, so he could attack the ABM in the very shadow of the XB-70 bomber—a project which was cancelled after \$1.3 billion went into it. The Senator failed to mention, however, that it was Congress—not the Pentagon—which tried the hardest to keep the B-70 flying.

So insistent, in fact, was former Chairman Carl Vinson (D-Ga.) of the House Armed Services Committee that President Kennedy had to cool him off on the B-70 issue by walking him around the White House rose garden. Goodell himself, a Congressman in 1962 when Vinson made the B-70 fight, voted for the bill which specified extra money for the bomber.

Not that the Air Force was necessarily right and Goodell wrong on the B-70 issue. The point is that it is a little too much for a member of Congress to shake a finger at the military in 1969 for supporting the same bomber he backed in 1962—a bad year for denouncing the military.

Then there is the TFX. Here was a case where the military wanted the lowest bidder, Boeing, but its civilian bosses decreed the

lush contract would go to General Dynamics which had a nearly idle plant in Fort Worth, Tex. For speaking out against the award, Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations at the time the contract was under fire by the McClellan Committee, was exiled to Portugal as our Ambassador. Robert S. McNamara, who made the decision as Secretary of Defense, stayed on the job.

As it turns out, however, Anderson was probably a lot closer to being right about the matter than McNamara. The Navy has since cancelled the TFX. Any day now there will be gasps as the cost overrun on the TFX—an unbelievable \$5 billion according to some calculations—is at last disclosed. It will look to many as if the military is running wild again.

Chairman John L. McClellan (D-Ark.) of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee may be able to claim he was right in 1963 when he challenged the TFX contract. But his failure to do much about it in the six years since then hardly speaks well for Congress. His subcommittee has not even filed its TFX report.

The Air Force—to cite another example—is taking the rap in the case of the C-5A transport. But who was in charge of that contract? Answer: Secretary McNamara and other civilians who prided themselves at the time on having come up with a "total package procurement" approval which they believed would help discourage the very overruns now getting so much publicity.

Is it fair, then, to charge such problems—and there are lots more of them—off to the "military industrial complex?" It may be comfortable, politically safe and even refreshing to do so—but it is hardly fair.

A strength of the American political system is its checks and balances. The generals and admirals indeed ask for horrendous amounts of money. But Congress, with its power of the purse, determines how much they actually get. The generals and admirals indeed have made their presence felt all over the world—often with costly bases that blight the host country physically and morally. But the White House and State Department, in making foreign policy, are responsible for America's overwhelming—and sometimes overbearing—military presence in the world.

If there is a lot wrong with today's "military"—as almost everybody says there is—then we are all in it together. It is too easy to blame it all on the "military."

The term "military" covers 3.5 million men and women in the services. Most of them are in the have-not category compared to the rest of American society. They eat off tin trays in godforsaken places; live in cramped houses or trailers; and die on ground much less well known than Hamburger Hill. They too, want to send their children to college. General Wheeler on Armed Forces Day was trying to speak for them. His speech did not get much play.

"... People in the armed forces own little—perhaps even far too little—in this world," the General said. "We serve as the custodian operators of the armed power of the American people. I do not suggest we stop wearing our uniforms, however visible."

#### WISCONSIN CONGRESSMAN DAVID OBEY SAYS LIBERALS MUST REDEDICATE THEMSELVES TO CAUSE OF PEACEFUL SOCIAL REFORM

**HON. HENRY S. REUSS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman DAVID OBEY, in a recent thoughtful

address, went to the heart of the matter when he warned that violence and intimidation practiced by the few could well lead to a backlash on the part of the many that would jeopardize basic freedoms and set back the cause of social reform for years. He urged a much greater commitment by liberals to needed change brought about by peaceful means—in our universities and our society—lest the Nation reap the tragic consequences of continuing unreasoned extremism by the few. I commend his timely remarks to my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DAVID R. OBEY,  
MAY 18, 1968

Civil liberties have been under attack in the past in this country by radical right-wing movements intolerant of dissent and minority opinion, but few people have seriously doubted our ability to preserve basic American freedoms. Even in the McCarthy era of the 50's most people were not really pessimistic about the preservation of Bill of Rights freedoms.

But today it seems to me that the violence and the intolerance being exhibited by a small minority of campus militants is creating such a backlash of public frustration and disgust that even the traditional American freedoms of thought, speech and dissent guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights and the United States Constitution are in serious danger—and so I might add—is the crucial tradition of academic freedom.

That danger comes from the fact that the violence and intimidation being practiced by a small—and I emphasize the word small—group of militants is causing such an emotional and psychological backlash that the American public is losing its ability—and its willingness—to distinguish peaceful protest from violent protest, honorable dissent from anarchy. In short, all dissent and all protest is being tarred by the same brush, and that is a tragic development.

No thoughtful citizen can ignore the need for change—not just change on our campuses—but change in many other of our institutions, both public and private. And that is why responsible Americans in touch with the needs of our time must resist the temptation to use frustration about the violence of some reform elements as an excuse for inaction or as an excuse for an attack upon all protest.

Public anger, no matter how justified, is no effective substitute in the long run for an active public conscience.

All groups, right and left, angered or satisfied, must remember that one of the great attributes of the democratic system is the implicit commitment not to push other people around. Any would-be reformer who seriously believes that he can gather public support in this country for human rights, academic freedom, an attack upon poverty and hunger, a more intelligent foreign policy, and even for campus reform by throwing bricks or carrying guns on campus is engaging in a tragic misreading of both history and the American character, and we may all pay the consequences for that error. And any person who seriously believes he can eliminate violent dissent by ignoring its root causes or by attributing it solely to "communist conspirators" is committing an error just as tragic.

It is terribly important for Congress, state legislators and the American people to avoid a massive, thoughtless repression of legitimate, honorable and peaceful dissent, but disregard of the traditions of fair play and tolerance on the part of extremists on either side of the political or social spectrum are, I am afraid, making that repression more nearly an inevitability.

If this repression is to be avoided and if

the public clamor for it is to be diminished and if we are to successfully preserve the principles of freedom of thought, speech and dissent which have made this country something special, we must avoid the emotional and psychological polarization of our people. And that can be accomplished only if we can, to a much greater degree than has been the case up until now, involved constructive liberals in the struggle not only to reform our campuses, but also to reform public habits which have allowed the poor to go hungry, the ill untreated, and the deprived uneducated.

Liberals must re-dedicate themselves to the opposition of violence wherever they find it—whether it be the violence practiced by the campus revolutionary or the more subtle violence practiced by society against the deprived and the under-privileged.

Each is equally corrosive of the values which unite a democratic and humane people.

Unless constructive liberals re-dedicate their time and re-double their efforts to achieve the reforms needed in our society itself we will condemn the liberal movement to the stagnation of pious comfort and we will abandon reform to the embittered few. And the resulting polarization of our people will paralyze the nation with tragic consequences for Bill of Rights freedoms as we know them.

## CAMPUS RIOTS AND U.S. GOVERNMENT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, when the Reporter magazine ceased publishing, I was most disturbed by the thought that Mr. Max Ascoli's views and observations would no longer appear in print. Mr. Ascoli, in his role of editor and publisher of the Reporter, gave it stature and authority far beyond many of those which still survive today.

I was very pleased to see him appear in print, again, in the Wall Street Journal for May 27, 1969, writing on a topic that concerns us all. Mr. Ascoli, in his usual solid reasoning and impeccable style, has done a superb job. The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 27, 1969]

CAMPUS RIOTS AND THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

(By Max Ascoli)

Why could it happen, and why did it happen here? a number of eminent people, the President first of all, have asked. The key word is *it*: A succession of conflagrations and racial disruptions centered or converging on the campuses of the nation that only too recently had found itself playing the role of example to the world. There is little sense in comparing our turbulent four and a half years from Berkeley on to the uprising at the Sorbonne.

Among the whys it could happen here, one is this nation's inexperience with revolution. The revolution to which the United States owes its birth is something else again, for it secured the centuries-old freedoms of the Mother Country that the Founding Fathers codified according to the needs of the new-born nation. France and England have repeatedly gone through chaos, and then emerged from it. In the Old World—Russia, Italy or Spain—they have had their troubles with anarchic uprisings. America had to deal with individual anarchists either of the bucolic Thoreau type or with showy mimics of overseas nihilism.

## MAINTAINING AN IMMUNITY

The principle became ingrained here that vastity and complexity had immunized our country from the sweep of ideological revolution or totalitarian dictatorship. In the universities the social sciences and allied disciplines did their best to maintain this immunity by neglecting ideologies and practicing birth control of ideas. Only facts counted, as if they had all been born free and equal, and the dusty leftovers of happenings called facts were assiduously piled up by scholars.

No wonder many college students were bored, and enterprising professors who had obtained tenure went after remunerative government or foundation assignments. No wonder also that in a large number of academic institutions there was a lack of contact between students and teachers. By and large, there was a superabundance of students and only infrequently could the leavening influence of teachers be effective. The substance of culture prepared for mass consumption in the multiversities and universities turned thinner and thinner, and ideas, or even their ersatz, were carefully pasteurized.

In 1964, on the largest campus of the largest multiversity, a substitute for ideas was accidentally discovered: *Loquor ergo sum* (I talk, therefore I exist). It is strange that it had not happened before or on some other campuses. At Berkeley, there was a group of students who during the summer had trained themselves to take chances by going South. The new chance they took proved immensely rewarding. They practiced participatory democracy before rediscovering the old notion. The *loquor ergo sum* principle took the name of Free Speech Movement. The meaning was that the more one talks, the more of a man he is; the more people yell in unison without letting anyone utter a single antagonistic word, the more power they get. The Berkeley rebels celebrated in their own way their freedom from thinking, and gained notoriety in intellectual communities all over the world. Thinking is not easy, while anybody can talk and yell. From those 1964 days on, the exaltation of dissent started. Dissent you must. It's no longer a right, it's a duty.

Mario Savio, leader of the Berkeley movement delivered at Sproul Hall an address that later was used in an article entitled "An End to History." He did not appear to find much satisfaction in his success. "This free speech fight points up a fascinating aspect of contemporary campus life. Students are permitted to talk all they want so long as their speech has no consequences." This statement is echoed by Professor Herbert Marcuse, of the University of California at San Diego, in his Political Preface, 1966, to *Eros and Civilization*, he wrote: "In and against the deadly efficient organization of the affluent society, not only radical protest, but even the attempt to formulate, to articulate, to give word to protest, assume a childlike, ridiculous immaturity. Thus it is ridiculous and perhaps 'logical' that the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley terminated in the row caused by the appearance of a sign with the four-letter word."

Unbridled, massive loquacity having been authoritatively hailed as identical to freedom of speech, it could be turned against other targets. And so it was: In 1965, the teach-ins started. There on the campuses, antiwar students were joined and supported by many a youngster emeritus from the faculties. Even those who held qualified opinions against the Vietnam war had an exceedingly hard time trying to argue against the mobs who wanted the war stopped—right now. This unreflective quality is characteristic of the movements a la Berkeley. Just as "free speech" came to mean four-letter speech, so the peace advocated at the teach-ins was not related to our times and to our opponent: It meant just peace at any price—now. Yet it is remarkable how many people, worthy of their high repute, for quite some time have not been able to mention the war in Viet-



nam without calling it immoral or criminal—a war that, for our own good, should end in our defeat.

#### A DISCONCERTING PHENOMENON

The exaltation of youth for its own sake, the disdain for anybody over 30, is disconcerting for a man like this writer who had to leave his native country at the time of "Giovinezza, Giovinezza." The Negroes, too, follow the same self-seeking trend: Superior education or at least a diploma must be provided for all the young black just because they are black. The place in society black power wants must be granted, and this demand is not negotiable. All these extreme aims have one thing in common: Each is to be reached for the hell of it.

In the universities the drives for student power, youth power, black power, meet and, as far as one can see, do not collide. Rather they pretend to have separate but equal status, and only occasionally do they give a hand to each other as, for instance the SDS and the Negroes in favor of negritude.

American culture, like America itself, is part of the western world and, until now, a fantastically successful outgrowth of it. One of the characteristics of western culture has been the ease with which it has given cultural citizenship to men from every part of the world, while becoming enriched in the process. The universities in this country cannot become centers of cultural fragmentation on a racial basis without becoming responsible for the ultimate fragmentation of the country. They do not belong to the trustees or to the faculties or to the students. They belong to history—a history that this country has in largest part inherited—and are entrusted in various degrees to different groups of pro tem curators and beneficiaries. Each fragment of this historical heritage can be irretrievably wasted away.

The answer, it has been said, is academic self-government. Within limits this is true, provided we are clear that academic self-government does not mean sovereignty or, as Attorney General Mitchell once put it, extra territoriality. The inner strength of a university and the position it establishes for itself in the cultural community are a large-scale reproduction of man's destiny: A balance between inner and outer world reflecting the role man plays in the various collective entities he comes to belong to. Man's freedom does not exempt him from spiritual or economic bankruptcy. And of course not from death. The same is true for the universities. President Nixon said it: "... violence or the threat of violence may never be permitted to influence the actions or judgments of the university community. Once it does the community, almost by definition, ceases to be a university."

Our government cannot force the universities to be free, but from the universities has started the eradication of freedom in our country. Academic self-government can sustain the inner and outer life of an academic community: In a microcosmic way each entity moves according to its own laws as part of a finite system that is exposed to extinction. The system and each of its components have a margin of freedom but, as has happened in a number of academic communities, when freedom is extinguished then the resulting condition is one of national emergency.

"The Federal Government," the President said, "cannot, should not—must not—enforce" the principle of intellectual freedom, which, he had already stated, "is in danger in America. . . . Violence—physical violence, physical intimidation—is seemingly on its way to becoming an accepted, or at all events a normal and not to be avoided element in the clash of opinion within university confines. . . . Anyone with the least understanding of the history of freedom will know that this has invariably meant not only political disaster to those nations that have submitted to such forces of obfuscation and repression,

but cultural calamity as well. It is not too strong a statement to declare that this is the way civilizations begin to die." But the Federal Government, according to the President, can do nothing. Yet he knows that he is not the Federal Government but only its Chief Executive.

Congress is not patient and is constantly exposed to the dangers of hasty or wrong legislation. For the right conduct of government, the President cannot disassociate himself from Congress. Indeed, one should hope that he is exerting a wise, harmonizing influence on the several Senate or House committees engaged in preparing legislation on campus or racial disorders.

He or his office can also urge the local or state authorities to act. We all remember the picture of James A. Perkins, president of Cornell, beaming with the leaders of the SDS and the Afro-American Society, after the faculty voted to support black students' demands, as if all were saying, "cheese, cheese." The Harvard students who threw the nine deans out of University Hall have not been suspended or expelled. Can Cornell and Harvard be called free institutions? Of the faculties the least said the better for the time being. When a community ceases to be a university, then the Attorney General should find a way to put it into receivership. Let's not forget that, whether Governor Faubus liked it or not, Dwight Eisenhower sent detachments of the 101st Airborne Division to Little Rock.

#### MR. TRUMAN'S MOTTO

Harry Truman kept a motto on his desk: **THE BUCK STOPS HERE.** Even the buck of a university headed by a weak man may end on that desk in the Oval Room.

The New York Times, the most authoritative organ of woolly thinking in our country, has adopted the position that to appease the students and the other riotous groups we need to settle the war in Vietnam.

Yet the President can be sure that the domestic Viet Cong will never make peace, even after Ho Chi Minh enters Saigon, and every single GI is back from Vietnam. President Nixon should keep the example of Abraham Lincoln constantly in mind. No one of Mr. Nixon's predecessors ever took such liberties with the laws of the land as did Abe Lincoln, but he saved the Union. President Nixon faces an even harder task, for he must save the Union not from a civil but a guerrilla war.

#### THE CLOCK IS RUNNING OUT IN GREECE

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, now living in Washington is an exiled Greek political editor, Elias P. Demetracopoulos. Mr. Demetracopoulos has access to considerable information about what is happening in his native country. A few days after the second anniversary of the April 21, 1967, military coup in Greece, Mr. Demetracopoulos sounded a pertinent warning and offered some sound advice to the United States in a speech at the George Washington University. The text of his remarks follows:

#### GREECE—A NEW VIETNAM?

Tonight I would like to discuss the situation in Greece; a situation which I believe not only denies the Greek people basic democratic rights but is also harmful to the national interests of the United States and contains the seeds of another "Vietnam." The element of time is terribly important in this

connection. An attempt will be made to show that the dangers posed by the current Greek situation leave little time for constructive action by the United States. In other words, I believe the clock is running out in Greece, and unless some major changes are forthcoming in American policy, both the U.S. and NATO are apt to be faced with the reality rather than the potential of explosive political, military, and economic developments on NATO's Southern Flank.

U.S. foreign policy in Greece, inherited by the Nixon Administration, is based on the hypothesis that the present dictatorial regime provides sufficient military, political and economic stability to satisfy America's strategic interests in the area—the kind of stability, supposedly, which could not be guaranteed by any realistic alternative. In support of this hypothesis ex-Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last May said, "I believe that the obligation upon us as a member of NATO is such that I place that as a more important consideration than I do the present government of Greece. I believe that we deal with a highly imperfect world, and if we were to confine our help to our Allies on the basis of our approving completely the different types of governments that existed then, I believe that NATO would disintegrate, and I believe that would be a calamity."

If that were true—if indeed the regime offered the only reasonable hope of stability in Greece—it would be possible for me to understand Mr. Clifford's position, even though both as a Greek and as a supporter of free democratic systems of government as a matter of moral and political principle, I am strongly opposed to dictatorship in any form. In my opinion, however, the premise that the Junta has or can bring stability to Greece is false. On the contrary, not only has the current junta failed to provide stability in spite of dictatorial and ruthlessly repressive tactics; it has actually created instability, uncertainty and the very real risk of civil war in Greece.

First, let us begin with the premise that the junta has brought military stability. Both the Pentagon and other senior U.S. officials claim that the Greek armed forces and terrain, as well as the U.S. and NATO bases in Greece, are necessary to maintain control of the Eastern Mediterranean, to deter direct communist aggression from the North, and to provide a vital link with Turkey which would otherwise not be a viable military ally. In addition they cite increased Soviet Naval strength in the Mediterranean to strengthen their argument. I agree with their assessment as to the importance of a strong and stable Greece as far as NATO is concerned. The key question then is: Have the colonels indeed provided this stability?

The Greek armed forces today are far less effective than they were prior to the coup. They are mainly an internal security force in which the Junta-controlled elements watch not only potential civilian opponents but also the very real latent opposition in the armed forces themselves. To this effect the continuing purges of the Greek military establishment two whole years after the April 21, 1967 coup are a key indicator.

The Junta has systematically removed from the armed forces an alarming number of the officers they consider unreliable. These hundreds of officers were trained at enormous American expense in the U.S., other NATO countries and Greece, since the Truman Doctrine of 1947. The officers purged were not and could not possibly be Communist, considering the nature of the recruiting process and the close ties between the Greek Armed Forces and the U.S. military and intelligence apparatuses. Indeed many of these officers fought against the communists in the Greek guerrilla war. On the contrary, the officers purged by the junta were generally

considered by Washington, the NATO authorities and the Joint U.S. Military Aid Group to Greece to represent the elite of the Greek officer corps. Their only sin was to have opposed the illegal seizure of power by a relatively small group of officers. These usurpers who seized power two years ago are reliably reported to number no more than 300, with a good percentage of them having intelligence and security training and background.

The purging of the cream of the Greek officer corps and a preoccupation with the internal security duties make the combat effectiveness of the Greek armed forces in time of full mobilization of the reserves an agonizingly open question mark for NATO planners. Thus the illegal seizure of power by the Junta and its subsequent actions have not only seriously weakened the combat capabilities of Greek armed forces; they have also undermined Greece's political and moral ability to fulfill its NATO commitments. For any crisis which required full mobilization would in all probability lead to the speedy overthrow of the Junta. This really explains why the Junta thought it wise to "defuse" the Cyprus crisis in November 1967. The armed forces have become mostly a police force which, under the new constitution, are also charged with preserving the "existing Social Order." The same reasoning applies to the U.S., NATO bases and other American listening posts and propaganda machinery operating on Greek territory. These bases are important. Yet in view of the climate in which they exist today it is a real question how much long-range strategy in the area can be built around them.

In view of the Soviet naval build-up in the Mediterranean, the Middle East crisis, the events in Czechoslovakia and the outflanking of Greece and Turkey by the Soviet Union's rapid strategic deployment along North Africa's coastline and the Middle East, it is indeed tragic that the Johnson administration should have used these events as reasons for supporting the Junta whose action has weakened the military capabilities and stability of the Greek armed forces.

Let us now turn to the key question of political stability which many supporters of the 1967 coup—including the Junta itself—cite as one of the prime benefits of the current Greek dictatorship. Measuring political stability is not easy when there is martial law and press censorship, when no opposition is permitted, and when violence, although on the increase, is still sporadic. The Junta alleges that they stepped in to save the country from the danger of Communism—yet even Greek Conservative leaders emphasize the fact that the danger of Communism was non-existent in Greece. They overthrew a Conservative Government.

Those who place too great an emphasis on the confused political situation in Greece as a justification for the Colonel's coup must remember that Greece fought a hard and dirty war against a foreign dominated and supported Communist aggression at the peak of the "Cold War" in Europe. The victory, although assisted greatly by U.S. material help and advice, was finally wrested with Greek, and only Greek, blood. If Greece was able to win this victory under a parliamentary government with basic democratic institutions functioning it is inconceivable that the current military dictatorship is necessary to correct alleged political instability.

There are some who argue that there was no political stability prior to the Junta and that the present arrangement is at least an improvement. This argument is superficial and needs a detailed recording of the events and the overall background that preceded the coup.

The fact is that political stability was damaged in the 1965-67 period by the intervention of the Greek Monarchy and its military establishment in the political process, thus perverting the institution of parliament

and the mechanism of achieving political stability which had worked well until then. This was done by repeatedly denying the use of the best safety valve available to real democracies—Free elections.

In 1963 and early 1964, the eight years of conservative (ERE) rule under Prime Minister C. Caramanlis, ended at the polls with the largest majority in modern times for the Center Union Party led by the late George Papandreou. The peaceful transfer of power was accomplished in the middle of the Cyprus crisis involving the threat of a shooting war with Turkey, following years of impressive aggressive aggregate growth and financial stability. It was, to be sure, a growth in which many did not share; few reforms in education had been accomplished and not enough employment opportunities had been opened up, as indicated by the thousands who had to seek work abroad.

As Richard Westebbe of the World Bank, formerly senior foreign economic adviser to the Greek government said in 1963 in a penetrating report, "Greece's long-run structural problems concern deficiencies in the structure of production, in public administration, in education, in financial institutions, and in the distribution of income."

The victors promised a better distribution of income, a more rapid modernization of Greece to enable it to enter the Common Market, and a reform of Greece's institutions which, amongst other things, implied the paying of fair taxes by certain privileged classes and a reduced role of the Crown in controlling the Armed Forces and the political processes. In short, a return to the intent of the constitution which would have the King "reign, not rule." In foreign policy, Greece was to become a fully equal member of the NATO Alliance, with a real voice in determining its own destiny. In pursuing these goals there is no question that the Papandreou Government committed a number of mistakes and lost many opportunities.

The Center Union Party was soon faced with the violent and growing opposition of the Crown, the Armed Forces leadership, and the economic oligarchy—an opposition which was enjoying the support of a large part of the official American establishment in Athens. The story can be picked up with the elections of 1961 in which the Army, through the so-called "Pericles Plan," unnecessarily rigged the result to ensure a Caramanlis victory, when the real unadulterated result would have given his party a narrower victory or, at the very worst, would have forced it into a coalition with the Center. The election-rigging gave the liberal forces their cause and they exploited it until their ultimate victory at the next elections. When it was decided to bring down the Papandreou Government, a "treason plot" called "Aspida" was concocted and ascribed to the Prime Minister's son. The charge has never been proven and even the junta, four years later, has been unable to produce any evidence. The Papandreou Government retaliated by resurrecting the Pericles charges and conducting a formal investigation. The Generals panicked and persuaded the King of an imminent plot to seize power by unnamed leftist groups tolerated or led by Prime Minister Papandreou. The result was the overthrow of the elected government and a series of almost comic opera attempts to make parliamentary rump-governments from mid-1965 through Christmas 1966.

The agreement of the conservative and Center Union Parties to hold elections in 1967 in order to restore real parliamentary government, and thus political stability led directly to the Colonels' coup, only a few weeks before the elections were to be held under the Conservative Government of Mr. P. Kanellopoulos. By the way he has spent a good part of the last two years under strict house arrest. The Athens colonels have since persecuted the leaders of all of Greece's major political groupings, i.e., the conserva-

tives, the royalists, the Center Union—among whom were several of America's best friends—as well as the left and the extreme left. They have resorted to systematic torture of opponents, as was shown at the recent Strasbourg hearings of the European Human Rights Commission and as has been publicly condemned by leaders of the British, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Dutch and Italian governments, among others.

On March 27, 1969, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, in his first major presentation to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said he shared the "concern" of Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), "not only for the torture phase" of Greece's new military regime, "but for other civil liberty" infringements. The Nixon Administration has made an encouraging start on the explosive issue of Greece's military dictatorship, through this statement of Secretary Rogers, who went well beyond any comments of his predecessor.

Senator Pell, speaking in the Senate on October 3, 1968, and January 31, 1969, said: "Over the past months I have become increasingly concerned with one of the more heinous characteristics of the Greek dictatorship. I refer to the brutal behavior of this regime in the treatment of its own citizens." . . . "I said in a speech to this body in May 1967 that I deplored the illegal military seizure and that I deplored, moreover, the lack of any kind of strong, public reaction or expression of disapproval from the United States." . . . "It seems to me that the inescapable conclusion can only be that the revitalization of democracy in Greece is as much in our own interest as it is in the interests of the people of Greece. We should, therefore, do everything we can to encourage its prompt evolution."

Many senior U.S. government officials, at the time of the colonels' coup, argued that there was little the U.S. could have done because the coup took the U.S. by surprise and once it was successfully carried out the U.S. was faced with a fait accompli. This is untrue as the threat of dictatorship in Greece was spotted early and this threat greatly disturbed politically prominent Americans well before the actual coup took place.

As early as September 4, 1962, and again on October 13, 1963, Senator Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) in published interviews with this speaker stated: "I am particularly concerned about the political developments in that country (Greece) and I do believe that careful investigation should be carried out on those accusations against our U.S. Embassy role in Athens in the last Greek elections." And in 1963 he said: "I am against the establishment of a dictator any place. That is why I strongly attacked the suggestion made that the establishment of dictatorship in Greece would be an effective solution to Greece's problems. Oh, Lord, No. Greece is the most sophisticated, civilized country in the world. Our democratic way of government came from Greece. It would be tragic if Greece, where democracy itself was first founded, were to go back to a dictatorship. I can't even imagine the Greeks thinking about it."

And in the summer of 1966 a galaxy of highly placed and influential U.S. personalities, covering the spectrum of the American political life, condemned publicly, very strongly and in no uncertain terms, the possibility of a military dictatorship of any kind in Greece, under whatever pretext. They also urged the Johnson Administration to take all necessary steps to ensure that such a catastrophic development for the American interests will not occur.

Their names are: The Speaker of the House of Representatives J. McCormack, Senators V. Hartke, S. Thurmond, E. McCarthy, J. Javits, W. Morse and E. Kennedy. The Chairmen of the House Judiciary, Armed Services and Agriculture Committees, Congressmen E. Celler, M. Rivers and H.



Cooley. The former Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral A. Burke and the former Supreme NATO Commander in Europe, General L. Norstad. And the then Governor of California E. Brown.

They spelled out their views to me in question-answer format, taped, typed and unofficially signed press interviews, which received wide coverage both in Europe and America. In short, there were numerous, early and authoritative warnings given to Washington, but to no avail.

Since 1947, America has played a decisive role in Greece, and, beginning in 1959 with Ambassador Ellis Briggs—now a strong advocate of the Athens' colonels—America has pursued disastrous, contradictory and vacillating policies—policies largely influenced by inter-service and personality rivalries. Should these policies be continued the communists will have an opportunity to organize and lead a liberation movement in Greece, for the first time since the late 1940's, with wide support and backing from non-communist elements in both Greece and Western Europe. Such a movement, even if led by communists, would ironically be formed under the banner of returning democracy to Greece. Thus, the tragic makings of a new Vietnam in Greece are all there.

It is very important for Americans to understand that there is widespread belief in non-communist Europe that Washington was involved, either by commission or omission, in the April 21, 1967 coup and is responsible for keeping the Athens colonels in power. While the substance of the more extreme forms of these theories has not been proven yet, the U.S. should realize that these beliefs have done much more than the criticism of the Vietnam War or the DeGaulle policies to undermine basic U.S. positions and interests in this vital area. This point, in many ways the most telling, is supported by such a personality as Mrs. Helen Vlachou-Loundras, well known publisher of the most influential conservative Greek newspapers, who was forced into exile in London, when, after the Junta seized power, she bravely refused to publish under censorship. (Her husband—wartime hero conservative Navy Captain Costas Loundras—was sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment after he was kept by the Junta in solitary confinement for fifty days). Mrs. Vlachou-Loundras spoke about the Greek regime in London on October 17, 1968:

"So the moment of truth is approaching, and the first brand new European dictatorship since the war is about to emerge, born of The Pentagon by the CIA, reared by NATO, surrounded by dotting businessmen. It is no use criticizing the Americans, divided as they are between those who would like to chase the junta but can not do it, and those who can, and will not."

The European reaction to the Greek coup can be gleaned in the following statements: West German Socialist Deputy, Klaus Schultz, said recently, "It was 36 years ago that Hitler took power in my country. And he did it under conditions far more democratic than those imposed by the Greek colonels." British Laborite Bob Edwards, during the debate whether to expel Greece from the Council of Europe for violating the 18-nation organization's statutes on human rights, said: "I am amazed at some of these speeches. We heard them between the wars—Franco was going to hold elections. Hitler was no dictator and Mussolini made the trains run on time."

In a futile attempt to improve their international image, to buy desperately needed time and to overcome the stubborn refusal of Greeks of prestige and ability to work for the regime, the junta announced a referendum on a new constitution in September 1968. This document, which received the private blessing of some American officials, in fact, makes the Armed Forces the sole final source of power, the guardian of the status quo and the dispenser of civil liberties in

Greece. Thus the constitution in effect gives the wolves the responsibility for guarding the lamb by giving the Athens Junta full power to "protect" the liberties they had already seized from the Greek people. The subsequent referendum on the colonel's constitution resulted in a Soviet style vote of 92.2% and was carried out under conditions of martial law. The really free sentiments of the Greeks became manifest a few weeks later when over 300,000 people in Athens spontaneously demonstrated against the regime and for democracy on the occasion of the funeral for George Papandreu, the last elected Prime Minister. On March 29, 1969, the influential London Economist wrote: "Mr. Papadopoulos (the head of the junta) has clearly reconsidered his views about a regrouping of political forces, which would eventually produce a satisfactory alternative to the present regime. He now argues that the constitution cannot be brought fully into force, and normal parliamentary democracy allowed to function, until the Greeks have acquired the necessary political maturity."

"The slowness with which the authorities are completing some of the legal formalities needed to make the provisions of the constitution operative, suggests that Mr. Papadopoulos is trying to keep all his options open. About a quarter of the constitution is still not even theoretically in force, including the provision for the creation of a constitutional tribunal, which the regime considers essential for the proper functioning of democracy. Nor has the prime minister yet fulfilled his pledge to introduce a law to allow the regime to ease or tighten martial law as it thinks fit, so that the Greeks can show how well they can behave under conditions of relative, or disciplined, freedom. All this deliberate slow motion is justified by the argument that the Greeks need time to acquire enough political maturity to decide who should govern them—although last September they were apparently sufficiently mature to decide in a plebiscite how they should be governed."

On the eve of the NATO Ministerial meeting in Washington, earlier this month, the Junta feeling the weakness of its position—both domestically and internationally—announced a series of supposed "liberalization" measures, under the new constitution. These measures, however, would be applied only after appropriate legislation is drafted and promulgated. According to Mr. Papadopoulos, this will take at least six months. But he did not explain how these two constitutional freedoms of assembly and of association could be reinstated under martial law, even if the legislation required to make them operative were to be enacted. What a mockery! Thus, the aim of his move is quite transparent; a typically flatfooted gesture on his part to forestall several NATO countries pressure for an early restoration of democracy in Greece.

Finally, let us turn to the alleged economic stability which the Junta pledged to bring to Greece. I believe that as a result of the coup, Greece is far more likely to be faced with a serious economic crisis, instead of stable growth.

The rate of growth of the Greek economy which averaged close to 8% a year in the period of 1960-66 was reduced to about half this figure in 1967, when good crops and an illusory increase in services offset a sharp fall in industrial investment leading to stagnation in manufacturing output. In 1968 manufacturing recovered somewhat but low crops held the growth rate to about 4%. Admittedly, the building boom had already leveled off by April 1967. However, the collapse of confidence following the coup led to a sharp fall in business investment and consumer purchasing. Imports into Greece stopped rising, and people hoarded money. The reaction of the Government was to stimulate demand and buy popularity. A massive give-away took place when all farm debts amounting to some \$280 million to the U.S.

financed Agricultural Bank were written off. This not only penalized farmers who had paid their debts but probably convinced all farmers, who constitute some 45% of the total population, that there is no point in paying future loans. What is perhaps worse is that the immense resources distributed in this way have not been directed towards raising farm productivity and bringing about the long needed structural reform of Greek Agriculture.

Bank credit and Government spending programs were greatly expanded. The money supply increased at an annual rate of 20% in 1967, and although the growth in money has decelerated since, it has not been matched by comparable increases in output. The recovery of consumer demand in 1968 has already led to a renewed import growth and some pressure on prices. Exports barely rose in 1968 and tourist earnings declined for the second year in a row, since the Junta took over. Another mainstay, emigrants' remittances, are stagnant. The result is a worsening balance of payments position. This has been partly shielded by drawings on the secret gold sovereign reserve and partly by a number of short term loans concluded with U.S. and European banks which are reliably reported to be secured by the nation's gold and hard currency reserves.

In the past, Greece's basic current trade imbalances were offset by rapidly growing tourist, emigrants and shipping remittances. These were increasingly augmented by capital inflow, mainly on private account from abroad. The prospect of maintaining balance of payments equilibrium at the present exchange rate and with free imports lay in a hoped for rapid rise in industrial and agricultural productivity. Unfortunately, with low growth rates and a sharp fall in private investments the outlook is for controls and/or devaluation, including rescheduling of all recently contracted short term foreign debt.

Further the mammoth spending programs have created a large inflationary potential which could lead to crisis conditions in a short time.

A confidential 12-page report prepared in March 1968 on Greece's Economic and Financial Developments by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York, states that:

"The regime has, however, displayed an increasing number of signs that it intends pursuing a 130-style authoritarian course. On the one hand, it has been intensely, nationalistic, having called repeatedly for a regeneration of Greek life. On the other, it has taken a number of steps designed to appeal to the lowest socio-economic groups: freezing prices; raising some incomes; and providing working girls with dowries. All this has taken place against a background of increasingly restrictive measures. Nevertheless, the combination has thus far been successful. Some of the reform introduced by the Papadopoulos government—especially those relating to the bureaucracy—have been to an extent necessary and desirable. The constitution, which the government was supposed to introduce in response to pressures from Western Europe, and has to be made public. However, any constitution which the drafters might develop would be meaningless because the regime does not intend that there be any return to democracy."

"Since the coup, Greek economic activity has slowed down; GNP growth rate is officially estimated to have been 5% in 1967—and privately put nearer to 3%—compared with 7.4% in 1966. Much of this has been due to a slowdown in investment, especially of the private sector. However, in 1967 the trend toward more rapid growth of industrial than agricultural production was reversed—agricultural production grew faster than industrial, largely due to the rapid growth of the latter in 1966. Prices have been stable due to a price freeze. Wages, on the other hand, have been allowed to rise rather rapidly. The overall government

budget deficit for 1968 will again be large—mostly due to the rising government investment budget."

At the end of March 1969, in a series of speeches to merchants, industrialists and others, Mr. Papadopoulos tried to undo the damage caused to the economy by the crippling uncertainty over the regime's intentions. He was not particularly successful. He insisted that the regime had achieved the political stability needed to expand economic activity. But his claim that it was not a dictatorship, but only a "parenthesis . . . that was necessary to put things straight," was contradicted by his further assertion that "whether you like it or not, the revolution is a reality and you cannot get rid of us."

The Government made numerous appeals to attract foreign capital. Its most publicized achievement for political, propaganda and lobbying reasons, was the signing of a lucrative contract with Litton Industries (a few weeks after coming to power) which guarantees the latter a handsome annual fee as well as a commission on all investments it induces to come to Crete and the Western Peloponnese. It is of interest to note that Litton withdrew its proposals prior to the coup, due to overwhelming parliamentary opposition. To date Litton has produced some studies and very small-sized investments coming mainly from the Litton group companies. It would seem that even their corporate name has not been sufficient to overcome the doubts of those who might have put their money in Greece. That's why, according to reliable information, both the Junta and Litton, at this very moment, are mutually dissatisfied with each other's performance. In addition, Litton was unhappy when last year the U.S. Department of Justice disclosed that it had launched an inquiry to determine whether Litton has engaged in activities which require it to register as a foreign agent. Although most foreign investors found pre-Junta Greece a favorable spot for private enterprise, a difficulty did arise in the case of the Esso-Pappas refining, petrochemical and steel complex. This contract was strongly criticized by the Center Union before it came to power and was renegotiated to Greece's advantage while they were in power. Oddly enough, Pappas has since then managed to avoid, with Junta approval most of the less profitable investments he was supposed to undertake and he has emerged as one of the most influential and vocal backers of the Junta in the U.S.

Finally, much has been made of a recent agreement of the Junta with Onassis to establish a new refinery, aluminum plant and tourist investments totaling some \$400 million over fifteen years. Specific features, according to reports from Athens, include his right to supply crude oil, in this case Russian, shipped in his own tankers, as well as guaranteed employment for part of his tanker fleet. Further, the prospect of another aluminum plant is far from an unmixed blessing. There is no cheap power left in Greece. Onassis proposed to produce high cost power with his oil in his own thermal plants. He would charge himself an artificially low power rate in order to produce aluminum and would force all other Greek consumers of power to pay a much higher rate for the excess power he would produce. It is significant that the Onassis effort to build the alumina-aluminum plant in partnership with the U.S. Reynolds Metals Company has fallen through and on March 17, 1969, the latter announced that it had ended talks with Onassis.

In summary, instead of bringing about stable economic growth the Junta has presided over a tragic misuse and waste of national resources, in an attempt to buy acceptance and some semblance of legitimacy. The resulting "gold rush" to extract favorable concessions from the Athens Colonels in return for supporting their dictatorship

has resulted in the sacrifice of important Greek economic resources and interests which no parliamentary government could have undertaken and remain in office.

Alfred Friendly writes in the Washington Post of April 5, 1969, from Athens:

"The battle of the Greek tycoons, the former brothers-in-law, Aristotle Onassis and Stavros Niarchos, over which one will operate the proposed new \$400 to \$500 million investment program for a new oil refinery, aluminum plants and several tourist projects raised for the first time the suspicion of corruption with the junta.

"The government's off-again, on-again, handling of the intricate affair may have been merely clumsy or shabby, testifying only to its administrative incompetence. But on its face, the Niarchos proposal, which was ultimately rejected, seemed so much more advantageous to the country than that of Onassis as to suggest bad faith by the regime.

"One would have supposed that, once the suspicion arose, the government would have taken elaborate pains to demonstrate clean hands. After all, one of the Junta's most loudly proclaimed justifications for its coup two years ago was the promise that it would end the notorious corruption of previous governments. If it is subject to the same failing, it loses a principal excuse for its existence.

"Suspected of sticky fingers, the regime's logical response would have been to lay out the proposals in detail, argue them and supply a complete explanation of its final choice. Instead, after a few weeks of pulling and hauling, the junta clamped complete censorship over the whole matter. Nothing more may be printed about it in the Greek press. The consequence was obvious; what was once a smoldering rumor is now a wild-fire scandal."

The political anomaly of a banana republic dictatorship in present day non-Communist Europe has led to a suspension of some \$55 million of European Bank loans to Greece under the Treaty of Association with the Common Market. The long run future of Greece's association with the Common Market, the first of its kind, is in fact in doubt. As Greece's chief Common Market negotiator John Pezmatzoglou, then Deputy Governor of the Central Bank, said in a 1966 Bank of Greece message, the economic union of Greece with the EEC was based, on the mutually agreed, basic objective of an ultimate political union of Greece with its European partners.

Since then the Governor of the Central Bank, Professor K. Zolotas, an internationally respected central banker, and the equally prominent Professor J. Pezmatzoglou have resigned in protest over the Junta and its policies. In fact, the great bulk of Greece's trained professionals have refused to participate in the Government, a phenomenon which has seriously hindered efforts at rational economic policy formulation and implementation. Last year, during a Congressional investigation conducted by the House Subcommittee on International Finance, on the proposed first World Bank loan to Greece, its influential Chairman, Congressman Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin, criticized strongly the World Bank and the Johnson Administration for the proposed loan. He even criticized some of the new so-called "non-corrupt" leadership of Greece's economy when he identified the new Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece, a Mr. Constantine A. Thanos, as having plagiarized his doctoral dissertation and other works and whose proposed appointment to the faculty of the University of Athens, in 1963, was vetoed because of these affairs. Reuss also questioned whether Greece, governed by such people and under these conditions, could be considered creditworthy for international public lending.

In conclusion I believe that it is imperative for the Nixon Administration, which is

in the advantageous position of having no responsibility for the events and policies of the last few years, to conduct a basic and urgent review of US policy towards Greece on the following grounds:

A. The assumption that the current military regime in Athens has or can bring stability is incorrect.

B. The Junta has greatly weakened Greece's military capability and political ability to fulfill its NATO commitments.

C. The situation in Greece is potentially dangerous.

If present policies are continued, a new Vietnam could result.

D. The widespread belief in Europe that the U.S. is responsible for the coup and for keeping the colonels in power is seriously damaging to America's position in Europe.

E. The existence of a military dictatorship in Greece is morally and politically repugnant especially to the extent that it appears that the United States is supporting this regime.

In considering U.S. policy towards Greece I would like to here make several points directed primarily to American conservatives. It has been a tragedy that many American opinions and actions concerning Greece have been viewed as a political issue between conservatives and liberals. As a result of the opposition to the Greek junta by many prominent American liberals, all too many American conservatives have not realized the true nature and intent of the current Greek regime. While Greek political liberals have suffered as a result of the coup, as many Greek conservatives with well-known anti-communist credentials have been suppressed, imprisoned, and driven into exile by the junta. In fact, many of the most severe critics of the coup and the current regime could be described as conservatives. In the light of the Athens colonels' past and continued repression of anti-communist Greek conservatives and the often-forgotten fact that the colonels seized power from a conservative government, I would ask some American conservatives who have either largely remained neutral or have supported the current Greek regime to reconsider their positions. For the situation in Greece cannot be described or understood along American political lines. In this case both American liberals and conservatives, perhaps for different but compatible reasons, should oppose the authoritarian dictatorship imposed on the people of Greece by a small group of

Thus, in reviewing U.S. policy towards colonels in Athens.

Greece I would suggest that the following specific changes in the policies inherited by the Nixon Administration would be both in the interest of the United States and the Greek people.

#### ACTION

1. A Clear-cut public condemnation of the Greek Junta by the new administration and real efforts of disassociation from the Johnson Administration policies, attitudes and methods used in dealing with Greece.

2. Delay the appointment or appoint, but do not dispatch, to Athens a new U.S. Ambassador and make clear to the junta and the NATO Allies the real reasons for such a delay.

3. Terminate immediately and completely all U.S. military aid to the Athens regime and reverse the disastrous decision taken on October 21, 1968, during the dying gasps of the previous Administration, to resume delivery of major U.S. military equipment to the Athens Colonels. Such a decision, under those circumstances, gave in effect official public U.S. government approval to the Athens military dictatorship.

With the U.S. presidential elections only two weeks away, the Congress adjourned, and three weeks after a rigged "referendum," conducted by the Greek Junta under martial law, the Johnson Administration felt that it was safe and advisable to go ahead with a decision that was strongly debated and



shelved repeatedly by the same Administration in the past.

4. Take the initiative for joint NATO action against the Junta by exercising maximum diplomatic, economic and military aid pressure, on a well coordinated basis, in behalf of the Atlantic Alliance. Such an American initiative will take options away from Moscow policy-makers and will build up U.S. influence in NATO and among the European liberals, intellectuals and youth. Such a U.S. initiative would have worldwide favorable repercussions and Washington will be in a better position to exploit existing turmoil among Moscow's Eastern European Communist satellites, non-satellites and the Communist parties in non-Communist Europe.

5. Give full U.S. support to the efforts of the Common Market and the Council of Europe to isolate morally, politically and economically the Athens Colonels.

6. Find other appropriate ways and means to support actively and effectively all anti-junta, anti-communist elements who represent the vast majority of the Greek people.

7. Strong efforts should be made to dispel the belief of U.S. involvement and support of the Greek Junta in Greece and the rest of Europe, including the use of the Voice of America. Such efforts are essential to forestall violent anti-American backlash in Greece, which otherwise is a virtual certainty.

8. As a last resort, taking up a line already gaining ground in NATO, particularly in Denmark, Norway, The Netherlands and Italy, and moving to expel Greece from the Alliance.

#### POINTS

A. All the above peaceful measures are sufficient if used effectively, in my opinion, to overthrow the Greek dictatorship without bloodshed, and without risking American lives, as you do in Vietnam today, or you did in Korea, Lebanon and in the Dominican Republic. The Nixon Administration must have learned some very valuable lessons recently with the events in Pakistan, the crisis in Peru and the negotiations over the Spanish bases. These events proved the grave risks inherent in dealing with anti-Communist military dictatorships and should help dispel the myth that such regimes serve effectively the U.S. interests.

B. If the Junta is overthrown by these peaceful measures proposed to the Nixon Administration, Washington will be in a much better position to deal also with the Middle East crisis, having the full support and co-operation of the liberated (with American support) Greek people, and the U.S. and NATO bases presently in Greece will not any longer be surrounded, as is the case today, by an increasingly hostile population, which makes their value presently, in case of emergency, at least doubtful.

C. More than 100,000 hard-core Greek Communists live in various parts of the Eastern European communist world, including the thousands of young children abducted by the retreating Greek Communist guerilla forces in 1949. These children are now completely trained militarily and indoctrinated. Greece has very extended and rugged mountain frontiers with her northern Communist neighbors. These facts may represent, at a given moment, an ace in the hands of Moscow and Peking.

D. Greece's unique geographical position places her athwart the crossroads of Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. The Middle East and Africa are two areas where the Greeks for centuries have maintained the closest ties and interests. On the northern borders of Greece is a kaleidoscope of three different kinds of communism: The Peking style in Albania (where more than 2,000 Chinese advisors are stationed in this first Chinese beachhead in Europe), the Moscow style in Bulgaria, and the Tito style in Yugoslavia. This fact itself makes Greece a very

good western "window", and ideal listening and influence post for the Southeastern European area. But it also makes Greece far more exposed to external communist and Slavic chauvinistic pressures now greatly complicated by the current Sino-Soviet confrontation.

E. The U.S. record over the last decade clearly shows a very benign attitude toward right-wing military coups while registering great alarm over left-wing ones. The so-called Schwartz doctrine (former State Department policy planner and top Pentagon authority on international security affairs) makes clear the U.S. will not interfere with extra-constitutional, totalitarian rule by anti-Communist governments. This double standard justified accusations all over the world and naturally Greece.

We were all dismayed at the ruthless crushing with Soviet military power of the modest liberal reforms which were taking place in Czechoslovakia. No satellite could be allowed to sway that far from orthodoxy and control in the minds of Warsaw Pact hard liners. Moscow paid a heavy price in terms of world condemnation and the discrediting of hard core Czech Communists. To many, the parallel of the U.S. position in Greece is disquieting. And Moscow's diplomats and propagandists are counter-attacking criticism aimed at their Czechoslovakian action by pointing to the U.S. role in Greece since April 1967. For the coup against the prospect of a liberal, but pro-NATO government was carried out by people closely connected with the U.S. military, intelligence and financial complex, with U.S. weapons and using a top-secret emergency NATO plan. All in the name of anti-Communism, the preservation of the orthodoxy of Greece in the Western Alliance and protecting the Monarchy, which the Junta forced into exile eight months later. Moscow intervened with Soviet troops to crush what she considered dangerous Czechoslovak liberation tendencies. While I do not believe that the use of U.S. troops to protect the freedom of the Greek people was or is necessary, it is a tragedy that the Johnson Administration played the role of Pontius Pilatus while U.S.-supplied tanks were used to crush Greek democracy even though ample warnings about the impending coup existed. That the Johnson Administration, on many occasions, has given the impression of supporting the dictatorship of the Athens Colonels, is doubly disquieting, considering that the freedom of the Greek people was guaranteed by NATO which Greece freely joined as a free nation in 1952.

In the process the U.S.'s best friends were systematically destroyed. In the end the Greeks will force their oppressors out of power. The process could be bloody and might well involve the U.S. in another Vietnam type situation. It is, therefore, legitimate to ask why long-term U.S. interests are being sacrificed in Greece for the sake of a ephemeral appearance of security and stability and whether it is wise to continue along this road to disaster much longer.

#### ANATOMY OF A ROAD

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I was privileged to join with highway officials and representatives of industries deeply involved in highway safety in previewing a film, "Anatomy of a Road."

This is a 27-minute, 16-millimeter color film produced by CBS Productions in

Detroit. It will be distributed through General Motors film libraries and Modern Nation.

Its aim is to foster public appreciation of the value of good roads by helping the layman to understand what is involved in roadbuilding.

As "Anatomy of a Road" makes abundantly clear, roadbuilding is a complex, difficult process requiring substantial capital investment, legislative action, legal due process, engineering skill and hard work. It is easy to see why roadbuilding takes time.

Many people today are appalled at the cost of modern highways and many have even wondered whether they are worth that cost. "Anatomy of a Road" endeavors to set that record straight by showing the public where its tax dollars go.

The film also covers such controversial areas as funding, land acquisition and beautification.

"Anatomy of a Road" explains and illustrates each of the major steps in highway construction from preliminary planning through completion and maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most informative and important film. I am hopeful every Member of this body will have the opportunity of viewing it. I am also hopeful each Member will advise schools, service clubs, and television stations in his district of its availability.

#### THE NATIONAL DEFENDER

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, one of society's greatest concerns is the crime rate, which has been increasing in recent years to an unprecedented level. All of us are looking for solutions, and among many aspects worthy of attention is improvement in the judicial system.

I have long felt that we should provide a Defender General to rank equally with the Attorney General in our judicial systems. At the various judicial levels, the Defender General would help insure that each defendant received his full legal rights.

Such a system was acted on by the Hawaii Legislature this year, with prospects that it could become a model for public defender systems in other States. Significantly, Gen. Charles L. Decker, director of the National Defender Project, predicted that Hawaii's plan could "reduce the crime rate 15 percent in the first year."

General Decker's remarks, "A Look Ahead," were made before the National Legal Aid and Defender Association in Washington, D.C., on May 16, 1969. Because of their timely application to today's crime problem, I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

#### A LOOK AHEAD

(Remarks of Charles L. Decker, director, National Defender Project)

After over five years of lending assistance throughout the country to States, counties

and titles in striving to provide equal justice in criminal trials we can take stock of the lessons learned from the National Defender Project. Then we can look ahead.

When this project started, we kept an open mind as to the best kind of organization to provide defender services in the communities throughout the country, one conclusion was definite before we had been in operation a year—providing defense to those who cannot afford a lawyer is not a job to be accomplished at the last minute by the random assignment of counsel. In every State there should be an organization worked out so that counsel are provided efficiently, so that court calendars are not delayed, so that defense counsel is competent in representation.

We suggest to you that the proceedings at this conference have made it clear that every State should have an organization at the State level—and the Nation at the national level as well—which would be headed by a man whose title would be that of defender general or director of defense. The old statement that a rose would smell as sweet by any other name may be true. However, in governmental organization, names and titles do have significance. The title given to the man who is responsible for the representation of defendants should be equivalent to the title given to the man who is responsible for prosecutions. The title public defender is associated with defense of the poor individual cases. The title defender general would mark the man responsible for criminal defense generally—proper representation of all defendants. He would be responsible for policy as well as law.

You have heard from State public defenders at this conference and you have been able to question them—and you can question them further—as to the efficiency of their organizations. Wherever such an organized system exists, we submit that many of the deficiencies discovered in the operation of the criminal process can be corrected by conference and mutual agreement between the State public defender (and from now on I will refer to him as the defender general) and the attorney general of the State. Where improvements can not be made in the criminal process without legislation, the defender general and the attorney general can consult. They can recommend improvements to the judicial conference. With the judiciary, the prosecution and the defense in agreement, they may present a fair case for any legislative reforms that are needed. Such support for legislation would go far in removing the frequent lags in legislative reform.

Where the bench, prosecution and defense do not agree, each can present the views pertaining to his activities to the appropriate committees of the legislature, and we can rely on the American process to resolve disputed problems better when the three parties to the criminal process are all represented—not just the judiciary and the prosecution.

By achieving improvement among State officials where legislative change is not required we cut down appeals and post-conviction proceedings. By more efficient accomplishment of needed legislative changes, we cut down still further the probability of appeals and post-conviction proceedings. In sum, we come closer to our goal. When we are able to try cases correctly in the first instance, gentlemen, we give to the citizens of the city, the county and the State a feeling of confidence in the fair and equitable administration of justice. That makes for a better society and a stronger government.

Many of you who are here today are working in your own communities to establish State defense organizations that will fulfill the purposes of which we have spoken. I suggest to you that, when the leaders of the bench, the bar and the community have

worked out a plan which fits a community, they still have the job of public education. We must bring the administration of criminal justice home to every neighborhood if it is to have full support. I suggest that there is one ingredient that must be added to an intelligent and workable plan. That ingredient is grim, dogged persistence on the part of leaders in continuing education and re-education of the community—and let all the community join in the great work.

These observations on the need for organization and on the need for a State Defender General and a Federal Defender General apply to the present and the very near future. They are not long range. They are coming to pass—in fact, they have passed and are passing—you have heard at this conference of two State legislatures which have passed bills providing for organized defender systems headed by a State Public Defender within the past two weeks. Currently, the legislature of Hawaii is considering the best plan to date. If the bill passes as written, and if carried fully into effect, I am of the opinion that it will reduce the crime rate 15% in the first year.

Before I move a little further into the future, I want to say once again what you have heard from many others already at this meeting. For nearly two centuries the lawyers of America have been donating free services to defendants in criminal cases who could not afford lawyers. I submit to you that we have been trying too long in vain to prove the falsity of the old adage: "You get what you pay for." The only way to provide competent representation is to pay for it, and I suggest that the principal source of these funds should be the governmental source. The Government has the primary interest in the proper administration of criminal justice. It should pay the charges for both the prosecutors and the defenders. I would also like to observe in passing that, in my opinion, both prosecutors and defenders are underpaid and that we will have a better administration of criminal justice when the compensation of the lawyers on both sides of the table in a criminal trial comes closer to the compensation realized by attorneys of like training and experience who practice in other areas of the law.

Now I would like to pass to a look that goes somewhat further into the future.

About half the business of our courts is now related to the administration of criminal justice. I suggest to you that the time has come to have a department of criminal justice—or it should take whatever name seems most appropriate to the government concerned. But it should be a department at the cabinet level of government. It could be headed by a director of criminal justice who might be appointed by the duly elected chief executive officer of the government. I further propose to you that under the director of criminal justice should be gathered all of the activities pertaining to the administration of criminal justice other than the judiciary. I believe that the best way to provide competence and continuity would probably arise out of a system which would give to all members of the department of criminal justice a professional career status or a status providing similar continuity and security. I believe that all of the heads of departments under the director of criminal justice should be career lawyers and that there should be, within the department, a career management division to see to it that the lawyers were so assigned that they reached high stages of competence in the whole area of criminal justice as they progressed in their careers.

Under the Director of Criminal Justice, at the very least, should be a Director of Prosecutions, a Director of Defense, a Director of Police and Investigations, a Director of Legal Research and Planning (who would be re-

sponsible for preparing the positions of the department to be presented to the legislature) and, above all, a comptroller who would be charged with continuous study to provide efficiency and proper compensation and to insure against the waste of Government funds. Of course, the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation would be under the Director of the Administration of Criminal Justice. Under a career plan it would be expected that the career lawyers would be moved through the various activities so that, at the end of 15 or 20 years, they would have a thorough comprehension.

Ultimately, we suggest to you that the Director of Prosecutions and the Director of Defense would not supervise or interfere in the trial of individual cases. They would be policy makers and would direct the flow of case assignments. Further, there should come a day when lawyers will no longer be designated defense attorneys or prosecution attorneys. They should be lawyers who could objectively do a full and fair job of representation on either side at any time. Thereby we would avoid any tendency to assign the more outstanding career counsel to either prosecution or defense.

We suggest to you that there should come a time when every individual, rich or poor, would be assigned a defense counsel by the Government. If the individual then wished to retain his own counsel, the Government counsel could be excused and the individual could retain and, of course, pay his own counsel.

To those who would say that this would destroy the criminal bar, I suggest to you that nearly all of our prominent defense lawyers had their original defense training in prosecutors' offices and stepped from Government employment into private practice. I suggest further that career lawyers would continue to step into private practice so as to provide a good supply of private practitioners who would be, of course, in the higher pay bracket. Correspondingly, qualified private practitioners could be admitted at appropriate levels into the career system, thus providing appropriate infusions of new ideas and cementing the Department of Criminal Justice more closely to their brothers in other areas of practice.

Not a single one of the ideas that I have placed before you in these past few minutes is less than a thousand years old. Good men are born, flourish briefly here on earth and then they die. Good ideas are born, flourish briefly or for a long time, then they are lost or isolated in other countries in a time of social upheaval—but they never die. As we look to the future, let us find and reassemble some of the best ideas, organize and implement them, so that the idea of equal justice will become a mature reality that will never die.

#### A SALUTE TO A NEW PUBLICATION

**HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of urban blight, both physical and psychological, has consumed an enormous amount of time in the Halls of Congress and the corridors of Government agencies and special commissions. Many of us are beginning to feel that the decaying structure of the inner city is irreversible. It is heartening to learn therefore that a group of Washington inner city residents are attacking one segment of this problem on their own.



I refer to the publishers of the upcoming magazine the People on the Streets. These three young men, Peter A. Noterman, a noted corporation lawyer, Richard Margolies, a member of the Institute for Policy Studies, and Verner Gray, a photographer, have already entered the prepublication stage of this venture.

Mr. Noterman, the spearhead of the group, has stated that there is a striking need for communication among inner city residents, but this need is not fulfilled through the existing channels. People seldom write letters to their friends or to those they can expect to see from time to time in their neighborhoods.

If a man has an idea he generally speaks it to his wife, or friend, or bar companion, smuggling it into general conversation, and watching it drift away with the usual vague smoke of talk.

If the person with the complaint or concept is possessed of an itch to write, he composes a poem or story or formal essay, perhaps manages to have it accepted for publication, and addresses it to distant readers whose names and circumstances he cannot know.

The theory behind the People on the Streets is striking in its simplicity and accessibility. Beginning in July, the magazine will be published and distributed to the people who live in the Adams-Morgan and Dupont Circle areas of Northwest Washington. It is open to all who wish to write for it. It is to serve as an instrument whereby people can write about what they know and think for their friends and enemies; parents and teachers; fellow writers and workers.

This is to be a self-supporting venture, not dependant on public or foundation funds.

I am sure all the Members of the House will applaud this venture which will attempt to solve a local problem on the local level with local participation.

#### APOLLO 10 TO CREDIT OF MILITARY, INDUSTRY

**HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN**  
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most Members of Congress have received numerous letters berating the military-industrial complex, containing a quote, taken out of context, from the farewell address of former President Eisenhower.

It was, therefore, very gratifying to me to read a letter written to the editor of the Atlanta Journal upholding the work of the complex. The letter is in regard to one of the more outstanding accomplishments of the so-called complex.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the accomplishment makes me proud to be an American.

The letter follows:

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITORS: APOLLO 10 TO CREDIT OF MILITARY, INDUSTRY

The EDITORS: As I watched in awe the beginning of the Apollo 10 flight, I was so deeply impressed, as I am sure many other millions of Americans were, with the incredible bravery of the crew and with the fantastic technological achievement it represented. There are few Americans, I think, who did not feel a deep sense of pride in the accomplishment of our fellow Americans who brought this to realization.

And then my train of thought went on to ponder that these men who rode Apollo 10 and the men who designed and built it were members of the so-called "military-industrial complex." The latter term has somehow been subtly used as a dirty word by the left wingers and even by some of our national legislators, who at best should know better and at worst bring their patriotism into doubt. Most charitably perhaps, they should be viewed as dupes of the people who seek to make of the United States a second rate power. The "military-industrial complex" is not a monolithic, faceless, inorganic mass. It is composed of individuals whose sons fight, bleed and die in Vietnam just as the inhabitants of the ghetto do and just as many other American sons are doing. I am sure that there are none in this "complex" who would not want the war over tomorrow and their sons back in the States regardless of the consequence it might have on their business or on their career.

The same companies that made the spacecraft, the fuel that powered it, the instrumentation that directed it, are almost without exception manufacturers of goods for civilian and peace time use to a much greater percentage than their war business represents.

One final word. The military is being assailed in some quarters for the Vietnam war, when any thinking person knows that the decisions which brought on our involvement in the war and even in the pursuit and conduct of the war itself, are almost entirely political. So let's get off the back of the military and industrial complex and give them the honors which they deserve for their amazing achievements and for making our country strong and keeping it that way.

FREDERICK J. WALTERS.

ATLANTA.

#### THE ECONOMICS OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT

**HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1969

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it was with great interest that I noted today's publication of the report, "The Economics of Military Procurement," by the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee.

To say the least, this excellent and perceptive report does much to pinpoint the too long endured squanderbund of multibillions of taxpayers' dollars by the obviously grossly mismanaged area of military procurement within the Department of Defense.

Certainly, among other things, this report does much to underscore the propriety of my presentation, before this body, of two rather typically routine cases of the great morass of competition restric-

tion and dollar waste too long permitted within the U.S. Army Electronics Command.

My first presentation, on May 15, concerned that which, with pointed conservatism, I estimated to have cost \$835.125 in sheer waste. Though, admittedly, this was the smallest such case that I could find in my file, my second presentation, on May 26, concerned that which, again with pointed conservatism, I estimated to have cost at least \$30,000,000 in waste out of a total sum of about \$75,000,000 spent on one project.

It is, therefore, quite understandable that I found abundant documentation of my own discoveries and my own effort to expose and remedy this incredible condition in such statements as these within the subcommittee's incisive indictment of Department of Defense procurement practices and procedures:

There is evidence that literally billions of dollars are being wasted in defense spending each year.

Huge cost overruns, slipshod management of multi-billion dollar weapons programs and concealment of information from Congress and the public have become common practices at the highest levels of the Pentagon.

In my concern and efforts regarding this strange, even suspect, disdain by the military procurement people for the American tradition of free competition and sound, dollar-conscious business practices, it is understandable that I also found documentation and support for my position in the fact that, among the subcommittee's specific criticisms were:

Lack of competition in procurement practices producing high costs, poor performance and late delivery of items being purchased.

Some experts believe that in the absence of effective competition procurement costs are 25 percent to 50 percent higher than what they would be under competitive conditions.

All of these elements of complaint and criticism lay shockingly at the heart of both of the Army Electronics Command cases which I have placed before the House. Although these cases are tragic enough, the greater tragedy is found in the fact that they are neither new nor different from a bizarre pattern of performance which, dating back to the urgency of World War II, has proved the backbone of the ever-expanding, already monstrously hulking phenomenon which the late President Eisenhower defined as the "military-industrial complex," and against which, with both wisdom and concern, he attempted to warn us.

As I told this body yesterday, the kindest thing that can be said for those responsible for this condition would be "incredible indifference," or "inordinate stupidity"; for to brand it more severely—and perhaps we should—would tend to suggest the possible propriety of the indictment and prosecution of someone, somewhere.

Meanwhile, as I also noted, it is in consideration of this problem which, obviously, the military procurement people will not rectify by themselves, that I am currently drafting legislation designed for remedy.