

Robert A. Mueller
James D. Sherrill

Jerrold B. Wilson

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

Clifton H. Acre
Merlin F. Anderson
Cager W. Campbell
Thomas A. Comeau
Arlyn R. Daering
Michael L. Doeter
Edward B. Dorsey
Thomas J. Glover
Jerry F. Hendricks
James E. Hudson

Charles E. Hughes
Thomas L. Lappin
George A. Mullen
Linville L. Ridener
Donald J. Rockwood,
Jr.
Myles E. Walsh
Alton L. Williams
Philip B. Wilson

Lt. John B. Ferruggiaro, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Ensign Philip A. Peterson, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Edwards, John W.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

DeBobs, Richard D.
Johnson, James I.

NURSE CORPS

Vought, Dorothy M.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adam, Ernest W.
Beam, David M.
Blakely, Frederick M.,
Jr.
Buckner, Joel K.
Conklin, Robert C.
Cupper, Terrance A.
Dolgow, Barry L.
Ede, Terrence F.
Hatfield, Stephen H.
Johnson, Richard L.,
Jr.
Jones, Philip W.
Kalin, David M.
Kelly, Robert T.
McCann, Richard G.
Mitchell, Thomas A.

LINE

Moffett, Gordon N.
Neumann, Dennis E.
O'Brien, Peter A.
Powell, Orrin B., III
Reilly, Michael J.
Richards, Harry J.
Sarver, James D.
Scafer, Frederick
J. A.
Schneible, Daniel C.
Segraves, Joel R.
Simpson, John D., Jr.
Trotter, Herbert M.
Vermilyea, David W.
Wilkins, Hubert C.
Wilson, Robert C.

SUPPLY CORPS

Fronczkowski, Ralph
E.
Mayes, Robert D.
Miller, Barry J.

Ruppman, Heinz O.
Sweazey, George E.,
Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Madden, Peter P.
Palanuk, Lawrence E.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification thereof as provided by law:

LINE

Kummer, Sandra I.
Prose, Dorothy A.
Reid, Heather M.

Richardson, Robert L.
Warner, Carl D.

SUPPLY CORPS

Moore, Beryl R.
Scarola, Joseph R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bruce, Charles J.
Dean, Hilbert D.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1969:

AMBASSADORS

Robert H. McBride, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

Richard Funkhouser, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabon Republic.

G. McMurtrie Godley, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

J. William Middendorf II, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Lane Dwinell, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

PEACE CORPS

Thomas J. Houser, of Illinois, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 12, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou hast given a banner to them that fear Thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth.—Psalms 60: 4.

Almighty God, we thank Thee for our beloved Republic, for the heritage which is ours, for the traditions and the institutions of a free people which have come down to us through the sacrifices of our fathers, and for which we now must live and labor to keep alive in our day.

Our hearts are thrilled as we look upon the starry banner, the flag of our United States of America. It speaks of freedom and democracy. It stands for law and order, justice and liberty, for peace and good will to all. It serves to proclaim the good news of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. May this flag continue to be the symbol of hope to the oppressed, the rainbow of promise to the downtrodden, and the banner of freedom to all men.

May we celebrate its birth not only with our lips but with the lives devoted to Thee and dedicated to our country. Amen and amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 28, 1969, the Chair declares the House in recess for the pur-

pose of observing and commemorating Flag Day.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to call of the Chair.

FLAG DAY

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the United States Flag, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding:

FLAG DAY PROGRAM, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 12, 1969

The United States Marine Band, directed by First Lieutenant Jack T. Kline, and the United States Air Force "Singing Sergeants" entered the door to the left of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The honored guests, officers and men of the First Cavalry Division (Airmobile), entered the door to the right of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The Air Force "Singing Sergeants," directed by Capt. Robert B. Kuzminski, presented *Prayer for our Country*.

The Doorkeeper (Honorable William M. Miller) announced *The Flag of the United States*.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The Marine Band played *The Stars and Stripes Forever*.

The Flag was carried into the Chamber by Colorbearer and a guard from each of the branches of the Armed Forces: Staff Sergeant Walter E. Dunkel, Jr., Honor Guard, 3d Infantry, Fort Myer, Va., Army; Corporal Antonio R. Aleman, Guard Co., Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., Marine; Seaman Michael K. Kuzma, Ceremonial Guard, Navy Station, Washington, D.C., Navy; Staff Sergeant William R. Williams, Honor Guard, 1100 Security Police Squadron, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C., Air Force; Seaman John K. Helms, Honor Guard, Washington Radio Station, Alexandria, Va., Coast Guard.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House.

The Flag was posted and the Members were seated.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas, accompanied by the Honorable W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, took his place at the Speaker's rostrum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HALL, will now lead the Members and our guests in the *Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag*.

The Honorable DURWARD HALL led the Members and guests in the *Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag*.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to express my appreciation to the other members of your Flag

Day Committee, the Honorable BILL NICHOLS of Alabama, the Honorable DUREN HALL of Missouri, and the Honorable RICHARD ROUBEUSH of Indiana, for their hard work and dedicated efforts.

The Air Force Choral Group, the "Singing Sergeants," directed by Captain Robert B. Kuzminski, will now present a medley of songs appropriate for this occasion.

The Air Force "Singing Sergeants," directed by Captain Robert B. Kuzminski, presented *This is My Country* and *Army Blue*.

[Applause.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day, 1969, is a day for all Americans to reaffirm their commitment to the principles of democracy, liberty, and human dignity.

Our forefathers were truly committed to the concept of freedom. They valued it highly; they worked hard for it; and they were willing to fight and sacrifice for it. They knew the meaning of liberty and they were determined to protect and expand the rights of man.

The successful functioning of a democratic system places a heavy burden on the shoulders of its citizens. It requires an enlightened people—aware of the complexities of their national development. It requires an understanding people—capable of accepting the shortcomings of others and willing to work for the improvement of society. And, it requires a people prepared to assume the obligations and exercise the responsibilities so necessary for the protection of democratic freedoms.

Today, these responsibilities are many—and they are important. In a democracy, citizens must participate. This participation is central to the efficient functioning of free institutions. It is necessary in order that our decisions reflect the views of all citizens, and it is necessary if our Government is to be responsive to the needs of our people.

Citizens must speak out on public issues. They must convey their thoughts to those who make the decisions affecting the future of this Nation. They must also be willing to serve in positions of leadership. They must recognize the rights of others.

Our system requires dedication to the ideals and principles which form the basis of democratic thought and action. These principles require a commitment to the rights of man—a commitment honored by the dedication and service of our fighting men.

Today, we have as our honored guests some of the officers and men of the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile). As a highly flexible air-striking force, by their heroic efforts in Vietnam, the 1st Air Cavalry Division has gained the admiration, respect, and confidence of free men everywhere.

These men are of courage. They serve the cause of liberty and freedom. They know what it is to sacrifice for their country. Many of them bear the scars of wounds suffered in Vietnam. Their commitment to the principle of democracy has been made clear by their actions in defense of this country. They have answered the call to arms and they have

defended the principles of this Nation with gallantry and dedication. To secure the freedoms we enjoy, they have endured the anguish and hardships of countless battles.

At this time, will General Kinnard, General Becker, General Blanchard, and the men of the 1st Air Cavalry Division stand so that we can express our appreciation and admiration.

[The Honored Guests rose.]

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. BROOKS. We also have with us today Mrs. Ben Dorsey, affectionately known as the "Mother" of the First Air Cavalry Division. "Mother" Dorsey designed the big, golden patch with the black horse's head worn by this courageous combat-hardened division. Mrs. Dorsey, will you please stand.

[Mrs. Dorsey rose.]

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. BROOKS. We also have with us two men of the First Air Cavalry who have received the highest military award bestowed by this Nation. Both of these men were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their heroic service in Vietnam. Both Medals were earned by heroism that also involved valiant and gallant efforts to save their comrades. Will Sergeant Charles Chris Hagemaster and Chief Warrant Officer Frederick Ferguson please stand.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. BROOKS. Gentlemen, on behalf of a grateful House of Representatives, I salute you. Your resourcefulness and valor will long serve as an inspiration to those who are committed to the defense of freedom.

Today, our country is confronted with the challenge of crisis at home and in distant lands. The traditions, values, and principles for which many have sacrificed so much are being attacked on many fronts. Our task is to successfully meet this challenge, sustained by a deep love of country and a renewed dedication to liberty and justice. The love we feel for our country is embodied in the stars and stripes of our Flag. It is the very essence of the American character. American patriotism is not blind to our weaknesses for it recognizes the distance we yet must travel to attain the goals we seek for all men.

If we understand the true meaning of freedom, the sacrifices that have been made, and the goals of this Nation, we will be able to protect the American tradition and the rights of all men.

As a symbol of the majesty of a great Nation, our Flag serves as a beacon of hope to the oppressed of other lands. Our Flag represents the strengths and the values and the highest traditions of this country—it signifies the pride we have in our heritage, as we face the future, resolved that our actions will bring honor to this Banner.

It represents our aspirations as a people, it embodies our faith in the American tradition—A tradition we dream of—a tradition we work for—and a tradition we hope to hand down to our children.

May our Flag continue to strike a responsive chord in the hearts of free men everywhere and offer hope, op-

portunity and promise to those who strive for the highest goals.

[Applause.]

Mr. BROOKS. The Members and guests will please rise to join with the "Singing Sergeants," accompanied by the Marine Band, in singing *The National Anthem*. Will everyone please remain standing while the Colors are retired from the Chamber?

The Members rose and sang *The National Anthem*, accompanied by the Marine Band and the Air Force "Singing Sergeants."

The Colors were retired from the Chamber, the Marine Band playing *The National Emblem March*.

The Air Force "Singing Sergeants" retired from the Chamber, the Marine Band playing the Armed Forces Medley.

The Marine Band retired from the Chamber.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the names of the members of the First Air Cavalry Division who represent that division in this ceremony today are:

CSM. Charles L. McQuerry, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Sp/5. Carl Harris, Laurel, Maryland.

Sgt. Gerald Miller, Laurel, Maryland.

Sp/4. Murray C. Coon, Norwich, New York.

SFC. Hazle Massey, Riverdale, Maryland.

MSG. Paul A. Boldt, Blairsville, Pennsylvania.

1SG. William T. Mooney, Arlington, Virginia.

CSM. John R. Jones, Ethelsville, Alabama.

SSG. Jerry M. Musselwhite, Kannapolis, North Carolina.

Cpt. Marvin W. Solomon, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

SFC. Donald A. Troy, Archbald, Pennsylvania.

Sgt. Michael A. Schumacher, Santa Monica, California.

Sgt. Roy W. Hawks, Runnemede, New Jersey.

SSG. Charles W. Henson, Prince Frederick, Maryland.

Sgt. John A. Tunewald, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

PFC. Volney H. DePriest, Elkridge, Maryland.

Sp/5. Frederick N. Clark, Severn, Maryland.

Sp/5. Ray S. Stanley, Houston, Texas.

Sp/4. Harvey E. Ward, Dale City, Woodbridge, Virginia.

Sgt. James R. Gochie, Lunenburg, Vermont.

Sp/5. William M. Roach, Jr., Brunswick, Georgia.

At 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m., the proceedings in honor of the United States Flag were concluded.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, on behalf of the House, desires to express our thanks to the chairman and the members of the committee for arranging, preparing, and conducting the splendid exercises today, and also to express the

thanks of the House to all who participated in the exercises.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House of Representatives, in this great Republic, it is a pleasure for me to participate in the Flag Day ceremonies held in this Chamber today.

I am sure that the hearts of all Americans beat just a bit faster when the flag of our country is presented, and what more fitting place could be found than the floor of the world's most freedom-minded body?

A flag is only a symbol, but it is the most important symbol of our national existence. The Stars and Stripes has flown all over the world. From the beaches of Normandy to the wall in Berlin; from the island of Okinawa to the continent of Antarctica; and now we expect it on the moon. It has been a sign of strength to the weak, and placed fear in the hearts of the evil. It has been loved by many and vilified by the nonunderstanding or uninterested. It has been trampled by mobs, spat at, slept on, ripped to shreds, shot at, and burned, yet it still remains the emblem of those who would be free.

A flag means many things to many people, but uppermost in the minds of all it is the symbol of this Republic, peopled by those who truly believe that a representative government is mankind's only way to have one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The Flag Day ceremony held in the House of Representatives today was a prime example of the courtesy due our Nation's ensign, and perhaps is best said in the words of the following poems. I place these poems at this point in the RECORD:

THE FLAG GOES BY

(By Henry Holcomb Bennett)

Hats off!

Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
A flash of color beneath the sky!

Hats off!

The flag is passing by!

Blue and crimson and white it shines
Over the steel-tipped, ordered lines.

Hats off!

The colors before us fly;
But more than the flag is passing by.

Sea-fights and land-fights, grim and great,
Fought to make and to save the State;
Weary marches and sinking ships;
Cheers of victory on dying lips;

Days of plenty and years of peace;
March of a strong land's swift increase;
Equal justice, right, and law,
Stately honor and reverend awe;

Sign of a nation, great and strong
To ward her people from foreign wrong:
Pride and glory and honor—all
Live in the colors to stand or fall.

Hats off!

Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums;
And loyal hearts are beating high;
Hats off!
The flag is passing by!

—
This flag, of red, white and blue
May not mean very much to you
But as for me this banner flies
And with its mighty voice it cries
Out to peoples far and near
To proclaim our freedom here.
A small beginning, I agree,

But like the acorn to a tree
Thirteen states we had at first,
But as our country grew, our thirst
For land and freedom did not stop.
That land did well; produced a crop
For countries of the world to share
And then they knew our flag was fair
And underneath the starry wing
Foreign peoples helped to sing
The greatest story ever told.
The story of our country bold,
Of its birth into the world
And of its wondrous flag unfurled.
And over the world there ne'er will stand
The flag of any other land
That will mean as much to me
As this flag of liberty.

FLAG DAY CEREMONIES HONOR
VETERANS OF THE FIRST AIR
CAVALRY DIVISION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of the program the names of those members of the First Air Cavalry Division who attended and represented that division in the ceremony.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY—GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I find it highly admirable that we have this opportunity again to display our respect in the House of Representatives for the greatest symbol of freedom this world knows—the American flag.

I urge that every man, woman, and child of this Nation ask himself on this traditional commemorative day how may he be of service to his country and a partner with others as a keeper of peace.

I hope that we will not let our fighting men and women down in their battle for freedom and that we here at home will keep the spirit of the American flag and its history close to us as we strive to make our Nation greater for the future.

Some in this Nation would have us believe that the flag is simply a ritual without any meaning. I would ask those who seek to destroy our flag, "Does it have any meaning for you that you are here alive in this great Nation of ours today and not buried under the might of those enemies we have fought in the past?" The flag is our symbol of freedom is my answer to those who burn or otherwise desecrate, deface, or defile the American flag. For those who show disrespect to the flag or even choose not to salute it nor pay it allegiance, they are not loyal Americans with any spirit of national feeling. They have nothing for their country in their life.

When I see the American flag during military ceremonies, or on my campaigns for reelection or when it is displayed in our cities and streets and on our buildings; I see kids eating hot dogs at the ball game, football teams lined up for the kickoff, America's huge industrial might turning out the best in manufactured goods any nation ever has had, mothers playing with their children in the park, clean-cut teenagers and college students walking across campus or doing the frug, jetstreams in the sky, and I can

hear the railway engines wail at night along with the bellow of a bull elk through the forest.

But, too, I can see the Marines putting the flag up on Iwo Jima and the flag-draped caskets of Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy and the all too many coffins coming home from Vietnam.

Our flag tells the world we are a proud and strong Nation, loving peace and freedom and always ready to defend our country.

Let us hope that the placement of the American flag on the moon by the crew of Apollo 11 next month, will cast around the world and emblazon the message and vision that truly this is a great country.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, the flag of the United States will be 192 years old. It has served us well.

In recognition, June 9 to 15 has been proclaimed National Flag Week.

This annual tribute is worthwhile and just—but it remains an annual event. In Vietnam, our flag flies every day in defense of this Nation.

In Edna, Tex., our flag flies every day in support of our defenders. Since January of 1967, nearly 150 flags have flown in daily tribute to the young men in Vietnam. Flags unfurl from store fronts and front porches of a people united in a common purpose—pride in country.

It all began in December of 1966 during a trip to Berkeley by the then mayor, A. D. Tinker. The student turmoil, the obscene disregard for democratic principles and desecration of the flag greatly affected Mr. Tinker. Rather than strike out blindly at the students, he chose a constructive approach which he hoped would be meaningful.

Upon his return to Edna, the mayor drafted the following resolution:

Be it known that inasmuch as our sons are sacrificing their lives in a conflict on foreign soil and knowing that draft card burners, protest marches and anti-war demonstrations tend to give aid and comfort to the enemy and prolong the war, we, the city fathers of Edna, condemn all such un-American activity and wishing to show our support of the government of these United States, do decree that the flag of the United States be displayed along our streets until an honorable peace has been secured in Viet Nam.

This approach was meaningful indeed. The townspeople embraced the resolution and have continued to do so. The norm in an undertaking such as this is for an initial spurt of enthusiasm, then a gradual fade to token support. Not so in Edna; the project has grown. Since 1967, the Boy Scouts have replenished the nearly 150 flags on four separate occasions. The present city administration and county officials have carried on in strong support.

Immediately after passing the resolution in 1967, the mayor received 600 letters from across the world—128 came from servicemen in Vietnam. Thirty-nine wounded men in war hospitals wanted to join the Edna American Legion. They were promptly made honorary members.

Since that time, the interest has swelled. About half a dozen other towns have jumped in with similar programs—one of those I am proud to say, is also in Texas—the town of Cuero.

Edna also has a considerable flag program in reverse underway. The townspeople have sent numerous Texas flags to Vietnam battlefields.

As we remember Flag Day, June 12, and the glories our flag has brought to this Nation, let us also pay tribute to the 5,000 people of Edna. They make patriotism a way of life—every day of their lives.

As the flag flies today in America, we are mindful that it also flies over the battlefields in Vietnam. We join in a united hope that this conflict will be brought to a just and honorable conclusion with all due speed and care. Tucked into every fold of the flag, where ever it flies, is the promise to all Americans—the promise of freedom.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Saturday will be the anniversary of the adoption of the design of our national flag. It was on June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress resolved that—

The flag of the United States shall be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white, with a union of thirteen stars of white on a blue field, representing a new constellation.

Although Saturday will therefore be a day of great significance to our country and to each of the sovereign States that make up these United States, another great day will soon arrive, one that will have especial meaning to the great State that I am privileged to represent in part in this great body.

The Fourth of July is the day on which a new star is added to the flag in recognition of the admission of a new State to the Union. This was not always the case, the practice in the early days of the Republic being somewhat different.

The original 13 stripes and 13 stars remained undisturbed until January 17, 1794, when Congress added two stripes and two stars to represent Vermont and Kentucky, the 14th and 15th States to join the Union. On April 18, 1818, Congress provided that the flag should have 13 alternate red and white stripes to represent the original States and that a star should be added for each new State on the July 4 that next followed its admission into the Union. On Independence Day of that year, the States of Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, and Mississippi saw their stars added to the galaxy.

The first State for which a star was added to the flag on the anniversary of our independence was the great State of Illinois. This took place on July 4, 1819, when the 21st star joined the stars and stripes. The sesquicentennial of this great occasion will occur 3 weeks from tomorrow.

During the many years that have intervened since my State's star became part of our national emblem, Illinois has endeavored to be worthy of its position in the national constellation. During those eventful 150 years, 29 other stars have been added to Old Glory, as the United States have extended themselves across the continent, into the Pacific, and above the Arctic Circle. Truly the words "E Pluribus Unum" have taken on new meaning. It was my happy privilege to be able to vote for the legislation that

enabled the last two States to add their stars to our flag.

This afternoon's observance is a fitting rebuke to those who have expressed their contempt for our Nation, its people, and its ideals by setting fire to its national banner. This would not, however, be sufficient justification for such an observance, as the handful of flag burners represents only the dregs of society.

Let our commemoration of the original Flag Day be placed upon the broadest possible basis by declaring that when we honor the flag we honor those who have carried it to victory in our wars, those who have taken it with them as they circumnavigated the globe on space flights, those who have worked to establish freedom and justice for all, and those who have served the Nation in humble but nonetheless essential labors as they have gone about their daily tasks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my words of tribute to the Stars and Stripes with these inspiring lines from Joseph Rodman Drake's poem, "The American Flag":

When Freedom from her mountain height
Unfurled her standard to the air,
She tore the azure robe of night,
And set the stars of glory there.

She mingled with its gorgeous dyes
The milky baldrick of the skies,
And striped its pure celestial white
With streakings of the morning light;
Then from his mansion in the sun
She called her eagle-bearer down,
And gave into his mighty hand
The symbol of her chosen land.

Flag of the free heart's hope and home!
By angel hands to valor given;
Thy stars have lit the welkin dome,
And all thy hues were born in heaven.
Forever float that standard sheet!

Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With Freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, while the flag that we are honoring this afternoon has added many stars to the original 13, it is fundamentally the same banner that was designed in 1777.

Even though it now has 50 stars, it is the same flag that Betsy Ross sewed almost two centuries ago, the same one that Francis Scott Key saw as the day dawned after the bombardment of Fort McHenry, the same one that Barbara Fritchie waved from the attic window as the hosts of the Confederacy marched through nearby Frederick.

The flag that waved over Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, Chateau-Thierry, Iwo Jima, and a hundred other battlefields is the same one to which we pay tribute today. It is the one that has meant deliverance in a promised land to millions who have come here from foreign shores, as well as a birthright of freedom to hundreds of millions fortunate enough to have been born here.

Mr. Speaker, may the Stars and Stripes continue to wave over a free people and may it be an inspiration to the generations that will follow us.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on this Flag Day, 1969, I am proud to call the attention of my colleagues to an organization which, since 1905, has worked tirelessly to foster patriots and perpetuate our American heri-

tage by encouraging recognition and respect for our flag.

It was 64 years ago when the Allentown, Pa., Flag Day Association was conceived. From that day to this, citizens of Allentown, Pa., have paid special respect to the Stars and Stripes.

The membership of the Allentown Flag Day Association were instrumental in having the national Elks organization establish an annual program of tributes to the U.S. flag on June 14 of each year, the anniversary of the Stars and Stripes' adoption as the flag of our Nation by the Continental Congress.

Further, through their active promotion of respect for our flag, the Allentown Flag Day Association has championed legislation to make Flag Day a national holiday. I hope that this 91st Congress will recognize the opportunity a national Flag Day holiday offers to renew throughout our country the keen spirit of respect for our flag which most Americans have shown through nearly two centuries.

Flag Day is observed each year as a municipal holiday in Allentown. It should be similarly observed throughout the United States.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, June 14, 1969 will mark the 93d nationwide annual observance of Flag Day and the 192d anniversary since the adoption of the flag of the United States as resolved by the Congress in Philadelphia on June 14, 1777:

That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

"Old Glory," so named by sea captain William Driver, of Salem, Mass., was thus described by George Washington:

We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity, representing liberty.

On June 14, 1917, President Wilson said of the flag:

And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us and of the records they wrote upon it. We celebrate the day of its birth, and from its birth until now, it has witnessed a great history, has floated on high the symbol of great events, of a great plan of life, worked out by a great people.

More recently, on June 10, 1967, President Johnson proclaimed:

This is the flag that crossed the oceans in defense of freedom, that waved in smoke above Corregidor, that was pushed aloft on Iwo Jima, that cheered the liberated peoples of Europe. This is the flag that has covered the remains of those who died in freedom's cause.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy indeed that I see the emergence among those of younger generations of individuals untouched by the lessons of history, except that they are free citizens because of the sacrifices of those who have gone before them. I am equally concerned about the growing number of so-called enlightened intellectuals who have found fertile ground in our educational institutions at all levels, spreading mistrust and suspi-

cion of our way of life and flaunting our heritage. To be sure, the contradictions in our democratic society are many, the ideal of peace and the fact of war are not easily reconciled, and the ironies of poverty among prosperity and of oppression in a society of justice for all are defiant of rationale. That our Nation has endured these dilemmas is a sign of the courage and faith of its people. But our survival as a free nation today has never been more threatened from amongst our own numbers.

Brigadier General Shaw, on the occasion of Flag Day in 1958, rightly stated:

Nothing is free, and nothing worthwhile is cheap. From our forebears we have inherited a priceless birthright of freedom and justice and equality. We must fulfill the trust which has been passed on to us. We must preserve this heritage and pass it on to our successor, not only unimpaired but enriched.

Have we too much freedom? It is a very relevant question and it might be well for the militants and radicals to ask themselves how long such conduct under a totalitarian regime would be tolerated or whether the suppression of all dissent in a society of tyranny is worth the price to be paid should our free institutions be destroyed. The present tactics being employed in dissent and protest are too closely akin to anarchy and, in my estimation, detract from rather than enhance reconciliation of what might otherwise be dealt with as legitimate grievances.

I was impressed by an editorial carried in the April 1969 issue of the *New Age* magazine. It is timely and the setting appropriately is the Nation's Capital. I include it herewith:

HAVE WE TOO MUCH FREEDOM?

On January 21, 1969, the day following the inauguration of Richard M. Nixon as President of the United States, I had occasion to take a cab in Washington, D.C., on a route that almost paralleled the one the inaugural parade had taken the day before. My driver was obviously a native of one of the Caribbean countries, possibly Jamaica, and spoke with more than a trace of a British accent.

As we came by the parade stands which were now being dismantled, I asked the cabbie whether he had been very busy the day before with all the spectators in town. He answered: "No, I decided to take most of the day off after the beginning of the ceremonies, and went home and kept my eyes glued to the television set. You know, Mister," he went on, "I really love this country. It's the only place in the world where a poor man like me with no family background can get an education and make his way in life as an independent citizen. I just got sick when I saw those long-haired, screaming freaks trying to draw attention to themselves when the President's party went by."

I shook my head in silent agreement with him, and he continued: "Later on when I was back cruising around for business, I saw a bunch of them being chased by the police, away from the park in front of the White House. They'd gotten in there although the park was taken over for the day by government equipment, and so forth. Some of them ran by my cab and the wild way they looked I think I'd been of another race they might've tried to tip over my cab or do some other mischief. I cut my engine off for a time and just sat there sorrowful . . . and I still am. Last night I couldn't sleep, trying to figure this thing out. What's wrong, any-

way? Here's a country that has tried to help the world and has made it possible for the ambitious to get someplace—and yet here's a minority fully determined to destroy the system that has made it possible for them to 'mobify'. Finally, toward morning, I came to the conclusion that we just have too much freedom. This group thinks freedom gives them the power, the right, to beat up or shoot at anyone who disagrees with them or shows any resistance. They think it gives them the right to rob a bank or any person they want so they can get money for their contemptuous assault on the type of government they have inherited—or maybe acquired by immigration as I did—without working for it. I guess freedom just comes too easy. I'm afraid of what will happen when the great bulk of the people who really treasure freedom begins to think and to turn on these fellows. I'm almost afraid if I met up with more of them, myself, I'd be tempted to run the cab over them."

About that time we arrived at my destination. I thanked the gentleman for giving me a lesson in present-day patriotism and wished him luck.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Flag Day 1969, I find no better way to express myself than to reiterate the "Pledge of Allegiance," affirming my solemn faith in these United States, her heritage and people, and holding our flag high as a symbol of freedom.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. MIZE, Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 14, is Flag Day. On that date, in 1777, the Continental Congress officially adopted the Stars and Stripes as our national emblem.

Flag Day is an appropriate time to honor our predecessors for the struggles they have borne. Through bitter war and numbing depression our Nation's people have persevered for nearly two centuries—the longest sustained period of freedom under a written constitution in the history of man. We should reflect for a moment on the sacrifices our forebears have made to preserve our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our traditions of representative democracy, our unique and resilient Republic.

Under the Constitution, the Federal Government is prohibited from suppressing free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, the right to associate and assemble freely, and the right to vote as a freeman. Through the application of provisions of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, the States are prohibited from suppressing those same basic, unalienable rights.

Under the Stars and Stripes, a nation has been born, suffered its adolescence, and matured to become the sword and shield of freedom, the "last best hope" of humanity so long accustomed to tyranny.

THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

There have been times in our history as a people when it appeared that the American experiment would fail. The War Between the States was the most severe test, but the inspired leadership of Lincoln sustained our Nation in its darkest hour.

There is no question in my mind that the Union soldiers, through the agony of battle, through disease and personal dep-

ression, through all the trials of those times, were fighting for more than territorial integrity.

They were sustained through the struggle by an emerging concept of the dignity and worth of the individual, the priceless sanctity of the human soul.

The intolerable curse of slavery was purged from the continent by men committed to a more perfect notion of freedom—freedom for all men—and that notion, so obscure a century ago, so fragile in those times, has become the central principle of Americanism. It is the foundation upon which the President, the Congress, and the courts build to achieve a more perfect Union.

THE THREAT TO THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Another test that our Nation survived was much more subtle, much less fraught with passion, but nonetheless a struggle for the survival of constitutional democracy. That test was the attempted packing of the Supreme Court during the depths of the depression. Had that ruse succeeded, the courts—an independent pillar and an equal partner in the trinity that is the Federal structure—would likely have become a pawn of the executive branch. Fearful for their integrity, the courts would have been forced to submit to the will of a President strong enough to subvert the performance of their constitutional duties.

The American people, in spite of temptation to seek dishonorable peace, have fought. The American people, in spite of the temptation to blindly follow a strong leader in times of economic crisis, have persevered in the belief that difficult times pass—but the Constitution is for all time, and surely our greatest secular protector and strength.

TODAY THE STRUGGLE GOES ON

Under General Washington, the colonists fought for freedom, when peace under a despotic king 3,300 miles away—would surely have been an easier alternative. Compromise and negotiation would surely have been possible, but our Founding Fathers chose to build a free and independent nation, and for that decision and those sacrifices we have been thankful to this day.

Under Lincoln, men fought to preserve the indivisible Union—and they fought to free other men caught in the remnants of barbarian slavery.

Under Chief Justice Earl Warren, who retires this month after 16 years on the Bench, and under President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon, the Nation has moved to destroy the remaining vestiges of slavery—the trappings of slavery—from a nation seeking to fulfill its historic role and destiny.

Many men of good will do not agree with some of the decisions of the Warren court—these decisions are too recently with us. But I am confident that through the coming years, as our people struggle to perfect the covenants of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, men will come to recognize that these years just past were another turning point.

The American Nation, under the Stars and Stripes, has emerged from the past decade and a half a nation more conscious of its responsibilities to all its

citizens, and has sought to meet those responsibilities.

THE YEARS AHEAD

And so, as we look ahead to the remaining three decades of this millennium, we search for the appropriate path to follow under the Stars and Stripes.

To my mind, our course is clear. We must set an example for a world so desperately in need of leadership, moral as well as military. We must demonstrate at home that men of all races and creeds can live and work together—under one flag—as free men with equal rights and equal responsibilities.

We must demonstrate that a free people can be a just people. That is the promise that our Founding Fathers made to generations of Americans yet unborn, and it is a promise which we must keep.

For the first time in our national history we are in the inescapable position of world leadership. Our success abroad as well as our tranquillity at home, depends upon our dedication to the freedom which our flag embodies.

We cannot escape from this responsibility. Indeed, we should rejoice in our opportunities. Our people, and all the world, watch us on this Flag Day.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today we hold our annual observance in honor of our flag. On Flag Day, June 14, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson said:

We meet to celebrate Flag Day because this flag which we honor and under which we serve is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation.

I would like to expand just a little on his wonderful words. Most Americans are known—and proudly so—as flag wavers. We resent and regret any action that smacks of disrespect for the Stars and Stripes.

We do so because, like Francis Scott Key, we have seen Old Glory embattled, and we have known the joy of helping to keep it high "o'er the ramparts we watched."

This flag belongs to every American. It proclaims our freedom, our rights, our duties. But in the family of nations it is more than just another national emblem.

If the American flag were to stand merely for nationalism—for a loyalty required of citizens—it would be no different and mean no more than any other flag. But ours is a very special flag, with special significance for all mankind.

It signifies that the Declaration of Independence, as Abraham Lincoln said, "gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world."

Let us imbue in ourselves and our children the so-called old-fashioned patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our country was founded.

Should not every home own and proudly display the National Colors on holidays and other patriotic occasions? Is the flag not the bequest to us of Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Ellis, Washington, Nathan Hale, Paul Revere, Andrew Jackson and other great men who have given us our heritage of freedom? When you look at this flag cannot you see Valley Forge, the Alamo,

Corregidor, Pearl Harbor, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*, Korea, and Gettysburg? Lest we forget, is not the flag the symbol of Flanders Field, Bataan, Iwo Jima, and Normandy Beach? The greatest events of our past and present are symbolized by our flag.

It is the proud symbol of a nation blessed by prospering industries, universal education, and free institutions. Our great Republic has been chosen by destiny to be mankind's last and best hope, a haven for the oppressed and persecuted of the world. That is what the flag means to me. Can we wave it too much? I do not think so.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to recommend the passage of my bill to provide that Flag Day shall be celebrated annually, as a Federal holiday on the second Monday in June.

To my way of thinking, Flag Day already is widely regarded, throughout the country, as one of the principal events of the calendar year. To so declare it in the statute books would merely re-echo the popular sentiment that has now existed for many years.

There are some Americans, of course, who will not support this proposal, but in my opinion they are very few in number. Their view is not unpatriotic, by any means; merely mistaken—or so I believe. According to their understanding of the matter, patriotic display fosters the martial spirit wherever it appears, and therefore fosters chaos and destruction. But I do not agree. Patriotism is the rock upon which any nation stands, including our own, which happens to oppose the forces of chaos and destruction. To dampen the patriotic ardor of a democratic nation is merely to strengthen the hand of totalitarian forces, and by so doing to breed the chaos and destruction we despise. To cheer the flag and to hail our national purposes must, then, be regarded as a vital American policy, beneficial to the interests of all mankind.

Liberty and democratic guarantees cannot be assured to any people as a family legacy, any more than children can inherit the knowledge and courage of their parents. Each generation must dedicate itself anew to the preservation and regeneration of these noble traditions, and the purpose of Flag Day is to insure that response.

In times such as these, with our liberties challenged by a formidable opposition, we would do well, I think, to emphasize the patriotic spirit. Our flag, after all, represents the goals and purposes of free men everywhere. It is indeed the flag of the free world, standing out majestically against the skies of many lands. Wherever it unfurls, the hopes of millions rise in grandeur, and courage returns to those once paralyzed by fear.

Our flag, as a result, is a symbol of defensive strength throughout the world and as such calls forth the best in us.

What better symbol than this have we to honor and applaud? It is the heart of our spiritual force and should be treated accordingly.

I therefore recommend the passage of my bill to provide that Flag Day shall be celebrated annually, as a Federal holiday on the second Monday in June of each year.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in my home city of Philadelphia our morning newspaper, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, has been conducting a campaign to encourage display of the flag.

It has been a well-conceived and successful campaign and other newspapers might well try something similar. In conjunction with this campaign, the *Inquirer* has been offering its readers a window flag at a very reasonable price.

I applaud the *Inquirer's* imagination and public spirit in this effort.

For many weeks, the *Inquirer* has been running page 1 stories featuring the statements of elected officials and public servants.

My comments appeared on April 29, 1969, in a story prepared by Jim Young of the *Inquirer* staff; and as we mark Flag Day in the House of Representatives, I place that story in the *RECORD*.

EILBERG ASKS FLAG DISPLAY

U.S. Rep. Joshua Eilberg (D., Pa.) on Monday called on residents of the Delaware Valley to display the American flag, "for it is a symbol of our achievement and a banner promising that America has not forgotten its covenant with the world."

"And if the Stars and Stripes have special meaning for us Americans, consider the Flag's message and promise to the rest of the world," he said.

"Too frequently we take our freedom and liberty for granted. Elsewhere, the Flag is a symbol of America and American freedom. To many, it is a standard of hope."

Eilberg's comment came as the *Inquirer*—to encourage display of the Flag on national holidays, offers its readers a convenient window flag.

The rayon window banner is 12 by 18 inches, and mounted on an ebonized staff. The staff has gilded spear tips and gold tassels trim the gold cord used to hang the banner.

It can be used wherever a window latch or wall nail is available in apartments, homes, classrooms and offices.

The Flag is available for \$1 in the lobby of The *Inquirer* Building, 400 N. Broad st., from 8 A.M. to 7 P.M. Monday through Friday and 10 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. Saturday and Sunday.

It can also be ordered by first class mail by using the coupon on Page 30. The mail price is \$1.35, including postage and handling. There is no sales tax. Allow two weeks for delivery.

SYMBOL OF NATION

"Nations and peoples have flown flags since the beginning of history," said Eilberg. "The flag has become a symbol of the character, aspirations and achievements of a nation," he said.

"The Stars and Stripes, therefore, occupy a special place, the highest ground, in the history of man."

"For we as a nation have pledged our energy and our resources to the battle against tyranny wherever it is encountered. And our Flag is a symbol of this pledge."

SERVES AS REMINDER

"It also is a blazing reminder of this nation's proud history, its sometimes painful sacrifices to the cause of liberty and its mighty achievement."

"Here in Washington, the Flag is never far from view, whipping in the wind at the Capitol, the White House, and along Pennsylvania and Constitution aves. There probably is no more stirring sight than the 50 Flags that guard the base of the Washington Monument."

FLY IT PROUDLY

"Too frequently we take our freedom and liberty for granted. Elsewhere, the Flag is

a symbol of America and American freedom. To many it is a standard of hope.

"We in America have much for which to be proud. We have much still to do. I ask my fellow Philadelphians and fellow Americans, to fly the Flag proudly, for it is a symbol of our achievement and a banner promising that America has not forgotten its covenant with the world."

PERMISSION TO PRINT PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks today on the Flag Day ceremony, immediately after the expiration of the recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JUNE 16, 1969

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have no further program for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day, and there are also four suspensions:

H.R. 11235, Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969;

H.R. 265, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies;

H.R. 11069, to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore, Tex.; and

H.R. 9946, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quit-claim certain land in Lee County, S.C.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day; and it will be followed by H.R. 6543, the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969, under an open rule providing 3 hours of general debate; and

S. 742, to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made subject to

the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY. JUNE 16, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader can give us any information as to when we might expect some kind of action on a resolution or a bill to continue the surtax?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, that matter is under consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am sure that the committee is endeavoring to expedite its consideration of it.

Mr. GROSS. Will it be the intention of the distinguished majority leader, as far as he can foresee events in the future, to say that it will be disposed of before the first of July, or will it likely come after the first of July?

Mr. ALBERT. Speaking for myself, I think it would be before.

Mr. GROSS. You think it would be before?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR GEORGE J. FELDMAN AT MEMORIAL DAY CEREMONY, AMERICAN MILITARY CEMETERY, LUXEMBOURG

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the traditional Memorial Day ceremonies, held at the American Military Cemetery in Luxembourg where more than 5,000 American soldiers lie buried, the Honorable George J. Feldman, American Ambassador to Luxembourg, delivered the Memorial Day address.

Ambassador Feldman delivered a profound address based on his keen knowledge and broad experience in gov-

ernment, and as a diplomat, which address I herewith include in my remarks:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR GEORGE J. FELDMAN

We have gathered today on this hallowed and peaceful field to remember and give thanks. The men who lie here—the sons, brothers, and fathers from a land across the sea—came and fought for an ideal. These citizen-soldiers left their farms and factories, their universities and offices to regain peace for us all. Their sacrifice was supreme; our gratitude on this Memorial Day 1969 remains profound.

The eyes of many peoples turned for help to the United States during the holocaust that was World War II. The United States rendered the assistance required and has remained a focus of attention in the post-war world. With the passage of time, there has been a discernible shift in attitudes. Today, an economically robust and politically active Europe demonstrates again an ever present readiness to examine critically the foreign and domestic policies and practices of the United States. Our national tradition of dealing frankly and openly with our domestic problems, without effort to conceal our warts and fissures, will ensure that we provide a continuing abundance of issues for discussion. Our insistence on exercising our own judgment in responding to the pleas of peoples in other corners of the world will also continue to provide material for discussion.

Of course, there have always been differences of opinion between us and our allies. Yet, these differences have been contained within the framework of a transcendent common interest, a vital common goal—the development of a just, free and prosperous society. Our joint efforts to this end have passed through several stages.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has just entered its third decade. In attaining its majority NATO stands as a mature organization with mature goals. Its success as an instrument dedicated to the deterrence of armed conflict has been marked. Its potential as a force for peace and progress in Europe remains rich.

The world in which the Alliance enters its 21st year is a very different one from that of April 4, 1949, when it was formed. Western Europe was feeble—militarily, economically and politically. A powerful, expansionist Soviet Union had just dragged Czechoslovakia into the Communist orbit. To the Europeans, the strength of the United States, as the world's only atomic power, appeared limitless, and alliance with it their sole salvation.

Today's world is a very different one. The era of global Communist unity has receded into history. The forces of nationalism and democratization shaken Eastern Europe. International Communism has splintered. Among Communists, some now eye Moscow, others eye Peking, while still others look elsewhere for inspiration and leadership. The power and independence of Asian communism has made itself felt, and power balances have shifted. As this happened, a period of confrontation gave way in Europe to a period of apparent detente.

In June, 1968, NATO's foreign ministers, meeting in Reykjavik, signed a declaration aimed at setting the stage for negotiations with the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe. But the events of August 1968 dashed cold water on these hopes.

With the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia, the requirements of military defense suddenly again became paramount in the alliance. The swift, efficient invasion of Czechoslovakia and the steady development of Soviet naval power in the Mediterranean, on NATO's vulnerable southern flank, led to an intensive re-examination of NATO's military capabilities.

The conventional force alone arrayed on the Communist side is formidable. NATO today is confronted with the forces of the Warsaw Pact. The formidable core of these forces consists of the Soviet Army—about 30 divisions deployed in Eastern Europe and another 60 in the European area of the Soviet Union. They are backed by a powerful and widely deployed Soviet air force and tactical nuclear missile capacity and the armed forces of the active Pact allies. But even more frightening than these forces, which, after all, did not spring up overnight, is the new Soviet doctrine and its consequences.

If the Russians nurtured among their many illusions the hope that life would be simpler after invading Czechoslovakia they were sadly mistaken. Far from restoring ideological order in the camp, the invasion created new divisions and difficulties. It widened the old split with Yugoslavia, alienated most of the West European Communist Parties, made the Romanians more wary than ever, and burdened all the participants with internal disputes about the whole enterprise. Any public pretense of socialist unity was shattered when the Romanians joined the Western European Communist Parties at the Yugoslav Party Congress while the five invaders stayed away, and compelled their victim to do the same.

In short, the occupation of Czechoslovakia immeasurably increased tensions, anxieties, and instabilities within the Communist camp as well as between its bloc and the sovereign nations gathered together in the NATO Alliance. The invasion of Czechoslovakia was a severe blow to those who had believed that the Soviet Union was becoming more enlightened and more ready to allow its Danubian colonies some freedom and diversity within the framework of the Warsaw Pact.

Czechoslovakia's was the first East European regime to earn genuine popular support. It has been crushed. The fear which now determines Soviet policy is not the fear of military attack from the West—even allowing for some anxieties about Germany—but fear of the explosive demand for freedom and true sovereignty in Eastern Europe.

This fact has several implications for Western policy. First, it is clear the Soviet Union fears the friendship of western nations—particularly when directed toward East European governments—at least as much as it does Western enmity. Second, when Soviet leaders speak of detente, they are really referring to a bilateral arrangement between the Soviet Union and the United States.

What do we mean when we speak of detente?

President Nixon, in his April 10 address to the North Atlantic Council session in Washington, spoke of the real world. "Living in the real world of today means unfreezing our old concepts of East versus West, while never losing sight of great ideological differences. It is not enough to talk of detente", continued the President, "unless at the same time we anticipate the need for giving it the genuine political content that would prevent detente from becoming delusion."

It is clear that attempts at bridge-building by the West are seen by Russia not as conciliatory but as aggressive maneuvers designed to foment trouble in Eastern Europe. Logically, perhaps, the Western reaction to this should be an attempt to soothe Soviet fears even more, to guarantee the frontiers of the Soviet empire in the hope of preventing further spasms of panic like the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In fact, however, this would be very difficult.

First, the Soviet Union would be liable to interpret any such move as a grant of *carte blanche* in Eastern Europe. Second, if the West is to continue to stand for freedom and self-determination it cannot categorically deny these principles to Eastern Europe.

Of course, a return to the pressures and threats of the cold war and the roll-back

theory of past policy, would not help much either. It would merely stiffen attitudes on the other side and discourage the more responsible open-minded people who are struggling for influence in the Soviet Union and in every East European country.

It may very well be that not a great deal can be done directly to ease tensions further in Europe, certainly not in the short run. But I feel it is a mistake, in spite of the present Soviet policy, to think of Russia and East Europe as one uniform and single-minded bloc. Even now there are differences in aims and policy among the various East European countries, and Western countries may well find that the best means of building contacts—and strengthening such contacts as there are—is in the old, slow, patient business of working out hard, practical agreements on such matters as trade and cultural exchanges between individual countries. This will not lead to any dramatic developments, but it is an aim worth pursuing, an aim which can build a foundation of mutual trust.

President Nixon has cautioned that "we can afford neither to blind our eyes with hatred, nor to distort our vision with rose-colored glasses. The real world is too much with us to permit either stereotyped reactions or wishful thinking to lay waste our powers."

The President has called upon us and our allies "to count ourselves among the hopeful realists." It is as a hopeful realist that I have addressed you today. It is as hopeful realists that we can preserve the peace for which these brave men have given their lives.

INCREASES IN PRIME INTEREST RATE CONTRIBUTE TO INFLATIONARY SPIRAL

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues in exploring the most recent increase in the prime interest rate. This increase to 8.5 percent was made effective under the guise of stopping inflation. But I would point out that the three other increases that have occurred since December of last year have done nothing to stem the tide of inflation. If anything, these increases in the prime rate have contributed to the inflationary spiral.

The large corporations who are forced to pay this increased rate on the money they borrow in turn pass the increase along to the consumer in the way of higher prices on the products or services they sell. The little man—the people you and I represent—is really the one caught in the squeeze. I really do not know how much longer the little man is going to be able to survive unless we return some sanity to our monetary policies.

I respectfully urge that calmness should prevail at this time rather than a seemingly state of panic that the Wall Street bankers are in. We in Congress can go a long way toward preventing further inflation ourselves if we will have the commonsense to cut Federal spending to the bare necessities and cut out all the "lace edging" that so often accompanies Federal programs.

FLAG DAY 1969

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks

at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week we voted overwhelmingly in this House to have our astronauts plant a flag on the moon, and, while I know there are some who do not agree that we should express a national pride in our accomplishments and that our efforts should be lost in the anonymity of some international order, I would go even a step further. I would suggest that the astronaut remaining in the space capsule play our national anthem for the world to hear while our men plant our flag on the surface of the moon.

There is nothing wrong with national pride provided that pride does not become a barrier to international understanding and cooperation. If we are the leaders in the world, and I trust we ought always strive to be, we must give something of value, something of spiritual value, over and above our material attainments toward which other nations can strive. It is no crime for one to express his love for his wife and family. It is no crime for one to express his love for a country such as ours which has given so much to so many in terms of opportunities and hope.

Today I present for the RECORD my thoughts on what Flag Day should mean to all who are grateful that there were those who so loved freedom that they were willing to lay down their lives that others might have the opportunity to pursue it. I urge my colleagues to read these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Ward Beecher once said:

A thoughtful mind, when it sees a Nation's flag, sees not the flag only, but the Nation itself; the principles, the truths, the history.

The flag of the United States is the most beautiful among national symbols. I suppose a person must actually leave this country for a spell and return to it to appreciate the full significance of the Stars and Stripes. A person has to give something of himself to a cause before he learns to appreciate the value of that cause. In the 25 years I spent in the pulpit of the parish ministry I never stressed financial needs in speaking to the congregation. Naturally we discussed these needs in meetings of the various working boards of the church but never before the congregation. I stressed stewardship in terms of the giving of one's time to the church and the larger task of building of God's Kingdom and the record proves that when the people of the church were busy giving themselves they gave generous support to the cause toward which they spent their labors. The same is true of the Nation. Those who give part of themselves for their nation are by and large those who more fully appreciate what their nation is and what it is striving to be.

I was one of those young men who began my adult responsibilities during the depression years of the early 1930's. I recall an incident which happened while I was in college. I was finding it difficult to secure the necessary food on a regular basis. My fiancée had a birthday which I did not wish to have pass by without notice. I purchased a modest present for her. When I gave the present

to her, she appreciated it but rebuffed me for buying her the present because she knew that I had to go without several meals to pay for it and she did not want me to do that.

You see, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that we have to give part of ourselves to our Nation before we can fully appreciate what the Nation means to us. This is what the late President Kennedy alluded to when, in his first inaugural message, he said:

Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.

On Saturday of this week we will be observing what I personally believe to be one of the most significant days of the year. I have a suspicion that it will go by almost unnoticed by the vast majority of Americans who find themselves too busy to tear themselves away from their favorite TV program, first long enough to take a look at what their forefathers have given them from the past; second, long enough to realize what is stealthily being taken from them as more and more they turn to Government to assume responsibilities for which they, by virtue of being created by God were personally endowed; and, third, long enough to understand what tomorrow is going to bring them if they insist on living in the make-believe world that Government can give them things for nothing much as God dropped down manna from heaven to the Israelites in the wilderness.

Flag Day ought to stir us into a deeper appreciation of what this Nation means to us and what it can, if we will it, mean to freedom-loving people all over the world. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the future—not the distant future, but the immediate future—for we are witnessing here in America chaos and violence; a disregard for constitutional principles; a lack of leadership; a grasping for personal power and vain glory; and a breakdown in respect for our historic traditions and institutions which must be appalling to all serious students of our national history and utterly distasteful to any man or woman in whose veins flow the blood of patriotism and in whose breast there breathes the fresh air of freedom's cause.

Time today will not permit me, I am sure, to say all I want to say or I feel needs be said but frankly, Mr. Speaker, I would be derelict in my duty as a citizen, a Congressman, and a clergyman, if I did not lay the cards on the table and tell you frankly and honestly and without fear of being misunderstood that the chips are down and the kind of nation you and I knew a decade ago and loved and appreciated and stood ready and are still ready to live for, and if needs be, to die for, may not long continue to be the kind of a nation which has brought us to our great accomplishments.

It is becoming corrupted by those who believe we must keep moving even if it means going in the wrong direction because they believe that making change must take precedence over solidifying the good we have been bequeathed from the past. Obsessed with their own intellectual capacity and impressed with their own accomplishments yet being also utterly devoid of that more sterling

quality of being able to make common-sense judgments based on practical realism, there are those who are willing to lead this country backward along collectivist and politically authoritarian trails to new frontiers on which are nothing more than ghost towns abandoned by those in the past who felt progress could not be made until the human spirit was freed of its political and authoritarian chains.

They do not question the integrity or sincerity of those who actually believe that the only way they can bring the rest of the world to share our level of standards is to bring us down to their level and thus narrow the economic and social and cultural, yes, and political, gulf that separates us—bringing with it a golden age of peace. But I do question their judgment.

They miss the mark made by our great, yet relatively short, national history, first, because peace is the goal, not freedom; second, because peace at any price is to them preferable to freedom with honor—some have come to the false conclusion that our Constitution is no longer adequate for the challenge of our age; third, some have lost faith in the capacity of the individual citizen to decide his own destiny and accept responsibility for himself and his own; fourth, they insist that interdependence with the Soviet-bloc nations in Europe is the key to perfect peace for a world hell-bent toward the abyss of collectivism. We are indeed victims of a strange social disease that makes us finance our own destruction.

Too many have swallowed the propaganda bait that Marxism is the "wave of the future" and so we find ourselves in the strange role of supporting the causes of collectivist dictators throughout the world who are accomplishing their ends with the use of mere slogans that are appealing to the ear and strike a responsive chord in the motional character of the finer nature of man. We are partners in a strange game of international roulette in which every bullet chamber is filled with the means by which freedom can be destroyed.

I left my pulpit in Burlington, Wis., which I served for just short of 15 years, to become a candidate for Congress, not because I had tired of the parish ministry but because I felt deeply that time was running out for freedom—for all that which our flag symbolizes—and that I might make a contribution to my Nation and my God that would be of value in these trying and difficult days—a contribution I would not make in the pulpit but which can be made only in the Halls of Congress.

I am of the firm conviction that from a theological point of view socialism is not compatible with the Judeo-Christian philosophy because socialism rests upon the philosophy of humanistic materialism, with its sole emphasis on the material man and the fulfilling of his material needs. Humanitarianism is not the answer to fulfilling the needs of man. It can keep men alive but it does not give them anything for which to live. The Judeo-Christian philosophy is that man is "more than flesh and blood and his body; more than raiment." He is in-

deed a spirit created in the image of God who is a Spirit.

Unless man is challenged and is made responsible for his own welfare and that of his loved ones, unless, of course, he does not have the strength or capacity to do so; unless he is set free to roam the vast frontier of unexplored ideas and is not thwarted in his attempt to find a better life by others who insist that he must operate within guidelines set by those who would sacrifice the pioneer "for the common good," man is reduced to the mere level of the animal of the field. He will be provided with pasture and shelter and a trough for food to which he can come when he gets hungry, but will be destined to serve only the ends of his beneficent or ruthless master, as the case may be.

Should we continue in our present direction we will become, from within, victims of the very evil we seek to avoid through an over \$60 billion a year expenditure for military protection. In just plain words, it is this: we talk like free men but we act like apologists for collectivism and we will end up under a Marxist yoke. It is high time we realize that freedom is not secure even with nuclear subs guarding the moat that separates our front door from the enemy if we leave the rear window ajar that borders on the fertile plain of socialism.

Now it is not important that you either agree or disagree with me. It is important that you sift the facts upon which you make judgments: if freedom is what we want, we still have it within our means to save it. If socialism is what we want, we merely have to sit and wait. It will fast overtake us. There is no middle road. There are only those who desire freedom and those who desire to collectivize our national institutions.

While I am concerned, I am not frustrated nor am I discouraged. We in America are glancing out upon a horizon of an utterly fantastic age. No generation of people has more to gain by success nor more to lose by defeat than we here in America who live in the year of our Lord 1969. The challenge is ours as is the responsibility.

I return you for a moment to my opening quote:

A thoughtful mind, when it sees a Nation's flag, sees not the flag only, but the Nation itself, . . . the principles, the truths, the history. . . .

Saturday we will observe Flag Day. I wonder what it will mean to the great people of our land?

Our Stars and Stripes came into being and was born amid the strife of battle. It became the standard around which a free people struggled to found a great nation. Its spirit is fervently expressed in the word of Thomas Jefferson:

I swear before the Altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Lest we forget, I remind you that it was the Stars and Stripes which in 1941 flew over the U.S. Capitol on December 8, when we declared war upon Japan and on December 11, when we declared war upon Germany and Italy. It proved to be the flag of liberation.

Our flag flew over Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and was the same flag which flew atop the White House on August 14, 1945, when the Japanese accepted surrender terms.

While those Stars and Stripes were waving majestically over the White House on August 14, 1945, I stood at attention looking at the same Stars and Stripes, which were battle-worn and weathered, flying in a gentle breeze on the flag staff of a heavy cruiser aboard which I served in the closing year of the war.

As a chaplain on active duty in the Navy in World War II and in the Korean crisis, I was aboard the U.S.S. *Louisville*, the flagship of the Cruiser Bombardment Division operating in the South Pacific which figured actively in the liberation of the Philippines and Okinawa. Less than 1 month after I assumed the chaplain's responsibility aboard her she received a direct hit from a Japanese kamikaze plane during the prelanding bombardment in the Lingayen Gulf.

We retired under cover of darkness to lick our wounds and to repair what we could of the damage. The admiral felt that though we were missing three of our nine 8-inch guns and had suffered the loss of only two 40-millimeter quads we should lead the fleet into the Lingayen Gulf the following morning to resume our task of helping to prepare for the coming landings of the American liberation troops. Again we suffered another hit from a second suicide plane. Suffering some 65 killed and 150 wounded in varying degrees of seriousness we retired from the foray and when opportunity permitted, 10 days later, we began our journey back to the States for major repair and overhaul.

Overhaul completed, we returned to the fleet in time to help in the Okinawa campaign. Again we suffered yet a third direct hit from a suicide plane and retired to Pearl Harbor, for repairs, after burying the dead and taking care of the wounded. It was in the final testing stage of our newly repaired guns that the Japanese surrendered. Upon receiving the official notice of surrender I requested permission from the captain to give a prayer of thanksgiving for peace from the bridge and suggested he might like to give a word of "Well done" to the men. We pulled into the harbor and tied up alongside the dock. It was there that the word came to the men that the war was over and that they were to be congratulated by a grateful nation for their sacrifices.

I shall always remember the scene from the vantage point of the bridge. Looking down I saw the men as they reacted to the news. Some could not contain themselves and shouted and jumped for joy. Some knelt in prayer; others seemed stunned by the news as if it were too good to be true while others sat or stood quietly in mute meditation.

After the captain's word and the prayer, a Navy band appeared on the dock and, after playing a stirring march, sounded off with "The Star-Spangled Banner." I can never forget standing there on that ship's bridge, at attention, under a beautifully blue Hawaiian sky, dotted by puffs of white cloud tinted with

the reflection of a golden sun with tears streaming unashamedly down my cheeks as I stood at attention before the flag that was a rallying symbol through the battles and long dark nights of fearful waiting and anticipation.

I discovered the real meaning of the Stars and Stripes. I saw there not just red, white, and blue bunting but I felt again first, the cold hands of those I held as I said a parting prayer as they lay dying on the scorched deck of the cruiser; second, I heard again the fainting whisper of a young lad who asked me to "tell Mom it's all right;" third, I saw the men to whom the cost of battle was personal as I helped transfer their torn bodies, minus limbs, to hospital ships or tried many times in vain to bring comfort to their tortured and twisted minds which could not take more of the chaos and hell of battle; fourth, I recalled the dying words of the admiral who told me on his deathbed, having lived 3 days after his lungs were seared by the blast of an incendiary bomb which exploded near him: "Chaplain, we must pay a big price for big gains and I am willing to be part of the cost."

And, Mr. Speaker, I knew that freedom does not come cheap. It is costly to attain and equally costly to keep. You and I are free men because others died to buy us the time that we might pursue it, and God forbid—God forbid you and I should be too busy—too indifferent—too cowardly—to live for that cause for which others were willing to die.

That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that this flag which is indeed the symbol, not only of freedom, but of the cost of keeping freedom, is not to be ignored.

Every time we hear our national anthem, or see our flag go by, our hearts should swell up with humble pride. If to love one's country; if to respect our flag; if to pledge allegiance to that flag is superpatriotism; if to salute our flag is being a 110-percent American, then I stand convicted and I make no apologies for it—and I hope you will not either.

On Saturday of this week I plead with you to put up your flag—and take the hands of the members of your family and sing together the national anthem. I urge you to look out upon your world in which we cry "Peace, Peace" but in which we know there is no peace.

Finally, may I suggest that you learn for yourself and teach your children the last stanza of our national anthem, for it bespeaks of the full extent of what America means to free men. It clearly sounds the warning to all that God is indeed the author of liberty and the flag the symbol of a nation molded out of that faith:

Oh! thus be it ever, when free men shall stand
Between their loved homes and the war's desolation!
Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a Nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: "In God Is Our Trust."
And the star spangled banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!

ALLEGIANCE PLEDGE: A STATEMENT OF NATIONAL GOALS

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, since the House is taking time today to mark the celebration of Flag Day, I feel it appropriate to speak in support of my bill H.R. 12024, to give proper recognition to the man who wrote the words with which we honor our flag.

Francis Bellamy, who was a graduate of the University of Rochester in 1876 and the Rochester Theological Seminary in 1879, served as chairman for a national school committee for the first observance of Columbus Day in 1892.

The pledge to our flag was first used in that ceremony. And it is fitting and proper for us to give the same honor to Francis Bellamy as we do to the other heroes of our national heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share with the Members of this House a column I distributed this week to the news media in my district:

ALLEGIANCE PLEDGE: A STATEMENT OF NATIONAL GOALS

"I pledge Allegiance to the Flag . . ."
(Francis Bellamy, Columbus Day 1892.)

These words were first used in public schools throughout the country on Columbus Day 1892 to mark the 400th anniversary of the founding of the New World.

Since then the words have been melded into our national heritage and stand with our flag as a symbol of this country.

Francis Bellamy was a native of Mount Morris, New York. He was graduated from the University of Rochester in 1876 and the Rochester Theological Seminary in 1879.

In 1892 he served as chairman of a committee for a national school program for the first observance of Columbus Day in this country. The pledge to the flag was used as a part of that celebration.

This week I introduced legislation to give proper recognition to Francis Bellamy and permanently establish his role as one of our national figures.

His words are recited daily in our nation's schools. They serve to build respect for the flag and all it symbolizes for all Americans.

The story of the American flag is the story of this nation. When the Stars and Stripes were first adopted on June 14, 1777, it was one of the country's darkest days.

Within 96 days the members of the Continental Congress were fugitives. The Capitol in Philadelphia had been invaded and occupied by British troops and the fate of the nation weighed in the balance.

George Washington gave a vivid description of the new flag when it was first flown by the Continental Army.

"We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty," Washington said.

Our flag was born in the heat of battle and given its baptism under fire. It survived as has the nation.

Over the years the United States has grown into the greatest civilization known to man. It has filled its natural boundaries and assumed the leadership of the free world.

Flag Day 1969 is a day when the colors of our country should fly proudly over the land. It is a day to reflect on the challenges which face us at home and abroad.

These challenges can be met only through reasoned action. Too often these days we find a polarization of thought.

Patriotism is a thing to be nourished and cherished. However, there is a difference between the true patriot and the fanatic.

It is the true patriot who can see the real meaning of Francis Bellamy's pledge to the ideals of "... One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

He sees the real meaning of these national goals and undertakes to accomplish them through constructive criticism and suggestions for national betterment.

WHITE HOUSE MEETING ON SURTAX

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard the clamor of many voices throughout our land. Some of those voices, and tragically enough, we are speaking about some of the young people of our country, have expressed disillusionment with our most basic institutions of government. They have suggested that they are unresponsive to the needs of our times and incapable in a time of crisis and change of taking the decisive actions that may be required.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that some of those who may be inclined to such beliefs had been present with me in the Cabinet Room of the White House this morning. The meeting, as the press has already reported, was called by the President, of both the Democratic and Republican leadership in the House of Representatives to consider the question of an extension of the 10-percent surtax as previously recommended by the President.

The Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK; the majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable CARL ALBERT; and the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable HALE BOGGS were present and pledged that together with the Republican leadership they would use all of their influence to secure a favorable vote in the House of Representatives on the President's tax proposal. They did so because they were willing to subordinate partisan considerations to what they deem the broad public interest in halting virulent inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I salute these leaders of the Democratic Party for an act of courage and statesmanship. It indicates that there is the will and desire on both sides of the aisle to disprove the contentions of those who foresee the ultimate dissolution of our institutions of democracy because we cannot act in responsible fashion during moments of danger. Mr. Speaker, as long as there are men like these, the Republic will endure.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 9946

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the Committee on Agriculture to have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 9946) to authorize the Secretary of Ag-

riculture to quit-claim certain land in Lee County, S.C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SECURITY IN PERSPECTIVE: THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the catch word of the hour is "military-industrial complex."

A national magazine quoted a Senator as saying that on the banquet circuit "one sure applause line is a condemnation of the growing influence of the military."

The amount of space in newspapers, in magazines, in columns, and in editorials devoted to the military-industrial complex in recent months is remarkable. There have been countless statements and studies and attacks of great fury by scientists, academicians, and politicians, including Members of both Houses of Congress. We are told that military advice is unreliable and has led us to disasters. We are told that the ordering of national priorities is askew and that military spending should be vastly curtailed so that spending for welfare, urban problems, and other domestic needs can be greatly expanded. And we are treated to dark hints or even outright allegations of vast conspiracy between military leaders and giant industrial concerns.

The tendency to emotionalize on the issue is very strong. I believe the origins of these emotions are sometimes understandable. But the most erudite terminology often buries remarkable inconsistencies and hides a deep emotional bias. And unjust statements which impugn innocent people are made by intelligent men who should know better.

I would like to look at the subject as dispassionately as I can. I would like to look at facts and realities, eschewing the leverage of hindsight and asking only that my points be considered in the real world in which we live rather than in the world as some would like it to be.

I believe some comment is required from me because of the responsibilities the House has imposed upon me as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I would have it clearly understood that I feel no compunction to defend the defense industry; and our military men, who cannot always speak for themselves, could, I am sure, find a better defender than I. But I am deeply concerned about the picture that is being given to the American people of our governmental process, our defense needs, and—what is worse—the reality of the world we live in.

I. OUR TRADITION OF ANTIMILITARISM

The men who founded the United States feared militarism as they feared all unwarranted accumulations of power, and their earliest concerns were contained in provisions in the Constitution against infringing the right of the citi-

zen to keep and bear arms and against the quartering of troops in a home without the consent of the owner. These were the second and third amendments to the Constitution. In our formative years in school, all of us learned these Bill of Rights provisions and the basic antimilitarism of the Founding Fathers has remained a feature of our national character.

Our first President, who was our first soldier-President, warned us "to avoid the necessity of those overblown military establishments which, under any form of government, are auspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."

Through all periods of our history up until the last 20 years, we have neglected and disparaged our military forces except in time of war.

A feature of this antimilitarism has been the tendency to blame wars on economic causes or, more specifically, on the munitions makers. Many of us, for example, remember the antiwar plays of the 1930's that came as a reaction to World War I and that pictured the makers of munitions as evil, scheming men who fomented war for huge profits. Those plays were often good theater, but they showed a childish understanding of international politics.

All the wars in our history up to and including World War II, and to some extent including Korea, have required a hurried refurbishing of our military power both in terms of our weapons arsenal and our military leadership.

Over the last 25 years we have been in a kind of situation almost entirely new in historical terms—called, for want of a better word, "cold war." It has required the keeping of a vast defense force in a state of high readiness for an unknown length of time—for the one simple reason that the reality of warfare has changed so that a future global conflict would allow no warning time and no period for preparation. This is a kind of situation that calls for a greater demand on our national resources, and that calls for bringing the military into the mainstream of American life.

I would suggest to you that it is a psychological situation with which, as a nation, we have not yet learned to live.

A series of frustrations have combined to bring a new wave of the old antimilitarism to a head: Vietnam, the humiliation of the Pueblo, high taxes, anxiety over unsolved domestic problems, headlines about spectacular cost overruns on defense contracts, the siren call of disarmament negotiations. The frustration has found a convenient focal point in the "military-industrial complex."

As the words feed on themselves, the charges get stronger and stronger and the complex gets all-embracing. The academic world is added because of military research. Some papers have added the labor unions—and, of course, politicians have to be included in any roasting. So we have the "military-industrial-educational-political-labor union complex." We have just about everybody in there but the Boy Scouts.

Let us look at some of the charges—and then look at some facts.

Is it true that defense keeps taking an ever-increasing portion of our national wealth and taking more and more of our Federal budget? Are weapons costs spiraling out of sight?

Are profits of defense industries getting bigger all the time?

Is it national defense expenditures that prevent us from solving our domestic problems?

What about the constant charges of self-interest on the part of Congressmen? It is said that the Armed Services Committee members represent the districts with big defense contracts, that Congressmen vote for defense bills because of defense industry in their districts and are afraid to oppose defense bills because of the economic effect of defense spending in their districts. Is all this confirmed by facts?

It is said that the military failed in Vietnam and has got us overcommitted around the globe. And it is said that the Russians are ready for negotiations and that this country is the cause of the arms race and of the failure to negotiate.

Is our great strength unnecessary? Is that what General Eisenhower warned us about in his famous speech?

Is there, indeed, a conspiracy between the generals and the kings of big industry?

II. THE CONSPIRATORIAL THEORY

In 1945, Gen. George C. Marshall said:

We finish each bloody war with a feeling of acute revulsion against the savage form of human behavior. And yet on each occasion we confuse military preparedness with the causes of war and then drift almost deliberately into another catastrophe.

Americans are understandably fatigued with requirements of national security, and they have understandably a fierce desire to solve domestic problems. Because they cannot see and cannot strike at the totalitarian forces that have created the uneasy world we live in, some of our people tend to start blaming what they can see—our military and those who work for the military—for creating this world. But the facts are that our military power and the industry that serves it are in response to the international realities of the years since World War II—not the other way around. Because of our strength, we have been able to deter global war and we have still, for all its imperfections, a free society. We have not solved all its problems. But we retain the capacity to solve those problems, the capacity to act to create human betterment and preserve individual freedom.

The citizen in the Communist half of the world does not have that capacity or anybody to exercise that capacity for him. One of the most essential things about dissent in America—that some people seem to forget—is simply the right to voice it. In Russia they have no such rights. You do not hear of students taking over the office of the president of the University of Moscow. And you do not hear of scientists in Russia complaining about arms development. But you do hear, if you will listen, about writers being thrown in jail for the mildest forms of criticism of the government.

And we hear Milovan Djilas, the former Vice President of Yugoslavia, a

tough and remarkable man and one of the most informed writers about conditions within the Communist orbit, making this forecast about the eventual control of the Soviet Union by military men:

The party apparatus and the secret police will be under the control of the army. The dominant role of the militarists in public life will be unconcealed and frankly accepted.

Suppose we did not have a huge industrial complex to supply the equipment and arms for our military forces. Without such an industry to provide the armament of modern war, the weapons, and sophisticated equipment, our military forces would be useless and our only hope would be that the Russians and Chinese would take a benign attitude toward our country.

The alternative would be to have all of the arms production handled by the Government with all of the industrial plants owned and operated by the Government. It would mean in effect virtually the elimination of the free enterprise system and a bureaucracy that would make present-day Washington look like a ghost town.

We have to get over our national guilt complex at having kept the world free. This is what we have done with our military might. And with our Marshall plan, our billions in foreign aid, our help to undeveloped nations.

The greatest libel against military leadership and the leaders of our big defense industries is that there is somehow a vast conspiracy taking place, a dark collusion to determine policy and subvert the elected leadership of the government. It is the theory that led one journal to refer to the military-industrial complex as an all-embracing conglomeration.

The author and former presidential aid Douglass Cater, whose liberal credentials are impeccable, and who was one of the first to write in some detail about the military-industrial complex—or what he calls the subgovernment of defense—has this to say about the conspiratorial theory:

It would be wrong to regard the subgovernment of defense as a secret conspiracy of malefactors. The greater problem arises because of its wide array of competing factions—because of the ever shifting coalitions of politicians, pressure groups, and military professionals striving to assert dominance for a service, a doctrine, or a weapon. The fact that defense has become a gargantuan governmental activity does not automatically bring increased risk of a military cabal capable of seizing power. On the contrary, the job of running anything as complicated as the modern defense establishment makes such seizure probably less likely than in the past. The missile cum nuclear warhead does not facilitate the staging of a coup d'Etat; nor is there convincing evidence that the man in uniform is less disposed to civilian government than is the man in mufti. The wise and the fanatical exist in both ranks.

There is little use in taking a doom-and-gloom view of "the warfare state" since the need for large-scale military preparedness during the foreseeable future is likely to continue. Too much of the literature on the subject—including Eisenhower's vague farewell admonition—begs the question of how to maintain military power while dealing with the political power that accompanies it.

Mr. Cater's book correctly states the truth about power in Washington—that it is diffused. It can still be made subject to our historic system of checks and balances.

Now let us look closer at that famous Eisenhower statement:

III. THE EISENHOWER STATEMENT

There is quoted at us over and over again from President Eisenhower's farewell radio and TV broadcast the following paragraphs:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

What is not quoted are the other things President Eisenhower said in that same farewell address—including his clear statement that our Military Establishment is "an inevitable necessity of our time." While saying that the conjunction of "an immense military establishment and large arms industry is new in the American experience," General Eisenhower stated, "we recognize the imperative need for this development." He further said:

A vital element in keeping the peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

He also explained why a large defense industry was a necessary ingredient of our time:

We can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions.

And we must not forget that President Eisenhower warned—again in the same speech:

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

Finally, General Eisenhower in his farewell speech gave this warning which the critics of the military-industrial complex do not seem inclined to take to heart:

We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake.

IV. SPIRALING WEAPON COSTS AND SOARING PROFITS

Defense is enormously expensive, and the defense industry includes industrial giants which make substantial profit. And in anything as large and complex as defense procurement, examples come up

from time to time of what can only be called terrible boo-boos. Mistakes are made—terrible mistakes. Our committee has been diligent in searching out and spotlighting these mistakes—on small procurements as well as large. And we are going to try to do an even better job in the future.

But the fact is that for all its size, defense today gets almost exactly the same share of U.S. output that it got a decade ago. The defense budget for the year ending June 30 is 8.8 percent of total U.S. goods and services and 43 percent of all Government outlays. In 1960, military costs were 47 percent of our Federal spending and 8.7 percent of total U.S. goods and services. Thus, spending on defense, contrary to popular belief, has maintained a consistent ratio to gross national product.

Another point to consider is that \$29 billion of this year's defense budget is soaked up due to the Vietnam involvement. That leaves \$49 billion for all other military needs. With the rise in payroll and other costs, this represents less actual buying power for defense needs—including costly weapons systems—than the Armed Forces had with a budget of \$43 billion in 1960.

Contrary to popular belief, the majority of the defense budget is not poured out to the defense industry for hardware. More than half of all defense dollars go for personnel and operating costs. Military personnel costs this year are around \$23 billion. Another \$22 billion goes to operation and maintenance, including paying of Defense Department civilians. And another \$7.5 billion goes for research and development, including the financing of research in some 350 colleges and universities and other non-profit institutions.

Of the \$78 billion budget, about \$33 billion of it is spent buying arms and equipment from the so-called industrial complex.

You might be interested to know that on the whole the percentage of profit on defense business has tended downward over the last 10 years.

The public picture that is sometimes painted of ever-spiraling costs and ever-spiraling profits is not correct. An independent organization, the Logistics Management Institute, recently completed an extensive study entitled "Defense Industries Profit Review." The report contains extensive statistical material on the defense contracts for the 10-year period 1958 through 1967 and makes comparisons of the defense industry profits with profits of defense firms in their commercial business and profits by nondefense industries.

Among the interesting findings in this study are the following:

First. The average defense business profit as a percentage of total capital investment tended downward for the first 7 years of the study period and remained level for the last 3 years. Since Fiscal Year 1962, the percentage of profit on defense business was actually less than the percentage of profit on non-defense business.

In addition, it was found that average defense profit declined more than 25 percent over the 10-year period. Average

profit of commercial firms increased during the same 10-year period.

Second. Defense industries which had the highest percentage of profit did not enjoy profits as high as the most profitable commercial firms.

Third. Commercial markets have expanded more rapidly than the defense markets.

For some 40 companies surveyed, all of which did at least \$25 million annually in defense sales, defense business increased about 50 percent between 1958 and 1967. Commercial sales for the same companies rose almost 200 percent in the same period. For nondefense companies, sales increased more than 110 percent.

Fourth. Over the 10-year period defense business profit as a percentage of sales declined more than 20 percent. Among the conclusions drawn in the LMI study was that the reduction in the profit-to-sales ratio in defense business is due largely to the increased use of competition in defense procurement.

Even in the face of these statistics, it is still a conclusion of L. MENDEL RIVERS that competitive procurement is not used nearly as much as it could be in the Pentagon.

In pointing out the lower percentage of profits on defense business, I certainly would not wish to overstate the case. There are advantages to defense business—Government financing for research and development, use of Government facilities, progress payments, and cost reimbursements which considerably reduce the risks for industries, though the use of these incentives varies widely from industry-to-industry and from contract-to-contract.

There have been some reductions in the use of such Government financial support, and perhaps there should be further reductions.

There have been problems, and there is plenty of room for improvement. But weapons costs are not taking an ever-increasing share of our resources.

Finally, should a defense contractor realize excessive profits from his defense business, Congress has very prudently provided for this contingency. The Renegotiation Board, which was created in 1951, and has the responsibility to recapture excessive profits derived by contractors and subcontractors in connection with Government procurement.

Every defense contractor who does a substantial amount of business with the Department of Defense during any fiscal year must file a report with the Renegotiation Board. This report and related information accumulated by the Board enables the Government to insure against unconscionable profits in defense industry.

This then places this entire matter of excessive profits in industry in proper perspective.

V. CONGRESS: THE ALLEGATION OF SELF-INTEREST

The catch-phrase is often extended to read "military-industrial-congressional complex." My district has been called a microcosm of the military-industrial complex. Charleston happens to be a great, natural warm-water port. It was made that way by God—who, I presume, is not a captive of the military-indus-

trial complex. But I am not alone in being assailed. There is continual criticism that "members champion defense systems out of self-interest," and that Congressmen win reelection by their success in winning defense contracts for their constituents. One commentator typified this feeling when he said, "It takes a brave legislator to vote against funds that mean jobs for some of his own constituents." This is part of old folklore about the Congress. I think even the Members of the House will be surprised to find the extent to which it is not true.

In general, it is charged that the members of the Armed Services Committee represent districts dependent on the military-industrial complex and get fat contracts for their districts in exchange for supporting unneeded weapons.

To begin with, the idea that the Armed Services Committee members represent the fat-cat districts is simply not true. I had an analysis prepared for fiscal year 1968 prime contracts of \$1 million or more by congressional districts. The analysis compared members of the Armed Services Committee with House Members as a whole as regards number of prime contracts.

It showed that we have 10 members on the committee in the top quarter of House Members, 13 in the second quarter, nine in the next to the lowest quarter, and seven members in the lowest quarter. In other words, the membership of the committee almost exactly reflects the membership of the House in terms of the relative number of prime contracts in their districts. So, it can be fairly said that the Armed Services Committee is not weighted in favor of the so-called military-industrial complex.

In addition, of the top 38 Members of the House in terms of amount of defense contracts in their district, only three of them are members of the Armed Services Committee. You might be interested to know that I am not one of those three. There are 122 districts which receive more prime contracts than my own First District of South Carolina. It might also interest you to know that of the top 10 Democrats on the committee, none of them are in the top quarter, and only two of them are in the next to top quarter.

Now, as to the votes of Members of the House as a whole, an analysis was made on four votes—the procurement authorization and defense appropriations bills for fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969.

There are 38 congressional districts that had no prime defense contracts. On the fiscal year 1968 defense authorization bill, none of these 38 voted against the bill. There were only three votes cast against the fiscal year 1968 bill, one being that of a Member who ranked in the next to top quarter and two by Members who ranked in the third quarter in defense contracts.

On the fiscal year 1969 authorization bill, there were 15 negative votes cast. Of these, two were Members whose districts received no contract awards. But of the other 13 negative votes, two were by Congressmen whose districts were in the top seven in terms of prime con-

tracts, while three others were among the top 72 districts. The other negative votes ranged the entire spectrum.

On the 1969 appropriation bill, seven votes were cast in opposition. One of these was by a Congressman whose district received no prime contracts, while another was by a Congressman whose district ranked No. 7 in the amount of contract awards. The other negative votes ranged the entire spectrum.

In summary, it can be said that there is no correlation between the voting patterns of Congressmen and contracts made to defense industries within their districts.

It is important to note that this is true both for the men who support military authorization and appropriation bills and for those who oppose them.

The inconsistency of the criticism of Congress for its alleged role in the military-industrial complex is something to behold. If we authorize weapons systems and other expenditures, we are castigated as lackeys and handmaidens of the military-industrial complex. But, of course, if we criticize a Defense Secretary's program, then we are enemies of economy. Recently, in an article that criticized the Congress for the swollen expenditures within the Pentagon, I found that one of the sins blamed on Congress was that the Defense Department Public Affairs Office budget was three times as large as that of the State Department Public Affairs Office. I just want to say that if any Member of Congress wants to introduce a motion to cut the budget of the Defense Department Public Affairs Office by two-thirds, he will have my wholehearted support.

If it were not for its harmful implications, there is much in the current wave of criticism that would cause a Member of Congress to laugh.

For instance, I read in a newspaper a short time ago that there is a new skepticism in Congress about the explanations given of the programs by the minions of the Pentagon. I have got news for you—I have had that skepticism for years. I had it back in the days when, as the papers tell us, it was not at all popular.

It amuses me vastly to hear people say that in the past the Congress has been too unquestionably ready to accept anything that the Pentagon said. It amuses me when I reflect on the kind of criticism we received, particularly in the press, when at any time during the last 8 years we questioned the decisions or the programs of the Secretary of Defense. The kindest word applied to us was "irresponsible." We were always wrong and the Secretary of Defense was always right.

In one article attacking the military-industrial-congressional complex, I saw the TFX listed as one of the prime examples of misjudgment and waste and boondoggle by the military-industrial complex perpetrated with the acquiescence of Congress. I do not have to tell anybody in the House the kind of abuse that Members of Congress were subjected to when they questioned the decision of the Secretary of Defense concerning the TFX. And you might reflect that the Secretary of Defense forced the development of the

common plane over strenuous military objections and, with the help of two other Defense civilians, overruled four military source selection boards in awarding the contract.

VI. THE THEORY OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The argument is made that while protecting our national security externally we are decaying internally. The mayor of New York City, Mr. Lindsay, expressed this point very dramatically when he said:

We are in danger of spending billions for the ABM and other weaponry to defend a shell of society which died of neglect.

And here again one can see a cause for concern. We do have grave domestic problems, and they must be met if our Nation is to continue.

The military-industrial complex, however, is ceaselessly attacked on the grounds that it is taking the money that would otherwise go to meet domestic requirements.

The point is made that if billions could be cut from the defense budget—the estimates I have heard run as high as \$35 billion—we could then pour that money into welfare and other domestic programs. The point is also made that our best minds are engaged in military work while they should be involved in domestic problems. Finally, the argument goes that crushing military costs have deprived cities and States of tax base. It is said that either the Federal Government should pour a large portion of its tax dollars back into municipalities or reduce Federal tax so that States and municipalities will be able to raise their taxes—and better meet their responsibilities for cleaning up cities, attacking pollution, improving education, and so on.

The concern of people who make these arguments is, as I said, understandable. Their reasoning, however, is based, quite simply, on conditions contrary to fact.

To begin with, the assumption is made of a constant Federal dollar: It is assumed that if a certain amount of those dollars are not spent for defense—if \$5 billion or so were saved by canceling a certain weapons development—that a corresponding amount would be spent on welfare programs.

Now, the interesting thing is that in the first place this assumes that budgetary restraints have in the past prevented Congress from spending what it wanted to spend on welfare programs. This simply is not true. Quite obviously, the lack of Federal funds has not prevented the Government from spending on welfare. We have appropriated billions for various welfare programs for a good number of years, even though in many of those years the appropriations were part of a deficit budget. If Congress wants to put more money into domestic programs of one kind or another, it will do so—even when the money is not there. And, in addition, if it wants to do so badly enough, it can provide additional taxing to finance the program.

But let us consider the most naive part of the basic assumption—that is, if the defense budget is reduced by billions of dollars, the money will be transferred to welfare or other domestic programs. Do you really think that would happen? Do

you really think that is what the majority of the Members of Congress want to happen? Is that what you think a majority of the American people would want to happen?

If the Vietnam war were ended and much of the \$25 to \$30 billion that war is costing annually were no longer needed in Southeast Asia, what would be the first thing the Congress would do? I think all of you know clearly the answer: It would eliminate the surtax. There would even be calls for greater tax reduction. There would be a strenuous attempt in Congress—entirely understandable—to have, for a change, a balanced budget.

The fact is that it is a fallacy to assume there is a constant budget dollar. The decisions both of Congress and the administration on domestic and welfare programs are made primarily on philosophical and not on economic grounds.

Finally, as you reduce Federal taxes somewhat, do you think the State and municipal officials would jump in and quickly increase local taxes to spend more money on schools and welfare improvement programs? Do you think that is what the majority of the citizens would want? Many of you have served on local and State governing bodies, and I think you have an idea of the enthusiasm with which tax increases at the local level are greeted.

Finally, it is a libel against the defense industry of this country to charge that it is the antithesis of social reform or the enemy of efforts to solve domestic problems. The defense industry and some of the associated "think" factories have been turning their systems management techniques to the solving of major domestic problems. The aerospace industry in California is making an effort to help with California's water and transportation problems.

I am aware that there are difficulties to be ironed out in turning this industrial talent toward the domestic scene—adjustments to be made in profit expectation, the relationship between research and development fees as compared with hardware sales, and the inaction of various local governments. But if our great defense and space problems are solvable, these difficulties are solvable.

The industrial know-how which supports our military forces provides a vital national resource which can help in all types of problems, ranging from education to housing, water and air pollution, and transportation.

I might add that the military services themselves have developed dramatic training and learning techniques which have proved and will prove of substantial value to other segments of our society.

The military services have successfully educated and given useful industrial skills to men from all sections of the country whom civilian society has discarded as unteachable and unusable. There is no reason why the military training techniques cannot be used by civilian agencies.

The Constitution of the United States charges the Congress with providing for the common defense and insuring do-

mestic tranquillity. It has always been a requirement to pursue these responsibilities simultaneously, and there is such a requirement now. It is just plain silly to say that one can only be achieved at the expense of the other.

VII. THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR VIETNAM

We all know that what is contributing most to the current debate on national purpose and national resources is the bitter sense of frustration because of the war in Vietnam. The enormous and unpredicted costs, together with the sense of futility, have created social and economic pressures that have been directed toward almost all defense programs. The failure in Vietnam, if such it is, is not basically a military failure but a civilian one. It is the failure of the approach to the war to bring forth the kind of response from the North Vietnamese that was predicted. That basic approach was decided upon by civilians, and all of the changes in the strategy were dictated by civilians and even some of the tactical maneuvers, always the province of military leaders in the past, were controlled by civilians. They were controlled neither by military men, nor industrialists, nor their supposed friends in Congress, but by the highest civilians in the executive branch.

I would not minimize the fact that there have been mistakes, bad decisions, and sometimes bad advice from military leaders. But the fact is that most of the decisions for which the military is presently being criticized were made by civilians. They were made most often by political leaders and often for political purposes.

In Vietnam we may never know if the generals were right. It is too late now, perhaps, to go the road of an all-out effort for victory, as I believe they recommend. But if what has happened has led to bitter disillusionment and uncertainty, the decision to do it this way was made by civilians—both the decision to get involved in the first place and the decision to follow a policy of gradual escalation. This is the first and only time the gradual escalation approach has been used for war; it goes against the grain of traditional military thinking. It may be that another approach would have had worse results. But in any case, the gradual escalation approach taken—the decision in 1965 against mobilization and for a "guns and butter" approach, the decision to expand bombing gradually, to commit forces piecemeal, to control each bombing target at the highest political level—and you know the address of the house where that level is—was a civilian decision.

Did you know that pilots in Vietnam were given seven pages of instructions on what to bomb and what not to bomb and how? And did you know that pilots had to get each target approved in Washington before they could attack it? Do you know that if they missed a target they could not return to it the next day but had to get it approved again in Washington?

The abandonment of the ancient principles of warfare, the announcement that we would not seek a military victory, the decision to modify the goals as

we went along, and the false predictions of how things were going—these were almost entirely the work of civilians. If you believe we should never have gotten involved in the first place, then you must agree that a greater role must be played by Congress in the future.

VIII. THE CONTRADICTIONS OF THE CRITICS

Nothing confirms the emotional bias of those who rail against the military-industrial complex so much as the contradictions in the postures they assume. The people who cry out against the complex and the supposed militarism in our society are invariably the proponents of an all-volunteer Army and critics of the draft. But at the same time they are invariably against the ROTC and against a strong Reserve. Needless to say, they would send up a hue and cry if somebody proposes tripling the size of West Point, but if we are to have neither the draft nor ROTC, I wonder where these people think the officer leaders for our Armed Forces are to come from.

The people who want a volunteer Army are doing their utmost to prevent the recruitment of same.

As Secretary Laird recently told our committee in relation to the forcing of military recruiters off college campuses:

You can't have a volunteer force if people are prohibited from recruiting volunteers.

It is, of course, inconsistent to complain about too much military influence and at the same time attempt to deny the Armed Forces the opportunity of having officers from various great universities throughout the country rather than just from military schools. It would be logical for those who fear militarism to want to bring the military into the mainstream of American life, and particularly to want to infuse into the Armed Forces young men from our great universities who have broad cultural and liberal educations. Presumably that would be the best way to insure the maintenance of a respect for democratic institutions in our Armed Forces and to avoid the over-emphasis on militarism.

But the same people who call for a volunteer Armed Forces are doing their utmost to alienate and isolate military people.

The simple fact is that we have accomplished in our time the feat of having both an efficient and an extraordinarily democratic Army. The training cycle rate in our Army today is fantastic. We take in and discharge around 800,000 men a year. The approach is not ideal either from a cost or efficiency standpoint. But it does make for a democratic Army.

We are also told that through the subterfuge of research contracts the military departments are having too great an influence in our colleges and universities.

It is really hilarious to pick up the daily newspaper and read on the first page about student revolts and sit-ins and file riflings and such at various universities and then to turn to the editorial page and read about the serious problem of too much military influence at colleges.

The military influence, if there were such, would seem to carry with it a leaning toward order, a respect for authority, or—at the very least—a propensity to defend buildings under siege.

IX. POWER AND THE GENERALS

An effective military force is absolutely necessary for our survival for the foreseeable future—and such requires generals who think like generals. But it is untrue and unfair to say that such implies the threat of a military takeover. There is not a hint of the coup psychology among real-life military men in our country. Our officer corps has a splendid record of avoiding political ties.

If anything, the members of the military services are less materialistic than their civilian counterparts.

Our constitutional tradition of civilian control of the military is safe—as long as civilians, including civilians in Congress, do their job. The danger is not that generals will grab the power, but that the civilian leadership will default on it. The most difficult task of controlling defense spending and industrial influence is a civilian job. It depends on the judgment and the toughness of civilian leaders.

If you consider the point at length, you come back again and again to the conclusion that a fuller part has to be played in the decisionmaking process in the one place where, constitutionally, the people most directly exert their influence—and that is the Congress of the United States.

X. THE POWER OF FALSE RHETORIC ABOUT THINGS WHICH ARE TRUE

We are all aware that the rhetoric of a speaker or a group may obscure the truth as well as embellish it, and we are all aware that the understanding of a problem is colored by the way it is presented to people and by what might be a natural emotional bias. The wish, as it were, is often father of the thought.

But I have noticed over the years a similar phenomenon that takes place in public debate and, particularly, in the press. That is that ideas presented over and over again become accepted as true, particularly when presented with a catchy phrase on which to hang a thought. Ideas wrapped in a key word become almost a part of the language and are repeated over and over in newspapers and columns to imply a certain set of facts without any bother to examine the original basis for the idea to see if it is, indeed, valid. In this way things become accepted as true which, in point of fact, are not true.

For example, if enough academicians and editorialists make reference to the desire of the Soviets for negotiations, it seems to become an accepted fact in the intellectual community that the Soviets do, in fact, desire such negotiations and in time this leads to the conclusion that the failure to start negotiations is our fault rather than the Soviets'. In point of fact, of course, efforts for disarmament negotiations by this country have been rebuffed in the past by the Soviets.

As another example, the word "détente" was used so often in the press and in lectures in recent years that people seemed to have come to the belief that the character of the Soviet leadership has somehow magnificently changed. This kind of departure from reality must be reviewed against the fact that the only difference between the Russian re-

action in Czechoslovakia last year and the Russian reaction in Hungary in 1956 is that in Czechoslovakia there was less provocation and, therefore, less requirement for the use of Soviet military force. There was no change in the readiness to use force—or in the reason for its use—to suppress an effort by people for greater freedom.

The Secretary of State recently said that the events in Czechoslovakia have not in any way altered the possibility of nuclear arms negotiations with the Russians. I recognize that that may be true, but I hope it has at least reminded the Secretary that in dealing with the Soviets he is not negotiating with the Bobbsey twins at Sunnybrook Farm.

XI. THE ILLUSION OF THE NEW RUSSIA

The outcry about the military-industrial complex is, as I said, a collocation of seemingly related but actually quite independent factors.

One of these is the age-old attraction of disarmament. Since the days of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the idea of throwing away weapons and outlawing war has appealed to peace-loving Americans.

In its present rather sophisticated stage, the key words are "destabilization" and "arms limiting negotiations." Nobody really seriously expects the great powers to disarm any more, but great credence is given to the idea of, as it is generally stated, "halting the arms race." The theory is that both the Soviets and the United States now have the power to actually destroy the other and this is the best deterrent of war. Anything that tends to increase one side's capacity to survive an attack or to launch a first strike attack without suffering unacceptable retaliation is "destabilizing," since it increases the likelihood of a first strike or an accidental firing starting a war and since it calls for effort at countermeasures by the other side. So, we should negotiate an agreement not to develop any more nuclear weapons, either offensive or defensive.

We hear frequently of late that there is real chance for arms limitation negotiations with the Russians, and by extension it is, therefore, assumed that the Soviets are ready to limit arms production. With the possible exception of Talleyrand at the Congress of Vienna, I know of no cases in history where anybody won at the negotiations table what they were not able to defend on the battlefield. However, the word "negotiation" has great charm for many people today.

The Secretary of State has announced that he hoped to get talks with the Russians started soon. However, I have seen no concrete evidence that the Russians are interested in stopping the development of advance weapons systems—except by the United States. But public statements assuming Russian interest in negotiations jump quickly from that point to the idea that the United States is somehow responsible for preventing negotiations and must take a first step in getting arms limitations talks started.

Recently I read a widely circulated article in a scientific journal on the arms race. The article said that reducing the uncertainty about an adversary's intentions and capabilities is an essential con-

dition to curtailing the arms race. Discussing ways to reduce uncertainty, the author said:

There is unilateral disclosure. In the case of the U.S. there has been a conscious effort to inform both the American public and the Russian leadership of the rationale for many American decisions regarding strategic systems and, to the extent consistent with security, of U.S. capabilities. This has been done particularly through the release by the Secretary of Defense of an annual "posture" statement, a practice that, it is hoped, will be continued by the U.S. and will be emulated someday by the U.S.S.R. This would be in the interest of both countries.

Now, the remarkable thing in this paragraph is that it concedes the United States is making efforts to disclose its capabilities and intentions most clearly to the Russians so that there will be no misunderstanding. In point of fact, the annual posture statement by the Defense Secretary has been a feature of our Defense reviews for more than a decade. The posture statements have gone to great length and detail, sometimes running into hundreds of pages. The author vaguely hopes that the Russians will emulate us someday, but he seems somehow undisturbed that they have not done so up to now and includes no criticism of their intentions and posture because of that fact.

Yet the main burden of the article is that we have to take steps to stop the arms race, that we have to stop development of ABM and the MIRV—multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle—that we have to take steps, possibly by unilateral restraint, to stop new arms development that may be destabilizing.

Little thought is given to what happens to our position if the Russians continue weapons development after we stop.

For example, the author says deployment of a U.S. ABM "seems certain to have an effect on Russian planners, who may push for development of their own MIRV systems." I have news for him—the Russians are vigorously pushing their own MIRV development already.

The simple truth is that most discussions fail to recognize the basic fact that the Russians have done far more to create an arms race than we have. They acted first to develop ICBM's. They developed a bomb as large as 60 megatons, although we have never developed bombs of anywhere near that size. They developed a fractional orbital bombardment system—FOBS—a destabilizing weapon if I ever heard of one, since it is essentially a first strike weapon. They have not only developed, but have deployed, an ABM system, although of limited capability, and they have continued to try to improve and update this system. And they are proceeding with MIRV development.

The curious reasoning of those who are attracted by the illusion of the new Russia was illustrated exceptionally well by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover—who is no darling of either the military or the industrial community—in stating his support for the ABM as a nonprovocative weapon. He said:

The Russians have been singularly silent in this respect; the outcry has come mostly from those in this country who habitually

apply a double standard when adjudging military developments in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. One must ask how can our defensive capability be considered provocative, while theirs is not?

If the Soviets are, indeed, prepared to enter negotiations, it will be for one reason—because they believe they have caught up or passed the United States and want to use negotiations as a device to freeze U.S. strength at present levels.

The idea that the beginning of negotiations is the end of the problem is not facing the facts. The negotiations process is a difficult task at best. And I have not heard even the supposition that the Russians would halt weapons development while the negotiations are in progress.

But those who call for negotiations invariably call for this country to cease its own weapons development pending the outcome of the negotiations. It is easy to see that the Russians could draw out the negotiations process for months or years—just as they have in the past—and during the negotiations continue to increase their weapons arsenal while the United States stood still.

I think it would surprise everybody if Russia agreed to inspection—even after an arms-limiting agreement were signed.

There is little hope of the Russians ever doing so because it is an example of the truth that goes to the heart of the relationship between the two countries. Theirs is a closed society and ours is an open society; ours is a country of free men and theirs is not.

Hand in hand with the illusion of a Soviet desire for arms limitation and an end to weapons development is the idea that the Soviet regime is more peaceful and more moderate in world affairs.

We are told that the nature of communism is no longer monolithic, that it is going through an evolution into better things.

I do not know if it is monolithic in its structure, but I know that it is paleolithic in its concerns for human freedom.

The Soviet actions in the Middle East show it to be as much committed to violence and unscrupulous measures to gain power as any Russian regime in history. In recent years there has been an attempt of intellectuals in Russia to speak out more and to take a greater part in determining Russian life. The result has been, of course, the jailing of artists and scholars, and senseless attacks against Jewish authors in the Soviet Union.

It is remarkable the degree to which some seemingly intelligent men can delude themselves on these points. In a letter to a newspaper, the British author Graham Greene remarked that he would much rather live in the Soviet Union than in the United States. The principal purpose of his letter was to say that he was giving the royalties from the sale of his books in Russia—which he could not get out of Russia anyhow—to the defense of two Russian writers on trial in Moscow. The reason for their trial was that they had criticized the state. Subsequently, they were convicted and are now in prison. Mr. Greene, a writer, would rather live in that society than ours.

Finally, what has all this got to do

with the military-industrial complex? The answer, of course, is "nothing." No Members of the House or Senate would suggest for a minute that any major defense contractor would take steps, publicly or clandestinely, to prevent arms limitations negotiations with the Russians. No Member of the House or Senate would suggest that any of these major contractors would take any steps to prevent the carrying forward of negotiations concerning the Vietnam war or to prevent the President from bringing that war to an end. And I know of no Member of Congress who would allege that any defense contractor made an effort to get us into the war in Vietnam. Yet the pressures for arms negotiations or ending the war are frequently coupled with an attack on these industrial forces.

XII. MILITARY INFLUENCE, FOREIGN POLICY, AND THE CONGRESS

In conclusion, where does the responsibility for policy lie? Where is the safeguard against unwarranted power?

Frequently, mention is made of the number of American bases and troops overseas and the number of countries in which we maintain a military presence, and this is generally stated in a way that implies both a criticism of the military and an overreaching influence of the military in our national decisionmaking processes.

It may be that we have overextended ourselves around the globe and overcommitted ourselves. I am inclined to think that to at least some extent we have. I am inclined to think that there are areas of the world we should stay out of. I would certainly agree with anybody who says that many of our allies could take a greater portion of the burden of military security in their own bailiwick and that some of our forces could be brought back. I am deeply concerned, as other Members of Congress are concerned, about our balance-of-payments problem and our gold reserves. And finally, I am convinced that we are committed, by bilateral and multilateral agreements, to more tasks around the world than we could always fulfill. A Special Subcommittee on National Security Policy found last year that our forces were not always adequate for the contingencies they were designed to face, that there had been inadequate coordination between commitments and resources made available, and that our planning for certain military contingencies—including various future contingencies in Vietnam—was inadequate.

I am convinced that a lot more thought has to be given to these problems and a lot better coordination achieved among the various branches of Government.

But the main truth to be recognized is that this military presence in foreign areas, this military response, took place as a result of foreign policy commitments decided by the President and the Congress. I think one might even say with some justification that foreign policy actions and foreign involvements which get the most bitter complaint are those which are decided by the civilian political leadership without a decision by Congress, or at least without adequate

debate and study prior to acquiescence by Congress.

I was interested to see the majority leader of the Senate say recently that civilian authority was remiss for initiating foreign policy which resulted, in the end, in major military commitments.

Recently in one of the local papers I saw a Member of this body quoted as saying:

It is high time we got back to what the Founding Fathers had in mind.

I could not agree with him more. And what the Founding Fathers had in mind was for the Congress to perform an active role in decisionmaking—foreign policy decisionmaking and military policy decisionmaking.

If Congress carries out its constitutional role without shirking, without passing the cup, there will be no need to worry about overreaching power in the hands of the military-industrial complex or any other complex.

The Congress of the United States is the forum where the voice of the people can be brought to bear on policy decisions. And it is by assertion of its responsibility by the Congress—and only in the assertion of its responsibilities by the Congress—that there will be assured the separation of power and diffusion of power which is the one sure safeguard against the disastrous rise of misplaced power. If the Congress does its job, then security and liberty can prosper together.

NEW AMBASSADOR TO THE NETHERLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as an exchange student in Holland, I developed a great love and feeling of kinship for the Dutch people. It has always been a source of great pleasure to me as a public official—and personally as well—that our country has long enjoyed such a warm relationship with this historic nation, through adversity and good fortune.

Thus I rise at this time to commend the President's choice for Ambassador to the Netherlands, J. William Middendorf II, for this is an appointment in which I take special interest. Mr. Middendorf is a gentleman of true distinction, a scholar of wide renown, and a businessman of great achievement. Not only is he deserving of such an important appointment, but he is extremely well qualified to represent the United States in the Netherlands.

Long an admirer and noted collector of fine paintings, Bill Middendorf has devoted a great deal of time to study and collection of the Dutch masters. Among the distinguished examples in his collection are two Rembrandts of exquisite beauty, a Steen, a Dordrecht, a Claesz, an Ochtervelt, and a Van Ostade. Thus, through his study of history and love of art, Mr. Middendorf is well grounded in the background of the Dutch people and the aspects of culture which are particularly dear to that nation. With his great sensitivity and understanding of

the illustrious past of Holland, he will be a most welcome envoy and an exemplary representative of the American people. He will have much to offer as Ambassador to the Netherlands that will serve to strengthen the warm relationship between the United States and our longtime ally Holland.

I have stressed Mr. Middendorf's commitment to the world of art for several reasons. From my student experience, I know that the Dutch people highly esteem the history of painting by their countrymen. Of equal importance, however, is the strength of the Middendorf collection of American painting and prints, which has been exhibited in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, in the Museum of Art in Mr. Middendorf's native Baltimore, and which will come to Washington within the next few years in the course of its nationwide exhibition. Mr. Middendorf and his charming wife Isabelle have developed this collection lovingly, with keen interest not only in esthetic aspects but also with regard to historical import. Thus both Bill Middendorf and his wife are dedicated students of Americana—a great asset to any American Ambassador representing our country abroad.

Mr. Middendorf's business acumen is well known throughout our Nation and in foreign lands. His expertise and resourcefulness will be respected by the Dutch people, who, with limited natural resources in their country nevertheless enjoy a healthy economy, created by their own business ingenuity. A partner in the firm of Middendorf & Colgate, Mr. Middendorf has devoted much time and energy to the development of forward-looking business. His activity in founding the Oceanographic Fund is notable. Funds from this company support the production of fish protein concentrates which may mean so much to the hungry nations of the world. He has also taken an active interest in the area of cybernetics, a key element in the future of science, industry, and technologically related fields and in modernizing business methods throughout the world.

Mr. Middendorf's talents and interests are indeed diverse, just as are those of the Dutch people. He is a trustee of the Philatelic Foundation and owns a rare collection. A connoisseur of many arts, Bill Middendorf is, like most Americans, a sports enthusiast as well. In 1960 he served as a judge at the Rome Olympics. He is a member of the U.S. Olympic Games Committee and has been president of the Field Hockey Association of America.

Industrious in all things, Mr. Middendorf is a well-known philanthropist. He has undertaken charitable works with the same enthusiasm he has devoted to his business enterprises.

Bill Middendorf has championed, among other causes, the campaign to save the American Renaissance home of Frederic Edwin Church, leading painter of the Hudson River School. This rare 19th-century monument, in the style of a Moorish Italian villa, now stands as a beautiful landmark in American architectural artistry; and its magnificent view is the delight of conservationists as

well. J. William Middendorf II was a forerunner in the recognition of the importance of preserving this unique home, and his efforts were significant in the success of the Olana crusade. This sensitivity on his part will be most appealing to the Dutch people, who share his reverence for history.

Mr. Middendorf has been a tireless worker in the American Antiquarian Society, as well as the New York and Greenwich Historical Societies, both of which he serves as trustee.

J. William Middendorf II has also worked actively for the cause of good government and the perpetuation of the two-party system. Shunning the public eye himself, he has long worked behind the scenes to finance the campaigns of worthy political candidates. Through active political participation, he believes, the democratic system of our Nation is best served. His most outstanding work in the political realm has perhaps occurred through his service to the Republican National Committee where he has been treasurer for a number of years—truly a thankless, unending job, requiring the utmost initiative and effort, in addition to interminable midnight hours.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the American people and our Government are indeed fortunate that Bill Middendorf is interested in public service of this kind and is willing to serve as our Ambassador to the Netherlands. He is a very distinguished American, committed to excellence in all things, a connoisseur in the fullest sense of the term. Mr. Middendorf, it may be accurately said, is a man touched by success. His great intelligence, perception, and affability have led him to success in all the varied fields of his interest. It is certain that his tenure as Ambassador to the Netherlands will be marked by even greater sympathy and mutual interest than that of the past.

I am extremely pleased at President Nixon's wise choice in Mr. Middendorf, for he—with his warmth, enthusiasm, and scholarship—will represent to the fullest extent all that is America. The American Embassy in The Hague is going to be a thoroughly enjoyable and interesting place—and a great credit to our Nation in every respect—under the direction of J. William Middendorf II.

IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in this body a bill designed to improve military procurement policies and practices which too often have resulted in exorbitant waste of taxpayer dollars.

Almost daily, examples of waste, cost overruns, and inefficiency are reported. This ever-increasing phenomenon is, in part at least, responsible for our burgeoning defense budget.

The totally unacceptable practice of acquisition by secretly negotiated, sole-source, noncompetitive contract has con-

tributed the most to this unacceptable condition.

This unbelievable, purposeful restriction of competition and restraint of trade has often featured highhanded inconsideration and rejection of low-bidding, certifiably competent small-business concerns. Conversely, this pattern of performance has often featured a favoritism in behalf of cynically lobbying, high-bidding large ones.

Not the least of the tragic results have been those in which more and more small companies which have survived have refused to risk further consequences of bucking the tide in trying to give their Government the benefit of their particular genius or capacity. And more and more big companies, arrogant with freely granted affluence, have become increasingly more dogmatic in their demands upon the military procurement components of the military-industrial complex and increasingly more lethargic about quality of product, contract performance, and delivery schedules. In short, the doctors of military procurement, to a strong degree, have created, in their favored industrial counterparts, their own Frankenstein monsters.

The end result of this tragic train of circumstances and its resultant quagmire has produced, as its most obvious, most frightening result, that which, with great perceptibility and incisiveness, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress defines as "the extensive and pervasive economic inefficiency and waste that occurs in the military procurement program"—complete with that which the committee, in its excellent report, "The Economics of Military Procurement," defines as "defense buying practices which are reducing competition for Government contracts and increasing economic concentration within the defense industry."

This report, which does much to underscore the propriety of my own publicly expressed concern and exposure of typical cases of waste, also notes the fact that—

The total effect of unnecessary cost overruns, of hidden profits in fat contracts, of inefficiency and waste, and of the absence of cost controls is to create a bloated defense budget.

It notes the contributing problems of "profit pyramiding," "buying-in," "absence of uniform accounting standards," "voluminous change orders and contractors' claims," and "failure of incentive contracting."

It notes the contributing problems of "secrecy and failure to disclose information." It also notes, with great and understandable concern, the massive problem of "negotiation"—that wasteful, ever-more-suspect procedure which, as the report affirmed, led to the result in which "formally advertised competitive military contract dollar awards dropped from 13.4 percent in fiscal year 1967 to 11.5 percent in fiscal year 1968," while "single source procurement increased to 57.9 percent."

These findings, and these percentages, by this able and distinguished joint committee of the Congress, are significantly close to the findings and percentages which, prior to publication of that report,

I, as one Member of the Congress, managed to ascertain by independent, personal investigation of a few typical cases.

It is certain that this peculiar procedure known as negotiation lies heavily at the fatty heart of the whole military procurement problem. Its most outstanding features—competition restriction and dollar-waste—are nurtured, perpetrated, and protected by the secretly arrived-at, sole-source, noncompetitive contract awards which flow, directly and regularly, from the negotiation procedure. And all of this is routinely alibied and rationalized on the blanket claim of "urgency of delivery" and/or "lack of drawings" or "lack of a competitive procurement data package."

It is, therefore, after careful consideration of the problem, its cause and its effect, and after consultation with experts on this subject, that I have drafted this proposed legislation.

In my great and growing concern for the ever-expanding magnitude of this problem, I hope that the Congress will give it most expeditious consideration and passage into law; for my bill would end this problem and its unacceptable ramifications. It would do so by creating, as an independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, a 12-member Military Procurement Review Board.

This Board would be appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate.

Its members would be appointed for terms of 4 years on a staggered basis to assure administrative and functional continuity.

They would be executive schedule personnel. The Chairman would hold level III status. The other members would hold level IV status.

The Board would have a Director and a professional staff, with neither being subject to civil service.

The Military Procurement Review Board would do for the Defense Establishment that which the Defense Establishment has proved unable or unwilling to do for itself. Under the Board's continually vigilant eye, doors to this long train of military procurement practices would be slammed in many ways in favor of the straight and narrow path of greater effectiveness, greater performance, and a saving of combat lives and taxpayer dollars.

This, in fact, will be a strengthening of the Defense Establishment and its position against those who seek to exploit it.

Under the supervision of this Military Procurement Review Board, my bill would do the following:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no procurement (whether by purchase or contract) or property or services may be made by the head of a military agency under chapter 135, 137, 139, 141, 431, 433, 633, 645, 931, or 933 of title 10, United States Code, unless the Board first approves such procurement by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the membership.

To approve a procurement, the Board must first find that—

The procurement, if proposed to be negotiated, will meet all other requirements which may be imposed by law with respect to such

negotiations; will be made under contractual arrangements of the kind authorized by law and appropriate under the circumstances; and is in the public interest; or the procurement, if proposed to be made by formal advertising by the head of the military agency—

Will meet all requirements imposed by law with respect to such formal advertising, particularly with respect to the availability, to all bidders, of all samples, drawings, and data necessary to permit full and free competition with respect to such procurement (whether or not such samples, drawings, or data were acquired by the United States pursuant to earlier procurement), and will be made under contractual arrangements of the kind authorized by law and appropriate under the circumstances.

In determining whether or not a proposed negotiated procurement will be in the public interest, the Board shall consider all relevant factors, including, but not limited to, the past military procurement experience (including all renegotiations of contracts) with the proposed contractor or contractors; past procurement experiences, whether by negotiation or formal advertising, with respect to similar property or services; uniqueness of design or construction of the items to be procured; and the conditions of competition among contractors experienced in the production of similar items. The Board shall not find a proposed negotiated procurement in the public interest in any case in which such negotiated procurement is sought to be justified on the basis of urgency of need or advantageous sole source procurement unless such justification is clearly supported by such evidence as the Board may require.

If the Board fails to approve a procurement proposed to be negotiated, the head of the military agency concerned shall make such procurement by formal advertising, subject to approval of two-thirds of the membership of the 12-Member Military Procurement Review Board.

If the Board fails to approve a proposed procurement by formal advertising . . . the head of the military agency concerned may not proceed with the proposed procurement until he takes, or gives assurances deemed satisfactory by the Board that he will take, corrective action, as shall be specified by the board, to insure that the procurement will be made in a manner consistent with law and under conditions permitting free and full competition for the purchase or contract.

The Board shall take no action to approve a proposed procurement until the head of the military agency concerned submits to it all information (including details of the contractual arrangements which the head of such agency proposes to make), papers, documents, studies, samples, and other materials with respect to the proposed procurement which the Board deems necessary to enable it to carry out its functions.

This includes "the case of a procurement proposed to be negotiated, the name of any contractor with whom the head of the military agency concerned proposes to enter into negotiations, and a detailed record of past military procurement experience with such contractor."

This also includes "the case of any procurement proposed to be made by formal advertising, the draft specifications, including attachments, which the head of the military agency concerned proposes to include in the invitation for bids."

My bill also provides:

The Board shall undertake a continuing review of all procurement practices utilized by the heads of the military agencies. At least once during each calendar year after 1969, the Board shall report such recommen-

dations for legislative action with respect to military procurement practices as the Board deems necessary or appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, in sum, will bring the aforementioned practices, abuses, and fact-covering military procurement procedures to an abrupt halt.

In the interest of the Government and people of the United States—and, indeed, in the interest of the Department of Defense and its servicemen everywhere in the world, particularly in Vietnam at this moment—this legislation will do what the military procurement people have proved unable or unwilling to do—impose a policeable and policed code of military procurement policy and practice in the perpetual, total interest of maximum efficiency at minimum cost, and the best equipment at least cost, delivered most expeditiously, properly tested and assuredly ready for combat.

And certainly not the least important aspect of this Review Board-administered performance will be its, at least, annual report to the Congress, complete with recommendations for legislative action required to improve or remedy any military procurement practice or problem which the Board may find requiring such action.

It should go without saying that such a report will be a most refreshing and welcome development for Members of this body; for, quite obviously, such a report from such a Board will be infinitely more factual, straightforward, clear, and candid than that which the Congress has too long been receiving, often only after much aggravating interrogation and digging, in its often severely hampered and frustrated efforts to meet its sobering constitutional responsibility to raise armies and levy taxes with which to pay, arm, supply, and support them.

EULOGY TO JOHN L. LEWIS

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of John Llewellyn Lewis marks the end of the road of one of the giants of the American labor movement. When he assumed the presidency of the United Mine Workers of America on February 6, 1920, wages in the coal industry were from \$1 to \$3 a day. At his death coal miners were among the highest paid workers in the United States and, additionally, they enjoyed pension and welfare benefits unheard of in the 1920's.

The impact of Mr. Lewis, however, went beyond the confines of the union which he headed for 40 years. The rights and dignity enjoyed today by so many men and women who work for wages are the result of the unflagging battles he waged for more than 40 years as an active labor leader and labor statesman. Mr. Lewis was a true and early crusader. Most importantly, he was a successful crusader.

The Committee on Education and Labor today is considering bills to improve the safety of coal miners, to protect them from the ravages of black lung, and to provide adequate workmen's compensation for coal miners who already are dis-

abled because of the black lung disease. These are goals for which John L. Lewis fought relentlessly during his active career. It is my desire and my hope that this Congress can pay fitting tribute to the memory of this great labor statesman by enacting a bill which will protect the coal miners of this Nation, in or out of the United Mine Workers of America, from injury or death resulting from accidents, will maintain the level of coal dust so that they may breathe pure air, and will appropriately compensate those already suffering from advanced stages of pneumoconiosis.

A statement by W. A. Boyle is included herewith:

STATEMENT BY W. A. BOYLE ON DEATH OF JOHN L. LEWIS

The thundering voice of America's greatest labor leader has been stilled. The passing of John L. Lewis is a great loss for the United Mine Workers of America and a personal tragedy for me. I have lost a friend, a counselor and mentor. John L. Lewis brought me from Montana, guided me and helped me to carry the heavy burdens I now must carry. His passing leaves a void in my life that can never be filled.

To the working men and women of the world, he was the symbol of dignity, strength, unity and labor's struggle for betterment. To America's coal miners, he was the fighter who led them from serfdom to their rightful place as first-class members of the American society.

John L. Lewis was a man of deep compassion, possessed of tremendous capabilities, extraordinary vision, sheer genius of mind and, as characterizes his brother coal miners, had indomitable courage. His entire life was dedicated to improving the lot of his fellow man. His name is a legend, as is the inspiration he has given to all of us. All America and the entire free world mourn his death. But it is felt most deeply among the members of the United Mine Workers of America and its leadership.

I am asking that on Monday, June 16, 1969, all coal miners gather in their respective churches and union halls for services in memory of John L. Lewis. Beginning at 12:01 a.m., June 13, 1969, until after the funeral there will be a period of mourning during which time all coal mining will cease in the United States and Canada as we honor our fallen leader. It is altogether fitting that the coal mines be silent while the men who work in them come together to do honor to John Llewellyn Lewis.

As an even more fitting memorial to him, I demand that the U.S. Congress immediately pass strong coal mine health and safety legislation. A John L. Lewis health and safety bill would be a fitting climax and memorial to the career of this outstanding champion of coal mine safety.

We hope that Americans of all stations and especially the American labor movement will now rally and support the push of John L. Lewis' union for health and safety legislation.

John L. Lewis best described himself at a convention of coal miners when he said: "I have pleaded your case from the pulpit and the public platform . . . not in the quavering tones of a feeble mendicant asking alms, but in the thundering voice of the captain of a mighty host, demanding the rights to which free men are entitled."

That was John L. Lewis.

A BAN ON GAS AND GERM WARFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, for myself and on behalf of 24 other Members, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that President Nixon should resubmit the Geneva protocol of 1925 to the U.S. Senate for ratification.

The Geneva protocol of 1925 bans the first-use of chemical and bacteriological warfare. With one possible exception we have adhered to the principles of the Geneva protocol in the 44 years that have elapsed since we introduced it in Geneva. We also voted in the United Nations in 1966 for a resolution which called for the strict observance by all states of the principles and objectives of the Geneva protocol. Yet although we are committed to the principles of the Geneva protocol and have also voted for a resolution in the United Nations inviting all nations to ratify the protocol, we have never done so.

On April 29, 1969, following a comprehensive review of our stated policies regarding use of chemical and biological warfare and our practices, I wrote to President Nixon urging that he resubmit the Geneva protocol to the U.S. Senate. I did so because I believe that the United States should remove any ambiguity surrounding its policies governing the first-use of chemical and biological warfare by ratifying the protocol. The policy of no first-use has been a traditional one for the United States. There is no good reason not to ratify the protocol at this time.

The Geneva protocol, one of the few treaties that has been relatively effective in limiting man's inhumanity to man, was first introduced by the United States. Representative Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, led the American delegation to the Geneva Conference for the Control of the International Trade in Arms, Munitions, and Implements of War which met in 1925. Representative Burton proposed an amendment to the convention being considered by the Conference prohibiting the use of gas and bacteriological warfare. He, of course, did so with the full support of President Coolidge and Secretary of State Kellogg.

The Geneva protocol governing gas and germ warfare was patterned on the provision adopted by Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments of 1922. A prohibition on the use of gas warfare was adopted by most countries attending that Conference. President Harding and Secretary of State Hughes were instrumental in bringing the prohibition of gas warfare before the Conference. The United States signed the Washington treaty adopted at that Conference and the treaty was submitted to the U.S. Senate for ratification. The Senate gave its consent to this treaty without a dissenting vote. Unfortunately the Washington treaty did not come into force because France objected to certain provisions limiting submarines.

A ban on gas warfare similar to that adopted by the Washington Arms Conference was proposed by Representative Burton in Geneva in 1925. An amendment was added including bacteriological

methods of warfare in this prohibition. The relevant part of the protocol states:

Whereas the use of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, has been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world; and

Whereas the prohibition of such use has been declared in Treaties to which the majority of Powers of the world are Parties; and

To the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as part of International Law, binding alike the conscience and the practice of nations:

Declare:

That the High Contracting Parties, so far as they are not already Parties to Treaties prohibiting such use, accept this prohibition, agree to extend this prohibition to the use of bacteriological methods of warfare and agree to be bound as between themselves according to the terms of this declaration.

The protocol was signed by the U.S. representatives at the Conference on June 27, 1925.

The protocol, however, was not considered by the Senate until almost a year later. During the interval, the American chemical industry and the Army Chemical Warfare Service lobbied against ratification of the protocol. In addition, because of the ease with which the Washington Arms Treaty had been ratified by the Senate, the executive branch apparently did not believe that it was necessary to mobilize support for ratification. The result was that the opponents carried the day. The protocol was considered in executive session by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and by the full Senate as well with the exception of a very limited debate open to the public. Senator Borah considered pressing for a vote on the protocol on December 9, 1926, but because of the absence of some Senators, decided not to. The protocol was not voted on by that Senate and remained in the Foreign Relations Committee until 1947. In that year Senator Arthur Vandenberg sent back to the White House, without prejudice, all unratified treaties which had been submitted prior to 1941.

The Senate has never voted on the Geneva protocol. It has not been ratified and cannot be ratified by the Senate unless President Nixon resubmits it at this time. Yet more than 60 nations have ratified the Geneva protocol. Every NATO country and every Warsaw Pact country except the United States has ratified it. Every major industrial nation except the United States and Japan has ratified it. But although we have voted for a resolution charging each nation with strict adherence to the protocol, we have not ratified it.

Our failure to ratify the Geneva protocol is particularly contradictory in view of the frequency with which American leaders, both civilian and military, have expressed their abhorrence of gas and germ warfare. These leaders reflected the highest ideals of our Nation in their statements and actions.

The famous statesman, Senator Elihu Root, one-time Secretary of State, Nobel Peace Prize winner, and strong proponent of the League of Nations, drafted the section of the Washington Arms Treaty of 1922 that banned use of gas warfare.

Following the signing of the treaty of the Washington Arms Conference of 1922, Gen. John "Blackjack" Pershing, famous World War I leader of the American Expeditionary Forces, stated:

It is inconceivable that the United States will initiate the use of gases . . . and by no means certain that it will use them even in retaliation.

General Pershing subsequently testified in favor of ratification of the treaty.

Representative Burton, formerly a Senator and chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, led the American delegation to the Geneva Conference in 1925. He pressed strongly for the adoption of the provisions of the protocol relating to gas and bacteriological warfare.

Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover all vigorously opposed the use of chemical warfare. President Coolidge supported the American position at the Geneva Conference of 1925. He also agreed to call a special conference in Washington to prohibit the use of poison gas.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt was a constant foe of the use of gas warfare. As Assistant Secretary of the Navy he was a member of the Advisory Committee appointed by President Harding to gain approval of the Washington Arms Treaty of 1922. This Committee mobilized public support for Senate ratification of the treaty. In 1937 he said:

It has been and is the policy of this Government to do everything in its power to outlaw the use of chemicals in warfare. Such use is inhuman and contrary to what modern civilization should stand for.

I am doing everything in my power to discourage the use of gases and other chemicals in any war between nations.

During World War II the United States had more than 12 million Americans under arms at one time. President Roosevelt learned in 1943 that the Germans might be contemplating the use of gas warfare. He said at that time:

Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.

Famous World War II Adm. Chester Nimitz, in discussing tough decisions in that conflict said:

There were a lot of tough ones. I think when the War Department suggested the use of poison gas during the invasion of Iwo Jima that was a trying decision. I decided the United States should not be the first to violate the Geneva Convention. It cost many fine Marines.

President Roosevelt's senior naval adviser in World War II, Admiral Leahy, in response to a suggestion made in 1944 that biological agents be used to destroy the Japanese rice crop, said such activity would "violate every Christian ethic I ever heard of and of all the known laws of war."

During the Korean war in the winter and spring of 1951 the Chinese-North Korean Command charged that the United Nations was using bacteriological weapons in Korea. The United Nations

and the United States emphatically denied these charges and asked that the International Red Cross investigate the charges. The U.S. delegation to the United Nations repeatedly proposed resolutions in the Security Council asking that the charge be investigated. And following the exchange of prisoners of war, American POW's stated that they had been forced to confess to the use of bacteriological warfare by the Chinese and North Koreans. The main point, however, is that the United Nations and the United States did not use bacteriological warfare in Korea and wanted to make it undeniably clear to the rest of the world that this was the case. We did not want even the suggestion that we might have used germ warfare to go unchallenged.

I also understand that some military leaders urged the use of gas during the difficult fighting in Korea. This suggestion was rejected by our top military leaders.

From the use of gas during the First World War by the French and Germans up until the end of the Korean war chemical warfare was not used by the United States. And our top political and military leaders had on a number of occasions stated their convictions that we should not use this form of warfare. With the exception of the Vietnamese war, gas has only been used on three recorded occasions, in Ethiopia, in China, and in Yemen. In each case gas was used on a relatively small scale. Compared to other forms of warfare, the post-World War I ban on gas and germ warfare has been fairly effective.

Within the past decade, however, increased spending for chemical and biological warfare and the use of chemicals in the Vietnamese war raise the question of whether we are moving away from our traditional policy of no first-use.

In the late 1950's the U.S. Army conducted Operation Blue Sky, an attempt to win public support for the use of chemical and biological weapons in warfare. Although this campaign proved somewhat abortive, increased funds were available to the Department of Defense for gas and germ weapons in the 1960's. It is estimated that the Department of Defense has at least a billion lethal doses of the latest nerve gas in its arsenals and it is believed to have pilot batches of germs for a number of deadly diseases that have been standardized for our biological warfare arsenal. This practice of stockpiling gas in large quantities is apparently not followed by our allies.

Heavy involvement in Vietnam, rising to a new level of violence in 1965, was accomplished by the use of gas weapons, something that had not been done in the last half century. Reporters found that United States and South Vietnamese forces were using tear and vomiting gases in this conflict. Following the public outcry that this announcement raised in the United States and abroad, Secretary McNamara stated that South Vietnamese forces had been equipped with three gases which they had used, CS, CN, and DM. He said that these were essentially riot control agents not covered by the Geneva Protocol and were being used to reduce the amount of violence required.

Secretary of State Rusk said, when questioned on this subject on March 24, 1965:

We are not embarking upon gas warfare in Vietnam. There has been no policy decision to engage in gas warfare in Vietnam. We are not talking about agents or weapons that are associated with gas warfare, the military arsenals of many countries.

We are talking about a gas which has been commonly adopted by the police forces of the world as riot control agents.

Now, why is tear gas a part of the equipment of police forces? It is because police forces would like to be able to use the minimum force that is required for the maintenance of law and order. It is a minimum instrument.

Now these are the essential policy aspects of the problem. We do not expect that gas will be used in ordinary military operations.

Yet in flat contradiction to this statement, we learned on February 22, 1966, that helicopters dropped hundreds of tear gas grenades on a small patch of jungle, believed to be a fortified Vietcong area 265 miles northeast of Saigon, in preparation for a B-52 bombing raid. The Defense Department explained that the gas attack was designed to flush Vietcong troops out of bunkers and tunnels before the attack so that they would be vulnerable to the shrapnel and explosions. We subsequently learned that gas was being used for this purpose for bomb and attacks. And we also learned that it was being used to flush North Vietnamese out of bunkers to be shot.

The use of tear gas in Vietnam is not a haphazard thing. The Army's procurement figures for the three types of tear gas indicate the extent of its use in Vietnam:

U.S. ARMY PROCUREMENT PROGRAM
(In thousands of pounds)

	Fiscal year					
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
CS	225	93	378	437	714	2,018
CS-1	142	160	1,217	770	3,249	160
CS-2					288	3,885
Total	367	253	1,595	1,207	4,251	6,063

These figures are only for gas in Southeast Asia and do not cover requirements for control of civil disturbance or other purposes outside of Southeast Asia.

The evolution of CS into a third type of gas, specifically designed for use in the humid conditions of Vietnam, also suggests some of the problems with the use of any gas. What is classified as tear gas today may well be changed in chemical formula to have much more extensive effects in the future and yet still be termed "tear gas." We already have an example of this in DM, designated by the U.S. Army as an irritant gas until the early 1950's when it changed colors and became a riot control agent of a tear gas nature.

In Vietnam we have changed our policy regarding gas warfare. The use of gas in conjunction with lethal conventional weapons such as artillery and bombs is clearly chemical warfare. Despite some ambiguity in the wording of the Geneva protocol, Britain, France, Spain, and a number of other countries have all said that the protocol applies to tear gas.

This is the protocol that we say we support fully in principle when the subject is raised at the United Nations.

We also found that we are using chemicals to attack food crops in Vietnam. Both State and Defense are quick to point out that the chemical defoliants and herbicides used are the same type employed in agriculture and industry at home and are not banned by the Geneva protocol. It is true that herbicides and defoliants had not been invented at the time the protocol was considered. But what State and Defense do not say is that the use of these chemicals in Vietnam is entirely different from that at home; namely, to destroy food and to open lanes of fire for our troops and aircraft. They do not say that biologists are seriously concerned about the long-term effects of defoliants and herbicides on the Vietnamese countryside. They do not say that we are clearly using chemicals as a weapon against food.

Previous administrations have taken the position that tear gas is not covered by the Geneva protocol. They state that it is a standard riot control agent and hence can be used in combat. I believe that this is a mistake. The principle of no first-use of gas—any gas—is clear and unequivocal. The problems that use of some gases raise are difficult at best. Do we specify what formula is acceptable? Do we state that we will only use it against those who are unlikely to use it against us? When does a riot control agent become an irritant gas? When does an incapacitating gas become a riot control agent? These are the questions that are extraordinarily difficult to answer once you go beyond no first-use.

Similarly, the use of herbicides against crops and the indiscriminate use of defoliants to clear jungle without a clear knowledge of the ecological consequences seems to me a violation of the spirit of the Geneva protocol.

In my opinion, we are slowly eroding our traditional policy regarding no first-use of these abhorrent means of warfare. In many respects our policies for the use of lethal gases are vestiges of a pre-nuclear era. And it is inconceivable to me that the United States would loose a plague from our biological warfare arsenal on another nation in retaliation for their use of such a weapon. The Geneva protocol does not, of course, ban use of gas and germ warfare. It rather bans first use. It is a principle to which we have by-and-large adhered. I believe that we should reaffirm our support for this principle by ratifying the Geneva protocol of 1925. For that reason, I believe that the House of Representatives should urge President Nixon to resubmit the protocol to the Senate for ratification.

The House of Representatives can speak out clearly on this matter. We have a long tradition of concern about this area of warfare, starting with the leadership provided by Chairman Burton of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I, therefore, urge the House to adopt this resolution expressing the sense of this body that President Nixon resubmit the Geneva protocol banning first use of gas and germ warfare to the Senate for ratification.

The cosponsors of this resolution are Messrs. JONATHAN BINGHAM of New York; JOHN BLATNIK of Minnesota, GEORGE BROWN of California, DANIEL BUTTON of New York, JOHN CONYERS of Michigan, CHARLES DIGGS of Michigan, BOB ECKHARDT of Texas, DON EDWARDS of California, WILLIAM FORD of Michigan, CORNELIUS GALLAGHER of New Jersey, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS of California, KEN HECHLER of West Virginia, HENRY HELSTOSKI of New Jersey, EDWARD KOCH of New York, ABNER MIKVA of Illinois, PATSY MINK of Hawaii, RICHARD OTTINGER of New York, BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL of New York, WILLIAM RYAN of New York, JAMES SCHEUER of New York, ROBERT TIERNAN of Rhode Island, MORRIS UDALL of Arizona, CHARLES WHALEN of Ohio, and HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT
KING'S COLLEGE DELIVERED BY
DR. JAMES E. ALLEN, JR., U.S.
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 1, 1969, the members of the graduating class of 1969 were awarded their degrees at commencement exercises of King's College in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. As an invited guest and as a member of the board of trustees of King's College, it was my privilege to be present to hear the inspiring commencement address delivered by Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., who was recently appointed U.S. Commissioner of Education. In order that more of our citizens may have the opportunity of reading what Dr. Allen had to say to the graduates, I would like at this point to quote the text of his address, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. ALLEN

Father Kilburn, Congressman Flood, distinguished guests, and members of the class of 1969, I should like to begin by congratulating you on the achievements of King's College. In its relatively short history, your college has distinguished itself by growth in size and in academic excellence. This is important to a nation deeply convinced of the importance of quality education in the life of the individual, the community and the Nation. Your college, located in the heart of an urban complex with all the problems of all urban complexes today, is actively involved in helping to rebuild the city around it. This is important in a nation increasingly critical of the ivory tower university and increasingly disposed to look to higher education for the levers of social change.

I congratulate you further on having as your champion in the allied causes of education and community service so able an engineer of civic betterment as Congressman Flood. I know how fortunate King's College has been in having him as its patron because I know how effective he has been in the part of his work that touches the Department I represent. As chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Congressman Flood has had a major part in many of the most significant improvements now being realized in education throughout the nation as well as in Wilkes-Barre.

This year's college commencements are again taking place in the glare of a spotlight.

They are the focus of the attention not only of graduates, parents and others directly involved, but of a public mindful of the widespread turmoil and tension in so many of our universities.

The excessive manifestations that are generating much of this attention are regrettable not only in themselves but because they obscure and distort the more constructive aspects of today's unrest. Most commencement speeches will be tempered by these times, whether the speaker sees harm or hope in the developing trends.

There have been strong reactions of disgust, pessimism, almost despair. But underlying the increasing activism on our college campuses is, I believe, a lively stirring, a sense of change within the academic community that, in its potential for a revitalization of our higher educational institutions, justifies a hopeful feeling of expectancy about the future.

One reason for optimism can be found in the very nature of a commencement speech appropriate for today's graduating classes. In the past, a speech loyal to tradition would rely heavily upon the two elements of commendation and exhortation. It has been felt that one of the main responsibilities of the commencement speaker was to urge graduates to put behind them the carefree days of youth, to leave the happy halls of academe and to go forth into the world to begin the serious business of life.

To speak so today would be a gross misreading of the temper of the young, ridiculous, indeed almost insulting, in the face of a generation whose members are very early acknowledging an obligation for participation in the real concerns of man's search for dignity and meaning of life.

While such a setting does not substantially alter my conviction that the commencement speaker is the least essential ingredient of the occasion, it does provide the inspiration of trying to be worthy of the seriousness of purpose already shown by the graduates.

The seriousness of purpose of today's college students is already, and will increasingly be, a major factor in shaping change both within and without the college or university.

As more and more students have become more and more impatient with policies and attitudes that they feel deny expression of both their aims and their abilities, they have begun to seek new ways of expressing themselves and of finding means for direct participation in affairs of their concern.

Thus, we are witnessing a degree of student activism, relatively new in this country, which has generated a sense of "student power" that will make itself strongly felt not only on the campus but in all aspects of society.

It is not my intention in these remarks to deal with the more aggressive manifestations of statement unrest, except to say that worthiness of purpose cannot be used to justify or excuse violent, excessive and destructive forms of protest.

What is of more significance in the student activism now taking so many different forms is that it is a part of an awareness of the world and their place in it that characterizes the younger generation of today. This is, in my opinion, a great younger generation despite some of the far-out ways they choose for self-expression, and commendation in a commencement speech is a tradition that has even greater relevance than before.

In attempting objectively to evaluate and understand the new student activism and to anticipate its future development, it may be helpful to consider some of the reasons why this movement should be taking place now.

Certainly one of the basic reasons is the fact that this is a generation whose members have grown up with the knowledge that constantly hanging over their heads is the very real possibility of man's self-destruction. While this knowledge has generated a certain

amount of cynicism, its stronger effect has been the creation of a sense of urgency.

Motivating young people also is the character of the times. Man's age-old problems of attempting to manage his environment and to humanize his relationships have attained in this age a magnitude and a complexity that will no longer allow delay and indecision. The much more difficult human problems are now rapidly superseding those of mere material advance. The imperative need to deal with such problems, and the possibility of finding solutions that offer real hope for the betterment of mankind's lot have a strong appeal to the idealism of youth.

Another powerful factor in producing student activism at this juncture is an environment that has nourished earlier competence and independence. Social customs, educational and parental influences have made this a time when there is opportunity for achieving maturity at an earlier age. Never have young people had greater freedom to move about, to express themselves, to make their own personal decisions. Earlier exposure to adult problems and experiences has produced a degree of youthful sophistication not prevalent in past generations. Transportation and communications, bordering on the instant, have given youth broad horizons which qualify them as citizens of the world both in experience and in knowledge.

It is not surprising then that the greater awareness of themselves and their world, and the better preparation for coping with the problems they identify, which mark this younger generation, should have also produced a deep disillusionment and a restless impatience which are among the most compelling reasons for activist behavior.

Eager for revolutionary change and the immediate correction of longstanding social ills and injustices, concerned young people have little tolerance for what they consider to be the failure of our traditional institutions to "get with it" and to adapt to change. They also have a profound distrust of conventional values and a supreme disdain for the gap between the preaching and the practice, the saying and the doing, which they see all too often in the private and public lives of their elders.

Most of the reasons for student activism have sufficient validity and substance to make reasonable the forecast that the movement will gain rather than diminish in force. With increasing emphasis on its constructive aspects, this is a development which will, I believe, result in renewed vitality and relevance for our colleges and universities. It will also help to revitalize our society and bring about more quickly the improvements and the new directions that are so desperately needed.

The picture of the graduating class as standing on the threshold of life is today an anachronism. The boundaries of the campus now, in reality, encompass the world, for the students their already so much involved in the practical affairs and real concerns of life beyond the academic.

With so much of the business of America and the world still unfinished and with so much barely started—it is heartening indeed to observe that perhaps the greatest awareness of this unfinished business exists in the young. Look at their activities, listen to their talk, read their writings and it will be very clear that their attention is focused on the areas where man's failure and shortcomings are most conspicuous.

The volunteer community service of youth throughout the Nation is a very good example of both their perception of need and their understanding of the kinds of action required.

I should like to share with you some representative examples of this kind of service.

An excellent model is New York's Urban Corps Program. This project, launched in 1966, has brought more than 6,000 students

from over 150 colleges and universities into intimate association with the problems and prospects of one of the nation's most troubled cities.

A majority of these 6,000 and more have taken part in 12-week summer internships, and increasing numbers have been working part-time throughout the school year. A cross-section of the student population, ranging from freshmen to doctoral candidates, they work in such diverse areas as community development, medical technology, documentary film-making, legal assistance, and air pollution control. They have been assigned to more than 75 agencies and departments of the City government.

So well has the idea worked that last year the Ford Foundation issued a grant to promote the establishment of Urban Corps in other cities. More than 25 cities are now involved. A dozen such Urban Corps programs where students are actively engaged with the Nation's agenda for social reform are operating at this moment. A number of colleges in your state have consulted the Urban Corps National Development Office for guidance with their own student participation programs. I might also note that Philadelphia is one of the key Urban Corps cities.

Students in Michigan are leading the way in productive volunteer activities for all segments of the population of their state. There are currently some 10,000 student volunteers on the 27 different Michigan campuses. Their projects are mostly self-propelling. While the state maintains a division of Volunteer Services as an information center on volunteer programs for all the colleges and universities in Michigan, its help is more a matter of advice than money. Individual projects are as varied in character as they are numerous. One example is that of community gardens planted by agricultural students of Michigan State University in cooperation with inner city residents of Lansing.

In the south, students work with the Memphis Area Project-South which sponsors "clothes closet" to provide families with essential clothing in cases of need. This project also aids planned parenthood programs in South Memphis and sponsors nutrition classes designed to help the poor blacks of Memphis plan well-balanced meals.

I could cite many more—such as the foster grandparent project in Austin, Texas, recruiting low-income persons to work with retarded children; the special preparatory courses for future ghetto ministers at Atlanta University's Inter-denominational Theological Center; the prison extra-curricular activities fostered by a student group here in Pennsylvania.

This is positive activism that bespeaks concern, dedication and determination.

Peace, poverty, urban decay, segregation of races, the quality of our education system—these are the kinds of issues and problems that speak to the spirit of the young and that are bringing them forth into the fray.

With exhortation of youth then not needed as it once was, the commencement speaker is free to direct his words of exhortation elsewhere. The previous reference to unfinished business gives a clue as to the proper recipients—obviously the older generation. It is we who need to be stirred, and the stirring must take place in two simultaneous ways. The first is, of course, the arousal to a greater effort to deal with the business before us, to change attitudes, to throw off inhibiting traditions and to be willing to experiment and explore new methods and directions. Old dogs can learn new tricks, especially when survival is at stake.

But of even greater importance is the need to concentrate on ways of helping the young to realize the potential of their new sense of purpose and spirit of activism. This involves intensive efforts—far greater than yet evidenced—to provide full opportunity for

first-rate education. It also places upon our colleges and universities the obligation to examine their policies and practices and to make those adjustments necessary for the proper exercise of student participation.

Wisdom, understanding, and, above all, patience, will be essential, for in force, character and degree the present student activism is, as I previously said, a relatively new experience in our country. There is historically, however, much precedent that should help in assessing and understanding our current situation. In other nations, the power of students has long been a factor in both the inner life of the universities and in effect of youth upon political and social development.

Bologna, the first of our western universities, was an institution of students, and the difficulty experienced there in the adjustment of citizens and students to each other is still reflected in the overtones of the phrase "town and gown."

The University of Paris was a university of masters—and there are many other examples of a structuring of university life that has given much more say to both students and faculty, allowing them a more influential role in both policy and administration.

Student influence can be seen also as a major factor in political developments such as the Revolutions of 1958 in Germany and Austria, in the fall of Czarist Russia, in movements for national independence for developing areas. In nations where education has been limited to a small proportion of the population, students have often spearheaded progress with advocacy for modern ideas of liberty, socialism, industrialization and equality of opportunity.

Seen in this perspective, it is surprising that a widespread determined drive for greater student power has been so long in coming in this country.

An attitude of flexibility and objectivity is essential in considering this new activism and its present and future effects. But such an attitude is made difficult because of the unfortunate excesses that have occurred in these first probing efforts to find means of effective participation. It is, however, the special role of elders to maintain perspective, to look beyond the immediate crisis, and to chart a course that will lead to emphasis upon the constructive aspects of a movement that holds so much potential for good.

It will be a grievous failure on the part of the older generation if we allow support of constructive potential to be sidetracked because of our rightful disavowal of the violent and disruptive tactics which have been used. Reaction to these tactics has already produced a demand for repressive measures, and this demand will likely grow in strength and fervor. But we must not be stamped into hasty, ill-considered action, framed in reference to the immediate, with too little consideration of the possible long-range detrimental effects upon all the inherent principles, values and goals of education.

While the recent disruptions are most serious and cannot be lightly dismissed, there is a certain wisdom in the words of Russell Lynes who suggests that: "The trouble with so many of the middle-aged is they are shocked by the wrong things, the superficial extravagances of youth with which youth intentionally baits them."

Despite their generally greater seriousness of purpose, the members of today's younger generation are not without their own kind of frivolity and caprice, and, as is most natural, find a certain wry pleasure and satisfaction in the tug-of-war across the generation gap. But the truly significant thing concerning them is that while they may be extravagant, they are strikingly free of superficiality.

As the older generation, our task, in faithfulness both to ourselves and to our hopes

for the future, is to respect the seriousness of purpose of the younger generation and to do everything in our power to achieve a coming together of the drive of youth and the experience of age.

Jean Piaget, one of the world's foremost psychologists, states his ideas of the goals of education in the following terms:

"The principal goal of education is to create men who are capable of doing new things, not simply of repeating what other generations have done—men who are creative, inventive and discoverers. The second goal of education is to form minds which can be critical, can verify, and not accept everything they are offered. The great danger today is of slogans, collective opinions, ready-made trends of thought. We have to be able to resist individually, to criticize, to distinguish between what is proven and what is not. So we need pupils who are active, who learn early to find out by themselves, partly by their own spontaneous activity and partly through materials we set up for them; who learn early to tell what is verifiable and what is simply the first idea to come to them."

These are, I believe, valid goals, and judged in such terms, the student unrest is not, as many people feel, a failure of our educational system, but rather an evidence of its success. Much of the difficulty of adjustment being encountered by the older generation stems from a contradiction between our willingness to endorse such goals for education and our unwillingness to accept the results of achieving them.

So, rather than challenging youth, it is they who are challenging us and it is, I believe, a most heartening and hopeful situation when exhortation is more needed by age than by youth.

President Nixon in an address entitled "Today's Youth: The Great Generation" said: "Our future leadership must provide our young people with a cause to be for; a commitment to the right to be unique; a dedication to social responsibility on a person-to-person basis."

Such goals indicate an increasing responsibility for government at all levels in promoting new relationships between government and the student population. There must be a new flexibility on both sides in pooling our efforts. It is my hope that the Office of Education can exert forceful and influential leadership in achieving these new relationships. This office in the past has been the facilitator of many constructive activities. Now, I hope that it can be something more, contributing an activism of its own to the cause of fruitful change.

As a part of our activism we have plans underway for more direct participation of the young in the planning for their future, including such things as ways of involving them in Departmental affairs at the policy-making level.

As part of already established programs, there will be 225 college students working in the Office of Education this summer and I hope to gain as much from them in new ideas as in the services they will perform in their various assignments.

In conclusion may I say again that in ways that are fundamental and serious, despite the more evident, highly regrettable excesses of expression, it is the students of today who, in their understanding, their attention and dedication, are leading the way. In their awareness of a responsibility to get on with the "unfinished business" of bettering mankind's lot, they are shaming the lethargy, the apathy, the blindness that have so tragically limited the efforts of my generation.

They envision a world that can be better not just for a favored few but the waiting many. They call for and deserve our support. I hope we shall not fail them.

My congratulations to you who are part of a generation that cares—and dares to act.

FAILURE AT THE FCC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been painfully evident for some years that the Federal Communications Commission has been a dismal failure as a regulatory body. It has become a regulator in name only, and its constituency has changed from the public interest to the private interests; it serves not those it was intended to serve but those whom it was designed to regulate. The malaise at the Federal Communications Commission must in large part be assigned to the failure of Congress to provide it with a clear mission, and adequate funds and support to carry that mission out. If the FCC is today the tail to the kite, Congress must take its share of the responsibility for that fact, and take steps to correct the failure of the FCC.

The fact is that the vast majority of all television programs in this country are created, produced, and sold by the television networks. Local stations have little incentive to do more than the minimum necessary public service programs to retain their licenses. The networks do likewise. And even when public service programs are done, they are done with more of an eye on sales and ratings than on public service. The FCC has a staff of less than half a dozen men to check on the accuracy, objectivity and other aspects of programs that may be irresponsible. And even when there is a finding of irresponsibility the Commission itself is loath to act.

A broadcaster can today with impunity violate a law in order to promote a "news" event and find that the FCC will support this action, or at the very least not punish it. Thus, when WBBM-TV staged a marijuana party, it broke the law by procuring and distributing marijuana. The results were broadcast as an authentic, candid film of a "pot party." Yet the FCC found no reason to penalize the station for promoting this scene. Following the same reasoning, the FCC could approve of a station setting up an armed robbery and filming it for realism, and so much the better if someone got hurt.

Promoting play-acting and calling it news is dangerous, because it distorts the truth and can lead to disastrous liberties with factual coverage of legitimate news. If in the WBBM case the station had wanted to show the clinical effects of smoking pot, they could have obtained films made by perfectly legal and honest clinical research laboratories. But they were not interested in showing the effects of smoking; they wanted to show a pot party. This could be defended on one basis only, and that is good ratings and good sales, and maybe even a prestige award for excellent "reporting."

In the face of the FCC's approbation of tactics of this kind, it is no wonder that networks themselves, with tens of millions of viewers, find it tempting to manufacture and distort news, and call the result honest journalism. The networks, with their total hold over the production of news, and with their in-

tense preoccupation with the minting of money, have nothing but their own consciences to hold them responsible. And anyone who views television programs today knows that the conscience of the typical network executive is very slender indeed. In fact I doubt that many television executives would be willing to be subjected to regular viewing of their own products. They cannot defend their programs on the grounds of taste, imagination, wit, enlightenment, or anything else except ratings and advertising sales. The result is sameness, dullness, formula packed, colorful, nothingness. In this desert there are a few programs devoted to news, and here the frightful irresponsibility of the networks, created and nurtured by a passive regulatory body, is most terrifying of all.

Once a month, or once every 2 weeks, the networks will come forth with an off-hour broadcast of a subject that is of special interest. Generally the depth of such shows is no greater than a reaching out for some color, but on occasion there is a real effort to arouse the public, or win a prestige award. Last year, CBS did such a program, and called it "Hunger in America" and they won an award for it. But the award makers, like most of the public, did not know that the show was in part faked, in part doctored, and in very large part wildly distorted. Will the FCC find it responsible when every investigator to look into the show found it untruthful, staged, and misrepresentative? Is deception in the name of sales covered by the first amendment? Is fraud honest?

Neither this case nor the WBBM case could have occurred, or would have been met with such passivity, had there not been a failure at the FCC. Had this regulatory body exerted its powers, and had Congress given that agency the means with which to exert its powers fully, and the backbone to match, I would not be making this speech today, because it would not be necessary. But the fact is that the FCC has not enough manpower, not enough clear direction, and not enough willpower to do its job properly. Part of this is the fault of this Congress, which must examine the failings of the FCC—which after all is a creature of the Congress—and correct those failings, be it through legislation, be it through better appropriations, or by a combination of actions. What we cannot afford is to let the FCC lie prone as the networks continue their arrogant accumulation of power over the airwaves, their flagrant disregard for quality programming, their complete abuse of news reportage, and their domination over the tiny agency that supposedly guards the public interest.

The basic law regulating broadcasting was written in a day when there were no networks, when there was no television, and when a great many radios were gadgets made of a crystal and cat's whisker. That law was written for an age of isolation—stations were isolated, people were isolated, and the country was isolated. But times have changed. The broadcasting industry today is not an adventure game, but a booming and

enormously profitable enterprise. The electronic media are a primary source of news and entertainment, as they were never expected to be by the legislators of 1934. Yet the law remains unchanged. In face of a revolution in this industry there is no change in the regulation of it. It is little wonder that there has been a failure at the FCC. Must this malaise continue? I hope that Congress will act, and that it will bring the FCC back to life, so that its constituency will again be the people of this country, and not merely the broadcasters.

SOVIET PENETRATION OF LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months, there has been a spate of reports suggesting that Fidel Castro has abandoned his efforts to foment violent revolution in Latin America, and speculating that the United States is preparing to normalize relations with Cuba.

For example, according to an article in the Wall Street Journal, datelined Havana:

The stage is suddenly and quietly being set here for a possible effort to restore diplomatic and trade relations between the U.S. and Cuba.

The initiative, states the article, is coming partly from the Soviet Union, which is joined "in diplomatic maneuvering" by "some key Latin American leaders."

The Washington Post, in an article on April 30, 1969, entitled "Cuba Is Seen Phasing Out Its Guerrilla Role" notes that no direct Cuban support of guerrillas has been detected since last November in Venezuela, long a prime target of Cuban intervention. The article states that Venezuela's defense minister attributes the change to "a conscious decision by the Cubans, plus greater vigilance by the armed forces." Thereafter, the thrust of the article is to suggest that Castro has halted his efforts to incite communist revolutions in the region.

The story continues with this statement:

Evidence that Cuban direct intervention has ceased lends credence to a report, from East European sources, that Cuba has officially informed the Soviet-bloc nations of its decision to abandon aid to insurrection in favor of economic development at home.

While the Post story is carefully couched with qualifications, it is skillfully written to leave the impression that Castro has indeed agreed—at Soviet urging—to quit exporting violent insurrection to Latin America.

On March 30, 1969, the New York Times Magazine, carried an article by John Plank, former Director of Research for Latin America in the State Department and now a senior staff member at the Brookings Institution, entitled "We Should Start Talking With Castro." Mr. Plank, as the title indicates, urges the

Footnotes at end of article.

United States to begin in a dialog with Castro looking toward reestablishment of diplomatic and trade relations.

Meanwhile, last month, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, accompanied by almost two dozen specialists in various fields, began a series of study missions to the capitals of 20 countries in Central and South America and the Caribbean on behalf of President Nixon. From the press coverage of the Governor's first two trips, it would appear that the question of Communist activity in Latin America has evaporated.

However, before departing on May 27 on the second leg of his mission, Governor Rockefeller held a brief press conference at the White House during which the issue was raised.³ He was asked:

There were reports for a number of years that Castro was exporting revolution to Latin American countries. When you visited the capitals did you detect that? Is that still a threat...?

Governor Rockefeller responded:

Yes, it is a fact that there are men in the countries we visited who are going to Havana for training, young men, coming back to those countries, in virtually all of them. Now, how successful that is is an entirely different question. (Castro's) prestige is nothing compared to what it was.

The questioner persisted, asking:

The main question is: Is it still regarded as a threat?

Governor Rockefeller replied:

They are still active. The question of a threat—you would have to get your definition of what a threat is.

The press conference ended shortly thereafter, with no further explanation of the matter.

I am perturbed by the picture that emerges from the rash of stories hinting at Castro's rehabilitation, the absence of any comment regarding Communist activities in Latin America in the press comments generated by Mr. Rockefeller's study mission, and by the line of questioning at his press conference which focused solely upon Castro and Cuba as the source of Communist danger in the region.

This concentration upon Castro ignores an elemental fact: Cuba became a serious menace only through its alliance with the Soviet Union. The real adversary, the real threat to hemisphere security, has been and remains the Soviet Union.

It is upon Soviet purposes, Soviet strategy, and Soviet tactics that we should be directing our attention. I propose, therefore, to examine the Soviet Union's Latin American policy in some detail. Only by understanding Soviet intentions, achievements, and limitations can a meaningful and effective U.S. policy be formulated.

A. SOVIET GOALS

From the outset, it is imperative to understand that the Soviets are bound to the Marxist-Leninist view that there can be only one final goal for all mankind. Despite talk of "coexistence," the Soviets invariably insist that the struggle between contending ideologies must be pressed relentlessly until communism

rules the entire world and all competing political values have been eradicated.

The extensive literature by Soviet spokesmen makes clear that their revolutionary aim is to strengthen the forces of communism in every possible way, in order ultimately to extend the Communist system throughout the world.

Khrushchev stated that fundamental tenet of the international Communist movement on January 6, 1961, after the 1960 meeting of 81 Communist Parties in Moscow:

The unity of the ranks of every Communist Party and the unity of all Communist Parties constitutes the united international Communist movement directed at the achievement of our common goal: the triumph of communism throughout the world.⁴

Nothing has happened subsequently to alter Khrushchev's appraisal of the role and mission of the Communist movement. The bitter dispute between the Soviet Union and Red China revolves in large measure around the proper tactics for achieving victory. But both hold that the triumph of Communist-led revolutions in every corner of the world is desirable and inevitable.

B. TRADITIONAL SOVIET POLICIES IN LATIN AMERICA

Historically, Soviet policy in Latin America has been one of limited involvement. Before World War II, the Kremlin had little success in the region and difficulties in controlling Communist parties.⁵ Moreover, the Soviet Union believed the United States to be invincible in the area. In accord with this belief, known in Communist jargon as "geographic fatalism," Soviet leaders limited their tactics in Latin America to working through local Communist parties to attain support for Soviet causes, on the theory that anything that strengthened the Soviet Union, as the center of the Communist world, would fortify the overall movement.

The Soviet Union's decision to restrict itself to secondary maneuvers in Latin America was firmly based upon its leadership's perception of Soviet political goals that stretch back to 1917—to wit, that the preservation and strengthening of the Soviet Union come first, and Soviet efforts to expand the Communist system must be measured carefully in the light of potential risks and gains.⁶

The ease with which the Communist-dominated Government of Arbenz in Guatemala was overthrown in 1954 confirmed the Soviet's conviction of "geographic fatalism."⁷

C. THE ADVENT OF CASTRO

Castro's pell-mell radicalization of Cuba, tolerated by the United States contrary to Soviet expectations, took the Kremlin by surprise. Indeed, Edward Gonzalez' study "Castro's Revolution, Cuban Communist Appeals, and the Soviet Response," demonstrates conclusively Moscow's reluctance to embrace Castro.⁸ Among the reasons for the Kremlin's hesitancy to become involved, Gonzalez notes the following, gleaned from the authoritative Soviet press:⁹

First, Cuba was geographically remote, militarily vulnerable, and beyond the immediate sphere of Soviet interests. The

1959 May Day slogans, always a barometer of Soviet priorities, listed Latin America after the other underdeveloped regions, and did not even mention Cuba;

Second, The fate of the Arbenz government in Guatemala still weighed heavily in Soviet thinking, evidenced by frequent references in the Soviet press to the "Guatemalan tragedy";

Third, The survivability and reliability of the Castro regime remained to be demonstrated;

Fourth, The favorable revolutionary assessments by the PSP—Cuban Communist Party—may have been exaggerated claims of one more foreign Communist Party bidding for Moscow's favor and support;

Fifth, Khrushchev's immediate foreign policy concern in mid-1959 was a summit conference with President Eisenhower, scheduled for September at Camp David, that could resolve the deadlocked Berlin crisis, and the Soviet Premier did not wish to jeopardize the meeting.

In sum—

Gonzalez concludes—

Moscow valued the Cuban revolution insofar as the Castro regime disturbed inter-American solidarity, weakened United States hegemony in Latin America, and diverted Washington's attention to the Western Hemisphere.

Nevertheless, the Soviets evidently hoped to realize these limited cold-war objectives with a minimum of direct involvement in Cuba and with the revolution retaining its liberationist but non-Communist character.¹⁰

Castro and the Cuban Communists, each for their own interests, worked for over a year to gain Cuban admittance to the Soviet camp. Castro, well aware of the Guatemalan precedent, wanted a firm commitment from the Soviet Union for protection against the United States; the Cuban Communists feared that Soviet nonengagement would result in their becoming "excess baggage" in the revolution.¹¹ To provoke the Kremlin into supporting Castro, the PSP cleverly exploited the Soviet Union's professed commitment to revolutionary expansion, and capitalized upon the growing Sino-Soviet dispute in which the Chinese were castigating Russia for its lack of militancy in support of fraternal revolutionaries throughout the world.¹²

The Soviets' unexpected toehold in Cuba, coupled with the U.S. defeat in the Bay of Pigs fiasco, seems to have enlivened Moscow's hopes for spreading communism in Latin America and dissolved their dogma of "geographic fatalism."

But developments soon dimmed the Kremlin's optimism for easy victories. The failure of various Castroite revolutionary attempts in the region, leading to the futile deaths of many comrades and crackdowns on local party "peaceful" activities, gave the Soviet Union reason to reevaluate its policy. Moscow was further chastened by the realization of its overextension in the missile crisis in the fall of 1962. A Soviet debacle far more disastrous than the Bay of Pigs failure was averted only by American failure to understand and fully exploit our advantage. Finally, our prompt Dominican intervention in 1965 clarified the continued existence of U.S. power in

Footnotes at end of article.

the region and our ability to utilize it effectively when motivated to do so.

D. CURRENT SOVIET STRATEGY IN LATIN AMERICA

These potential setbacks helped to cause the Soviet Union to adopt a more cautious course, but not to alter its aim. The Kremlin's long-range goal in Latin America remains the same: to isolate the United States and end its influence in the region.

To this end, Soviet efforts are now concentrated more on intermediate objectives, that is, on encouraging existing Latin American governments to resist the economic influence of the United States and to oppose U.S. policies in general.¹³ In its present tactical stage, Soviet policy is to support programs strongly nationalistic in economic matters and independent in foreign policy.

In pursuit of its objective, the Communist parties throughout Latin America have been instructed to give conditional support to nationalist reform movements, whatever the coloration of the regime in power.¹⁴ Analysts of Soviet theory and practice note that current tactics differ from old "united front" strategy.

Under the old united fronts, the aim was to increase Communist strength in key positions at the expense of their allies in order eventually to eliminate them, take over power, and destroy their organization.¹⁵ Under the new policy, called national democracy in Communist jargon, the object is to occupy positions of power under national revolutionary leaders, then to win them over step by step for a "socialist" policy. The idea is to join reformers, and guide and push them through a "creeping revolution." Included in this strategy are increased diplomatic, cultural, and trade exchanges between the Soviet Union and Latin America, designed to relieve suspicions regarding Communist aims, create the impression of Moscow's sweet reasonableness, and to offer the Latin Americans an ostensible alternative to the United States.

A number of observers see Soviet preference for political and diplomatic action based at "creeping revolution" as a realistic appraisal of Communist opportunities at this stage in Latin America. Dinerstein maintains that the Soviet Union, spurred by bitter disappointments in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, and weighted by the costliness of maintaining the Cuban economy afloat, has come to recognize the limit to the potential number of new Communist states which the Communist bloc countries could support.

Since "premature" Communist states that could not count on Soviet economic support might founder, with the consequent loss of prestige for the Communist bloc, Moscow much prefers to avoid the risk.¹⁶ As another analyst of Soviet affairs notes:

The committee to defend and subsidize one Cuba is onerous enough.¹⁷

Wolfgang Berner stresses the total primacy of domestic politics for Soviet leaders, and quotes a Pravda editorial

of October 1965 entitled "The Supreme Internationalist Duty of a Socialist Country," which emphasized the Soviet leaders' determination to stop the excessive proliferation of Soviet foreign aid. It declared:

The Socialist countries were concentrating their main efforts on the building of socialism and communism in their own countries, seeing this . . . their chief contribution to the development of the world revolutionary movement.¹⁸

Moreover, as Dinerstein notes, U.S. power in the hemisphere has given the Soviets pause about creating new Communist regimes in Latin America. The emergence of regimes in Latin America seemingly on the path to communism has been shown sometimes to provoke U.S. intervention. Such intervention is less costly to the Soviet Union when the loss does not involve a state to which the Soviets have made large commitments.¹⁹

Further, as Berner points out, Soviet leaders have strictly observed the principle that no territory, once integrated into the "Socialist camp," will ever be abandoned to the "class enemy."²⁰ The emergence of new Communist regimes in Latin America, exposed to U.S. intervention and far from Soviet sources of conventional weaponry, could risk nuclear war if the principle had to be defended—and on behalf of nations of little strategic importance to the Soviet Union.

Various Soviet publications, from which the Latin American Communist parties take their cue on policy matters, have spelled out the Soviet united front approach toward the ultimate goal of socialism. Writing in the *World Marxist Review*, Luis Corvalan, a leader of the Chilean Communist Party—one of the oldest and strongest Soviet-lining parties in Latin America—reminds the hotheads:

Lenin warned against reckless ventures which, as a rule, cause senseless waste of lives and end in retreat.²¹

Instead, Corvalan continues:

The important thing is to extend the anti-imperialist front and engage against the common enemy all sections of the public, including those who may not be admirers of the Cuban revolution and revolution in general, but who have taken a stand in behalf of Cuba's right to build socialism and the right of all Latin American peoples to opt for the system of their choice.

In direct conflict with Chinese and Cuban exhortations to seize power by force, Corvalan warns:

Any attempt to impose the communist view on the other anti-imperialist forces . . . can but hamper unity of action and narrow the struggle against the common enemy.²²

Abandoning the dogma of revolution by the proletariat, Corvalan declares:²³

The driving force of the revolution in Latin America comprises the working class, peasants (the majority of whom in many countries are Indians), students, middle strata and some sections of the national bourgeoisie. There are contradictions between them, but common interests in the fight against U.S. imperialism and the oligarchies predominate. This offers a serviceable basis for unity and calls for closer bonds. Our policy of united action by all anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic forces builds on the belief that an alliance of workers and peasants, of the proletariat and non-proletarian elements is the best possible basis for an enduring and mili-

tant united front. To make headway, mutual understanding between proletarian and petty bourgeois revolutionaries is absolutely essential.

What is the role of the Communists to be? Corvalan answers, "forging the class consciousness of the Latin American proletariat and the anti-imperialist awareness of the peoples."²⁴

The Soviet decision to tread a gradual road toward communizing the world has led to bitter denunciations by Castro and the Chinese Communists. In their view, the Soviet Union has an international revolutionary duty to respond with all its might, including the use or threat of nuclear force, in order to protect any country from imperialism.²⁵ Further, they view violent revolutionary tactics as the principal, if not the sole, mark of the true Communist revolutionary.

The Soviets, it should be noted, have not ruled out armed struggle. At the end of 1964, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist parties of Latin America met in Havana where they adopted a resolution calling for "support in an active form to those who at present are subjected to severe repression such as the Venezuelan, Colombian, Guatemalan, Honduran, Paraguayan, and Haitian fighters."²⁶ Dinerstein interprets the Soviet endorsement of diverse revolutionary roads as a compromise to secure Cuba's support against the Chinese.²⁷

Whatever the reason, Soviet policy of endorsing both peaceful penetration and violent revolution has created some embarrassing situations for the Kremlin. At the Tricontinental Conference in Havana in January 1966, the Soviet Delegate, Sharaf R. Rashidov, declared:²⁸

The Soviet people has always supported people's wars, the armed struggle of the oppressed peoples, and has been rendering them every possible support and assistance.

We express fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle waged by the patriots of Venezuela, Peru, Colombia, Guatemala for freedom against the puppets of imperialism.

The council of the Organization of American States adopted a resolution denouncing the Tricontinental Conference as a violation of the U.N. Declaration of Nonintervention, while 18 members of the Latin American group in the United Nations addressed a letter of protest to the President of the Security Council. In a letter of reply to the group protest, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Soviet Representative maintained that the participants at the Conference were "representatives of public opinion," not of the Soviet Government; charged that the letter as well as the resolution of the OAS Council contained "fabrications" and represented an attempt to divert attention from the intervention of the United States in the Dominican Republic and Vietnam; but went on to state that the Soviet Government condemns any foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of states, including those of Latin America, with which it wishes to maintain only friendly relations.²⁹

Herbert Dinerstein has written a cogent explanation of the Soviets' ambivalence with respect to guerrilla warfare in Latin America. In view of the

Footnotes at end of article.

apparent dangerous trend in the United States toward ignoring the question of Soviet machinations in the hemisphere, I would like to quote Dinerstein's lucid account of how the Soviets are intricately involved in Latin American domestic affairs, despite any protestations to the contrary:

At first sight, the Soviet Union's encouragement and support of guerrilla movements in Latin America, whether grudging or spontaneous, seem to contradict its estimate of the prospects for revolution in Latin America. But if the Soviet Union is to maintain its influence over Latin American parties (control being no longer in question), it must be responsive to their needs. When guerrillas are active in Latin American countries, the communist parties find themselves in a quandary. . . . The guerrilla leaders often are not Communists. Sometimes only a minority of them will be communist; in no case in the past have they all been Communists. . . . The established communist parties often are opposed to guerrilla activity because they are convinced that it will fail and that their support of any movements which they do not control may uselessly jeopardize whatever legal rights they have. However, in weighing their opposition, they have to take into account the danger of losing the support of young militants who admire those who are fighting. Most typically, the relations between the communist parties and the guerrillas are very strained. In the unusual case, a communist party may publicly denounce a guerrilla movement as a political mistake. But more commonly, communist parties will furnish limited support to the guerrillas and some personnel, in an effort to ensure some control over them and to avoid the onus of being against those who are "fighting with weapons in their hands." The police often arrest and harry the Communists, partly because they are in fact, though perhaps reluctantly, helping the guerrillas, and partly because they are concentrated in the cities and thus easier to catch. And if the Party suffers enough, it may try to get the guerrillas to desist. . . . Soviet Communists may disapprove of the tactics of a local party but nevertheless support it. . . . The Cubans are showing signs of greater discrimination in their support of guerrilla movements, and the Soviets still seem to be chasing the guerrilla movements leftward without being able to overcome the contempt of the guerrilla leaders for the old-line Communists.³⁰

In short, the Soviet Union finds itself in the position of the man chasing after a frenzied mob, shouting, "Wait for me, I'm your leader." While grappling with the problem of how to assert control over Latin American guerrilla movements, the Soviet Union continues to pursue its long-range objectives of bringing labor and intellectuals, peasant groups and anti-American nationalists, under Communist influence.

E. DESIGNING DOGMA TO FIT REALITIES

Having recognized the liabilities of premature revolutions and the limitations of the Soviet ability to support revolutionary governments economically and militarily, Soviet theoreticians have sought to devise a rationale for their new approach of chipping the third world away from the imperialist camp.

Since 1962, Soviet policy toward the underdeveloped world in general has shifted toward a reliance on non-Com-

munist to lead their countries along, what the Communists call, the noncapitalist path to development, and eventually into permanent reliance on the "Socialist camp."

According to the new theory, the Soviet bloc should support nationalist non-Communist leaders in underdeveloped countries, especially those who espouse creeping socialism in the form of state-owned and state-run sectors of their economies. The theory calls for economic development prior to communism, thus easing the financial burden which might otherwise be an undesirable burden on the Soviet Union, and avoiding the embarrassment which would accompany the economic failure of a prematurely announced communism.

Since the Soviet bloc cannot supply all the necessary capital and skills to create the "preconditions" for socialism, countries should welcome such assistance from the capitalist nations; if foreign capital is employed to strengthen state socialism rather than local private enterprise, so the argument runs, transformation from capitalism to Soviet-style socialism, that is, communism, will eventually follow.

Furthermore, the theory avers, the new engineers and technicians trained to run state-owned enterprises will unwittingly prepare the nation for communism because they will have a vested interest in pushing toward a state-managed, rather than a private enterprise, economy.

The Chinese have mocked the theory that non-Socialists will make socialist revolutions in spite of themselves.³¹ Even Soviet analysts have raised some pertinent questions. A state-owned enterprise, say the doubters, unless run efficiently, as many are not, will discredit the idea that state ownership is necessarily advantageous.³² Furthermore, in a mixed system, a state enterprise may provide substantial benefits to private firms. To illustrate: the Indian steel industry, a state enterprise, may actually be providing a direct subsidy to capitalists, by selling its output at low state-fixed prices to private firms that process the steel and sell their products at free market prices.³³

Of the new Soviet theory, one observer notes that the Soviet Union, lacking the economic and military resources to pursue any other policy, has been forced to make "a virtue of necessity."³⁴

By whatever tortuous mental gymnastics the Soviets seek to justify their actions to themselves, they have set about on a very practical course to exert their maximum influence upon the Latin American countries.

F. SOVIET EFFORTS IN LATIN AMERICA

"The Soviet 'peaceful' offensive in Latin America, aimed at driving a sharp wedge between our neighbors to the south and the United States, is conducted by various diplomatic, economic, and cultural means.

Until 2 years ago, the Soviets maintained embassies only in Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, and Uruguay. In the past 2 years, they established full-fledged embassies in Colombia, Chile, and finally in Peru on February 1, 1969.

Under normal circumstances, the exchange of diplomatic personnel is a welcome means of facilitating international business and improving understanding. Keep in mind the critical fact, however, that Latin American Ambassadors who go to Moscow lead lives of limited access to what is really going on in the Soviet Union, like the rest of the Western Ambassadors. By contrast, the Soviet Ambassadors to Latin America and their staffs have the free run of the countryside.

With respect to the operations of Soviet Embassies, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee made some revealing comments in a report published last November. Of operations in Mexico City, the report reveals the following:³⁵

The Soviet Embassy in that city is one of the largest diplomatic missions there—and probably one of the key Soviet espionage and political agitation facilities in the entire world.

There are some 100 Soviet personnel employed in the Embassy: more than 50 officers and a comparable number of wives. The latter, however, must be considered an integral part of the Soviet operation in Mexico; with the exception of the Ambassador's wife, each of them appears to have regular assigned duties within the Embassy complex. They serve as secretaries, bookkeepers, telex operators, kitchen help, chauffeurs, and perform other work.

There are no foreign nationals employed at the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City.

In contrast, more than one-half of the staff of the U.S. Embassy in that city is composed of Mexican nationals.

Intelligence and other covert operations can provide the only explanation for the size of the Soviet "diplomatic" complement in Mexico. The normal, legitimate functions of that Embassy are estimated to require a staff of about one-tenth the size of the present one.

While the bulk of the Soviet "diplomats" in Mexico are assigned to consular, political, commercial, and other sections of the Embassy, their responsibilities clearly involve other duties. Most of the Embassy's sections dealing with the public remain open only a few hours each week. The officers assigned to them, therefore, either do an awful lot of resting—or engage in mischief.

It is appropriate to recall that immediately prior to the 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor the large Japanese Embassy in Mexico followed the same pattern of non-employment of Mexican nationals—while it constructed and operated its covert Western Hemisphere intelligence and sabotage operations. In fact, Americans familiar with Mexico regard such employment policies as virtual guarantees that anti-American operations are being conducted by such embassies.

Such key Soviet operations in Latin America as their Embassy in Uruguay receives literally thousands of pounds of propaganda material each month for distribution.

Now, with embassies in Chile and Peru, Soviet couriers can operate on interior lines from Río to Montevideo, across the River Plate to Buenos Aires, over the Andes to Santiago, and up the long Pacific coast to Lima. The opportunities for covert operations in the interior of the whole continent are obvious.

Only six Latin American countries do

Footnotes at end of article.

not have relations, at some level, with one or more Soviet bloc countries. These diplomatic gains by the U.S.S.R. and its satellites came mainly in the last 6 years. As a result of the rush of activity, this is the current picture in the major Latin American countries:

Argentina maintains full diplomatic relations with seven Communist countries: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.

Peru, with six: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia, and is negotiating with Hungary.

Brazil has five Communist embassies: Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

Mexico has full diplomatic relations with five: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.

Chile has four Communist embassies: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

Uruguay also has four: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.

Colombia, three: Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and the Soviet Union.

Venezuela also has three: Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

Ecuador, one, Rumania.

Bolivia, one: Yugoslavia.

In comparison, the United States has seven Communist embassies—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.

Meanwhile, beginning in 1966, the Soviet Union and other East European countries intensified their efforts to step up trade with Latin America. Various trade missions from the U.S.S.R. and East European countries have fanned out over the region, making overtures regarding the establishment of trade offices or the upgrading of existing offices. In line with the new Soviet policy of peaceful penetration, the U.S.S.R. even signed a 4-year \$100 million credit agreement in August 1966 with Brazil's stanchly anti-Communist Castello Branco regime that had overthrown Goulart's left-leaning government, upped its trade with Argentina under Gen. Juan Carlos Onganía's military government and in January 1967 signed \$57 million worth of credit and technical assistance agreements with the Chilean Government of President Eduardo Frei, who had dealt that country's Communist Party its biggest election defeat in history.

Despite the Soviet trade offensive, Communist-bloc trade with Latin America remains low, at less than about 1 percent of the total area trade. Given the high transportation costs and buyers' concern over spare parts, the Soviets cannot compete with other Latin American suppliers in Europe and the United States.²⁵ In fact, the large credit lines extended to Brazil and Chile have moved very slowly.²⁶

Wolfgang Berner sees in the recent Soviet diplomatic and economic offensive an ulterior motive. He states:²⁷

The long-range objective of this new Soviet drive, combining economic diplomacy on the governmental level with reformist reason-

ableness on the part of local Communist parties, appears to consist in breaking up the trade blockade imposed by the USA and the OAS allies upon Cuba. It seems remarkable that the Soviet Union and other East European countries should have started in 1966 to offer all kinds of economic aid to an increasing number of Latin-American governments (including Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay, etc.) while reducing systematically similar commitments in Asia and Africa. This striking change in Soviet policy toward Latin America, where up to 1966—with the single exception of Cuba—Soviet aid had always remained negligible, confirms the impression that the entire drive is related to a more important, more ambitious operation of higher priority.

Many observations lead to the same conclusion: The aim appears to be a comprehensive transformation of the over-all situation in Latin America by careful investment of relatively small means. This input may, however, pay considerable dividends if the Soviets succeed in restoring Cuba to basic self-sufficiency and shaking off their own shoulders the tremendous burden of political, military and economic responsibility for the Castro regime.

Soviet overtures have found some Latin Americans receptive for a variety of reasons. Many are eager to find new markets for their products, of course. But certain psychological factors make the Soviets' job easier. A number of Latin Americans, many of them key intellectuals who are active and honored in local politics, frankly resent the material disparities of fortune in this hemisphere which make them the poor Americans, and us the rich.

Such members of the Latin American intellectual and political hierarchy are the most vulnerable targets of Soviet persuasion. They frequently feel inclined to yank a tail feather or two from the Yankee eagle. And a cozying up to the Russians, they also display their "independence from the United States," a condition politically desirable given the depth of nationalism in Latin America.

Furthermore, dealing with the Russians provides even a military government with a sheen of "liberalness," softening attacks from even our own liberals.

The Soviets, well aware that Latin American nationalism is their greatest asset for extending their influence, maintain a considerable propaganda program designed to exacerbate Latin American sensibilities regarding the United States. During 1968, the Soviet Union beamed the following broadcasts to the region: 73 hours, 30 minutes per week in Spanish; 17½ hours per week in Portuguese; 1 hour per week in Creole; 7 hours per week in Quechua, a language of the Andean Indians; and 3½ hours a week in Guarani, which is spoken in Paraguay—this last, a new endeavor begun last year.

The Eastern European bloc countries contribute their efforts, too. Their weekly hours of broadcasting to Latin America include: Albania, 38½ hours—over double the 1967 rate; Bulgaria, 24½ hours; Czechoslovakia, 31½ hours; East Germany, 26 hours, 15 minutes; Hungary, 12½ hours; Poland, 3½ hours; Rumania, 17½ hours; and Yugoslavia, 7 hours.

Cuba, whatever its differences with the Soviet Union, adds a loud voice to the

din of charges against the United States, reaching Latin America over radio. Cuban weekly broadcasts include: 163 hours, 20 minutes in Spanish; 14 hours in Portuguese; 6½ hours in French; 7 hours in Guarani; 7 hours in Quechua, and an additional 38½ hours each week in medium wave-length broadcasts to the Caribbean.

The Communist propaganda mill also keeps a number of book publishers busy in Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, and Cuba.

The keystone of the policy of the United States toward our neighbors to the south should be exactly what is required of our policy elsewhere in the world—enlightened self-interest. We should recognize that the development of each of the countries of Latin America is a matter of paramount concern to the people of that country, and that their particular path of development and their speed along that path need not be what we would select for them. Indeed, it need not be what we selected for ourselves.

Recognizing that there are material differences in present social structures, not only between our Nation and our Latin American neighbors but between each of these nations, is fundamental to the formulation of any policy in our relationships with these peoples. We should identify and aid the stabilizing forces in these nations, whether or not they are the same stabilizing forces which exist in our society. It has been a strange scene indeed to witness the many times when our policy in Latin America seems to be merely an extension of the Soviet policy. The very elements of the social structure of our southern neighbors which are the bulwarks against Communist infiltration and disorder are too frequently attacked by spokesmen for our Government as "undemocratic" and "reactionary."

Our enlightened self-interest requires us to encourage the development of stable and viable societies and economies in each and all of our neighbors. But it is important that our encouragement be in the form of honest and dependable assistance in the direction and at the speed which our neighbors choose to move—rather than forcing them to embark upon courses of our choosing regardless of their local conditions. It is also important that our assistance not be of the patronizing type—but that it be of the quiet, dependable type found among good neighbors who trust, understand, and by mutual respect help one another.

Effective Soviet penetration in the Western Hemisphere is possible only with the assistance—intentional or unintentional—of the United States. Such a situation seems insane, and indeed it is. But time and time again, in nation after nation, we have made the positions of our best friends untenable by our power response to situations vital to them but really of little importance to us. We have undermined the very leaders the Soviet must undermine, and have demonstrated that the cry "Yankee imperialism" has justification. Quiet diplomatic solutions to problems—not loud publicity to disagreements—must be a part of any successful policy.

We, in the Americas, have everything in common. None of us have anything in

Footnotes at end of article.

common with the Soviet. There is no reason that our ineptness should aid the Soviet in driving a wedge between us and our neighbors. There is every reason why each and every nation in the hemisphere, for our common interest as well as our individual interests, should cooperate understandingly with one another. This should be the keynote of U.S. policy toward Latin America—tolerant, sympathetic cooperation, in the orderly development, each in its own manner and at its own speed, of its own political, social, and economic system. Such a policy will lead to true hemispheric solidarity, to real internal and hemispheric peace, and is unquestionably in the enlightened self-interest of the United States.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ "Some See Possibility U.S., Cuba May Restore Diplomatic, Trade ties." February 13, 1969, p. 1.
- ² By Lewis H. Diuguid, p. A16.
- ³ Mimeographed press release. Office of the White House Press Secretary. Press Conference of Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, May 27, 1969, pp. 2-3.
- ⁴ U.S. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. 89th Congress, 1st Session. Organization of American States Combined Reports on Communist Subversion. Washington: G.P.O., 1965, p. 14.
- ⁵ Herbert S. Dinerstein. *Soviet policy in Latin America*. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, May 1966. Memorandum RM-4967-PR, p. 19.
- ⁶ Philip E. Mosely. Communist policy and the third world. In: *The Review of Politics*, Volume 28, No. 2, April 1966, p. 212.
- ⁷ Dinerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
- ⁸ *World Politics*, October 1968, pp. 39-68.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 47. See also: Theodore Draper. *Castroism: Theory and Practice*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- ¹³ Wolfgang W. Berner. Soviet strategy toward Cuba, Latin America and the Third World. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the USSR*, July 1968, Number 7, p. 5.
- ¹⁴ Dinerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
- ¹⁵ Richard Lowenthal, Russia, the One-party system, and the Third World. *Survey, a Journal of Soviet and East European Studies*. Number 58, January 1966, p. 55.
- ¹⁶ Dinerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
- ¹⁷ Kevin Devlin. The permanent revolutionism of Fidel Castro. *International Communism*, January/February 1968, p. 8.
- ¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 6.
- ¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 4.
- ²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.
- ²¹ Volume 10, Number 7, July 1967, p. 46.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵ Mosely, *op. cit.*, p. 212.
- ²⁶ Dinerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- ²⁸ Council of the Organization of American States. Report of the Special Committee to study Resolution III and VIII of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs on the First Afro-Asian-Latin American People's Solidarity Conference and its projects. OEA/Ser.G/IV, C-1-769 (English) Rev. Volume I, 28 November 1966, p. 34.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.
- ³⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 31-33.
- ³¹ Dinerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- ³² Mosely, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
- ³³ *Ibid.*
- ³⁴ Dinerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
- ³⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 2nd Session. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Inter-American Af-

fairs. *The new strategy of Communism in the Caribbean*. Washington: G.P.O., 1968, p. 3.

³⁶ Conversations with officials in the Department of State and Department of Commerce.

³⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

A research paper prepared by Lt. Comdr. Donald D. Pizinger, U.S. Navy School of Naval Command and Staff, which was printed in the Naval War College Review for April 1969 follows:

PRESENT SOVIET POLICY IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Lt. Comdr. Donald D. Pizinger)

(NOTE.—Lt. Comdr. Donald D. Pizinger U.S. Navy, did his undergraduate work at the University of Kansas, holds an M.S. in Oceanography from the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School and M.S. in International Affairs from The George Washington University. He has held various billets in destroyers, and his last operational assignment was Commanding Officer of the U.S.S. *Moctobi* (ATF 105).

(Lieutenant Commander Pizinger is currently assigned to the faculty of the School of Naval Command and Staff at the Naval War College.)

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to draw conclusions regarding the nature of present Soviet policy in Latin America provided primarily from a review of recent Soviet literature. The first part of this paper deals with general Soviet guidelines for social revolution in developing countries. This will be limited to a discussion of the Soviet view of transition to communism in developing countries as it forms a framework and theoretical basis for policy in Latin America. The second part deals with unique circumstances in Latin America and their effect on Soviet policy. The final section draws together doctrine and reality into conclusions regarding present policy.

Much of the literature surveyed, especially that in *International Affairs* (Moscow), was authored by Soviet professors and institutional representatives. It represents some differences of opinion, although agreement on basics is far more singular than would be expected in Western literature. This literature may or may not represent the view of Soviet decision makers and, therefore, should be used cautiously as a basis for determining policy. However, it is useful to recall that the state is, in effect, the only publisher in the Soviet Union and need not tolerate literature which is too far afield from official thinking.⁶ In any event, the literature does furnish some notion of the intellectual atmosphere in which Soviet policy makers move.

I.—DOCTRINE AS A FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY

Noncapitalist Development. Beginning in the early 1960's, Western observers began to note important changes in Soviet doctrine toward the achievement of communism in developing countries.⁷ This new theory of noncapitalist development grew out of several years' experience with the newly emerging countries of Asia and Africa and the underdeveloped countries of Latin America. The new doctrine decreases the role of local Communist Parties and violent revolution, while retaining the ultimate goal and inevitability of communism. Prior to the early 1960's Soviet theorists thought that developing countries would go through a multistage revolutionary process in which the Communist Party would play an ever-increasing role in the leadership of the revolution, culminating in the final classic seizure of power by the Communists. The new formulas for the advent of socialism have "whittled down independent community activity to the point that the radical regimes and non-Communist mass parties are recognized as performing the revolutionary tasks hitherto reserved to

the proletariat and its party."⁸ Supposedly, after a period of economic development and increasing concentration of economic power in the state, the effective political class will automatically convert to communism without revolution.⁹

There are 3 cardinal traits of noncapitalist development. First, the leaders of the revolution (such as Nasser of Egypt, Ne Win of Burma, and Boumedienne of Algeria) are revolutionary democrats and not leaders of the Communist Party. To be a revolutionary democrat one must profess to accept scientific socialism (Soviet socialism and not the Western brand of socialism) and be willing to cooperate with the Soviet Union.⁴ Second, the vanguard role is played by non-Communist, mass parties and not by the Communist Party and the proletariat. With the progression of time, "Marxist-Leninist parties will be gradually formed and strengthened."⁵ That is, the Communist Party will gradually be formed out of the non-Communist parties.

And finally, "being a transitory stage, noncapitalist development combines intermediate and mixed forms of economic relations" with private and state capital working together.⁶ The eradication of capitalism is no longer seen as an abrupt and tumultuous process but is a gradual displacement. Western aid is not rejected. And to avoid serious economic harm, nationalization may be a gradual process. As one Soviet economist has observed,

"In contrast to countries taking the capitalist way, these states (on the non-capitalist path to socialism) join foreign capital in setting up mixed companies in which local bodies hold the controlling interest. . . . The basic difference between the countries advancing along the two opposite ways of historical development is that the capitalist-way countries regard foreign capital as a natural and permanent factor, whereas the non-capitalist-way countries see it as an inevitable but temporary measure."⁷

In other words, the theory calls for economic development prior to communization, thus easing a financial burden that might otherwise be imposed on the Soviet Union (and which might be an impossible burden if several countries needed support) and avoiding the possible embarrassment of countries prematurely announcing communism and then reverting back to the Western camp because of lack of economic support. Ironically, according to Soviet theorists, Western money builds the Communist society.

The new doctrine is still in the developmental stage and is subject to modification. Or, as one Communist article states it, "the Marxist-Leninist theory of noncapitalist development is enriched" through the experience of implementation.⁸ "Advance" will be "neither easy nor automatic" and will require "considerable time."⁹ Mistakes are expected and have occurred in the past. For instance, temporary "regression of the revolution" occurred in Guatemala in 1954 and more recently in Ghana and Indonesia.¹⁰

What are the reasons for this modification in the traditional formula for transition to socialism? Analysis from the Soviet Union relate it to complexity and diversity in the developing countries. Among the important variables from country to country are the degree of political consciousness of the masses, the degree of economic development, and quality of revolutionary leadership. This may be accompanied by general lack of development of a revolutionary proletariat and Communist Party. According to the Soviets, these complex and diverse factors call for the more flexible and realistic approach offered by non-capitalist development.¹¹

As a Western observation, E. K. Valkenier, in an article in *Orbis* suggests this shift is "... a diplomatic gamble to out-manuever the Chinese in their bid for the leadership of the Afro-Asian world. Unable to claim any

racial or close economic affinity with these countries, the Soviets have sought to find a common 'revolutionary' language. They now accept the validity of the 'socialist' reforms introduced by Nasser, Nkrumah, and Ne Win, no matter how much this approach might flout the traditional Marxist concepts of class and party, of revolution and socialism.¹²

Soviet articles lend support to this interpretation. Mao Tse-tung is accused of being "leftist, petty-bourgeois," in opposition to a more conservative Soviet policy. For example, foreign policy specialists Prokopyev and Zhukov decry the "recklessness" of "leftism" and "leftist, petty-bourgeois" theories of China which would "push" and "speed up" revolutions with the help of war and which act as a "splitting activity."¹³ Supposedly, these "leftist lines of Mao Tse-tung's group are causing great damage to the national liberation revolutions, thereby hindering the noncapitalist development of some countries and disorganizing the ranks of the revolutionary democrats [Soviet followers]."¹⁴ Or, as the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Chile recently stated, "Petty-bourgeois revolutionaries [Chinese followers] tend at times to underrate the workers and the Communist parties, to gravitate towards nationalism, recklessness, terror and, at times, even anticommunism and anti-Sovietism."¹⁵

In another Western view, H. S. Dinerstein, who is an American specialist on Soviet military power, states the modified formula represents concern by Soviet leaders that nuclear war might grow out of small-scale confrontations. "Peaceful transition to socialism" would reduce the possibility of United States-U.S.S.R. confrontation. He also feels the communization of Cuba demonstrated to Communists that traditional methods of transition were not necessarily models for today inasmuch as Castro achieved power as a non-Communist and then became a Communist, absorbed the party, and carried the country with him.¹⁶ In sum, the present guidelines for transition to socialism in a developing country resulted from a combination of U.S.S.R. competition with China; secret concern for United States-U.S.S.R. nuclear war; lessons demonstrated by the Cuban revolution; and reality of the complexities connected with the developing countries as experienced in Egypt, Algeria, Indonesia, and elsewhere.

Guerrilla Support. While noncapitalist doctrine neither holds violent revolution as necessary in the transition to socialism nor encourages it, it should be observed that nothing in the doctrine denies "support" for guerrilla movements or wars of national liberation. In fact, a typical Moscow line regards "as just and supports war in defence of the freedom and independence won by the peoples against imperialist aggression, wars for national and social liberation."¹⁷

In this connection, in January 1966 the leading Soviet delegate to the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America meeting in Havana declared that the Soviet Union was ready to give "all-around assistance" to the "national liberation struggles," going so far as to pinpoint targets in Latin America by expressing his country's "fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by the Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism."¹⁸ As far as it is known, in the 2 years since the above statement, the Soviet Union has yet to give any significant material assistance. As a Western explanation, D. Tretiak regards this ambivalence in Soviet support of guerrilla movements as an "amelioration of ideological tensions" in a Soviet search for accommo-

dation with Fidel Castro.¹⁹ Castro has long contended that revolutionary violence is necessary to bring about any meaningful political change in Latin America. He claims that when boldly led guerrilla units can take to the field and sustain themselves there, they will precipitate the conditions which will assure their eventual success. He has been openly critical, even scornful, of the traditional Communist doctrine that the urban proletariat (blue collar worker) should be the focus of revolution and contemptuous of the newer Soviet line that peaceful means to socialism are acceptable for Communists in many countries today.²⁰ At the time of the 1966 Solidarity Conference, Castro particularly criticized Latin American revolutionaries who wasted time in "theorizing" and urged preparation for "a most violent struggle." He said that "sooner or later, all or almost all" peoples of Latin America would have to take up arms to "liberate" themselves and called for a "joint spontaneous struggle."²¹

Dinerstein agrees that verbal support by the Soviet Union helped ease Soviet relations with Cuba and further suggests that, from the Soviet point of view, verbal encouragement to active guerrilla movements in Latin America "... is a way of preserving some influence over revolutionary situations. . . . The Soviets probably feel confident that these guerrilla movements will not succeed in overthrowing governments and setting up communist states, for, if this were to happen, the Soviet Union would find it embarrassing not to help such new states and yet very dangerous to help them. Most likely, the Soviets assume that the United States would intervene before matters reached such a point, and that American intervention, in turn, would provide justification for the Soviet Union's general policy of supporting anti-Americanism in Latin America."²²

Briefly stated, the Soviet Union will provide verbal support for political expediency and convenience without particular concern for ideological considerations, or without actually intending to provide material support. The result is opportunism and flexibility within a framework of low risk—as appears to be the present situation in Latin America.

Conclusions. The doctrine of non-capitalist development supports a policy of using local forces—nationalist leaders, non-Communist groups, and Western capital—to perform the revolutionary tasks hitherto reserved to the proletariat and the Communist Party. Moreover, it asserts that properly controlled "imperialist" capital may be useful or even necessary, that armed revolution is not mandatory, that the transition to socialism may take a long time, and that there may be setbacks. In short, non-capitalist doctrine supports a policy which is inexpensive and low risk. And while it offers no guarantee of success, it does offer some promise, and it may be expensive and frustrating for the United States and the countries of Latin America to counter.

The next section discusses a number of somewhat unique aspects in Latin America which tend to compound policy problems for the Soviets and reinforce the wisdom, or perhaps necessity, of following the present, inexpensive, and low-risk policy.

II—UNIQUE ASPECTS AFFECTING SOVIET POLICY IN LATIN AMERICA

United States Dominance.

"U.S. imperialism is . . . the main, direct external enemy of the peoples of all the Latin-American countries. For many of them it is the main enemy . . ."²³

"Enemy number one is U.S. imperialism. . . ."²⁴

These statements leave no doubt that United States dominance in Latin America is a rallying point for Communist attack. Their attacks and frustrations are echoed in

vociferous, verbal complaints regarding U.S. economic, political, and military influence.

Four facets of U.S. influence receive considerable space in Soviet writings on Latin America. They are the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, the non-existent Inter-American Armed Force, and U.S. "monopoly" investments. The first three may be all the more annoying because they seem to have been a United States response to the communization of Cuba and reinforce the veracity of President Johnson's 2 May 1965 statement that "the American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."²⁵

Alliance for Progress is criticized as anti-Communist and a "counter-revolution" against real reform (as it suppresses the national liberation movement). It is also criticized as being primarily beneficial to the ruling elite (it helps them stay in power), big landowners (they can sell their "waste-lands" under land reform), and U.S. monopolies (it preserves their status quo)²⁶ Two Communists, one Soviet and one Latin American, see the program as having had a dangerous success is delusion.

Early in 1967 the Soviet writer commented: "In the five years of Alliance for Progress, U.S. ruling circles succeeded in slightly strengthening the positions of the national bourgeois groups (nonrevolutionary, middle class) inclined to look to the United States in some Latin American countries, and in sowing dangerous illusions among small sections of workers, employees and peasants concerning the sincerity of U.S. intentions."²⁷

The commentator from Latin America expanded on the problem of the "illusion" and its danger to communism:

"We cannot 'repeal' the facts. In their daily life, people take guidance from what they see, from the concrete circumstances, and we have no earthly reason to assume that all the social projects of the pseudo-reformists will be stillborn. Some have been partly realized, which has had its effect on the public sentiment, especially in view of the extreme poverty of the bulk of the people. Some measures (building houses and schools, sanitation, land amelioration, etc.) financed by Alliance for Progress funds, alleviate the lot of the few but they sow illusions among many. And charities sponsored by such U.S. 'aid' organizations as Care, Caritas, Food for Peace, and by some West-German agencies, add to these illusions.

"Illusions about the benevolence of a government, Church, charity organization or 'generous' employer may become a peril of the first magnitude if they are nourished for decades by reforms and begin to act as an opiate."²⁸

In short, these Communist writers see winning of the minds through peaceful reform as a real danger to the Communist movement.

The Peace Corps is seen as "a vanguard of U.S. imperialism whose task is to help disarm the national liberation movement in Latin America ideologically." Its "main task . . . is to advertise the American way of life, sell U.S. domestic and foreign policy, present an attractive picture of capitalist development and fight communism."²⁹ No Soviet writer made a favorable comment on this program—thus indicating it may be a U.S. success.

One of the favorite Communist topics is the Inter-American Armed Force, even though it does not exist (and in this writer's view is not likely to be implemented). Nonetheless, Communist writers see 4 dangers in its use. First, the establishment of a joint armed force presupposes a joint foreign policy and hemispheric cooperation.³⁰ Second, it might be used "to unleash a 'holy war' against Cuba."³¹ Third, it could "crush the popular movements in Latin America . . . or any other country where a situation may

Footnotes at end of article.

arise imperiling U.S. imperialist interests." And fourth, "it has been estimated that this would allow" the United States "to put at least 20 million Latin Americans" under arms and create a "reserve for its military gambles outside the Western Hemisphere."³³

Some of the discussions leave the impression that the authors have written ominous propaganda about something nonexistent in order to receive credit for it not being put into effect. On the other hand, other writers are genuinely critical from their viewpoint of existing inter-American military and police aid (about \$90 million from the United States, in fiscal year 1967) as it forms a base for anticommunism and U.S. influence.³⁴ They are therefore critical of any military program which might extend this influence.

In reviewing U.S. economic domination, Gvozdev and Leonidov consider U.S. investment amounts to \$15 billion (75 percent of all foreign investments in Latin America) and controls 25 percent of all industrial production and half of Latin America's exports. It is this extensive U.S. economic domination which combines with "military-political projects" such as Peace Corps and Alliance for Progress to form the "aggressive U.S. policy in Latin America."³⁵

Many Westerners would agree that the dominant presence of the United States, coupled with an anti-Americanism inherent in Latin American nationalism, creates problems for U.S. policy and exploitative possibilities for Soviet policy. For example, in 1958 Louis Halle, in discussing American aid to Latin America, stated:

"Though the intention has been to provide a kind of economic development that will make the Latin American republics more independent, more able to stand on their own feet, it has seemed to me that these aid programs might be having the opposite effect, that they have in fact been promoting a habit among the Latin Americans to look to the United States for the solution of their problems, and to hold the United States, rather than themselves, responsible. If a Latin American country is in bad shape, its citizens and its officials are likely to ask, today, what the United States is going to do about it."³⁶

More recently, *Newsweek*, in reporting increasing anti-Americanism in Brazil, contained a quote from Washington, "We are not unduly concerned, said one Administration official last week. 'There is a great sense of frustration in Brazil, and the U.S. as the big boy of the hemisphere is the traditional target of that frustration. Things are merely back to normal.'"³⁷

This "normal" situation provides fodder for Soviet propaganda. A general impression of Soviet literature is that all Latin American ills can be blamed on U.S. imperialism, and substantial space is devoted to propagandizing it. This Soviet task is made easier by the lack of their own presence and influence, as well as geographic separation.

The Assistant Director for Latin America of the U.S. Information Agency, Kermit Brown, has testified:

"The Communist propaganda effort in Latin America has traditionally availed itself of targets of opportunity and its success or failure has depended in large part on the prevailing winds of official and public opinion. Although there has been no recent dramatic increase in the amount of Communist propaganda or influence in the area, there is evidence that the Soviet Union, in addition to lending support to terrorist activities, has simultaneously embarked on a subtle, 'soft sell' propaganda program whenever and wherever they are permitted to operate. . . . Soviet Communist propaganda strategy for Latin America is directed toward the de-

struction of U.S. power and influence in the area and ultimately the imposition of Marxist-Leninist regimes throughout the hemisphere. In its present tactical stage, the Soviets' aim is to support programs strongly nationalistic in economic matters and independent in foreign policy."³⁸

Briefly stated, Soviet policy recognizes weaknesses inherent in U.S. domination and uses these as rallying points for its own political purposes. One of its primary political tools is propaganda. The Soviet Union believes that Cuban communism has inspired the United States to adopt a strong anti-Communist policy in an effort to preclude another Cuba-type revolution in Latin America. Therefore, they are encouraging and utilizing inherent anti-Americanism to counter U.S. dominance.

Latin American Economic Development. Latin America has economic characteristics of both the developed and underdeveloped world. This is partly because "most of the countries of Latin America won state independence a century and a half ago, when capitalism was still a necessary stage of social and economic development for the colonial people."³⁹ In consequence, the countries of Latin America, when compared to new Asian and African nations, are already further along the capitalist path to development.⁴⁰

Further, within the economic setting of Latin America there is a fairly large "worker class" not interested in communism as a method of reform. According to one author, the blue collar "working class" together with clerical workers constitute more than 50 percent of the gainfully employed population.⁴¹ The lack of interest in communism by the Latin American working class movement in general and the trade unions in particular is explained by ". . . the fact that the Latin-American working class is better off than the downtrodden rural masses. Because of this many who recently left the countryside to find steady employment in the towns feel that they have radically improved their social and economic status, effecting what might be called their own 'private revolution.'"

In other words, a peasant can improve his status by moving to town, and "the rapid influx of new contingents of workers in 1940-55" has produced a large group who can remember when they were much worse off.⁴²

The result of these factors is that a number of countries are already well along the capitalist path to development and lack mass parties interested in following the Soviet scheme of noncapitalist development. When tied with social and political factors, discussed later in this paper, it is easy to see why Soviet strategy adopts a "united front" policy which seeks to join together reformers, both Communist and non-Communist, in a "creeping revolution" formula. Included in this formula are increased diplomatic, cultural, and trade exchanges between the Soviet Union and the countries of Latin America.

Thus far, the Soviet Union has had little economic exchange with Latin America, although new trade agreements have recently been concluded with Brazil, Chile, and Colombia.⁴³ Previously, very small amounts of trade have existed with Argentina, Uruguay, and Mexico.⁴⁴ The total 1966 Soviet trade exchange with non-Communist Latin America was about one quarter of that with Cuba.⁴⁵ In general, the countries of Latin America have been reluctant to trade with the Soviet Union because of the Soviet Union's preference for barter. Also, a country may find its supply of convertible currency adversely affected because it has less coffee, sugar, meat, or mineral output available for sale in the West.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, the Soviet emphasis is on increased trade, not only in Latin America, but all over the world.⁴⁷

Thus it is that economically, Latin America poses handicaps to successful Soviet domination. The countries are Western oriented and considerably more advanced than those

of Africa and Asia. Additionally, the fairly substantial worker and trade union movement is not interested in revolutionary economic reform, including communism. Trade and aid, which are major instruments of Soviet foreign policy in some developing countries, have thus far had limited application for the countries of Latin America, although there is now increasing Soviet emphasis on trade.

Latin American Social and Political Development. There are numerous social and political factors of interest in Latin America; however, only those which have major implication for Soviet policy will be discussed. These are nationalism, and the groups which play a major role in it, and diplomatic and cultural relations between the Soviet Union and the countries of Latin America.

Nationalism, as a force for modernization, would exist in Latin America with or without a Communist menace. Anti-Americanism, itself, has long been one of the chief ingredients of nationalism in Latin America and existed prior to the development of communism in Russia.⁴⁸ What is significant is that Soviet policy seeks to intensify nationalism and anti-Americanism. J. Gregory Oswald has stated:

"Soviet scholars, outspoken proponents of the Communist cause, carefully study this mysterious force (nationalism), determined to employ it against reformist moderate forces seeking the middle way for their nations."⁴⁹

As previously alluded, this intensification is shown in "the Soviets' aim . . . to support programs strongly nationalistic in economic matters and independent in foreign policy."⁵⁰

Achievement of Soviet aims, however, is handicapped by local intolerance for communism, especially Castro communism, among all groups except intellectuals, playing a major role in development of nationalism. Discussing this, Whitaker and Jordan list 4 major groups who play the predominant role in this development of nationalism—the armed forces, the middle class, the intellectuals, and organized labor. The armed forces and middle class are probably the most important. In some countries the bureaucracy, the Church, and the political parties may be added as separate entities, although in most cases they operate through one or another of the 4 major groups.

In discussing each of the groups, Whitaker and Jordan conclude that the armed forces, meaning its officer corps, and the middle class, while fragmented on the issues of nationalism, are similar in that ". . . there are extremes that no substantial part of either of these two groups is likely to tolerate. The populist type is almost certainly such an extreme, especially if it has a Castro-Communist flavor.

"The intellectuals, including the university students, present a picture of utter confusion. Most of them are nationalists but their types of nationalism vary with their political affiliations, and those are widely assorted. According to a recent study, they provide 'a significant percentage of the new members drawn into the Communist party' and provide most of its top leadership. Many more of them are anti-Communist Marxists or left-wing democrats, and a respectable number are middle-of-the-road liberals or out-and-out conservatives. . . . A new type of intellectual leader, the economist-in-politics, is appearing as modernization progresses."

The technocracy of Mexico is nationalism of this "new type."

Discussing organized labor, Whitaker and Jordan conclude its ". . . political power . . . is still curbed in one way or another by strong forces hostile to that kind (populist) of nationalism. Moreover, the labor leaders themselves are restrained by the risk

Footnotes at end of article.

that populist nationalism may end in Castro-type regimes. They are well aware that Castro destroyed not only the existing armed forces of Cuba but also the existing labor organization and the freedom of labor."⁵¹

Whitaker and Jordan have been quoted because of the similarity of their conclusions to those of some Soviet writers. In discussing the military, A. Shulgovsky states:

"Of late, nationalist trends have become clearly evident in Latin American military circles. . . . In the armies of Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and some other countries, nationalism is identified with the national dignity of the country, the independence of its foreign policy and its equality within the framework of the 'Western world.' Nationalists of that trend do not object to military co-operation with the U.S.A., but want to preserve national control over the armed forces, do not want them to become a pawn in the Pentagon's global strategy."

In Colombia, Peru, and other countries "there are military groups who associate the idea of nationalism with the demand for the implementation of far-reaching social reforms." However:

"It should also be remembered that the military holding views closely approaching those of the radical, revolutionary forces—and there are such generally leave the army (or to be more exact, are pushed out of it). . . . The view that the army has to play a decisive role in the revolutionary processes unfolding in the countries south of the Rio Grande is therefore completely erroneous. . . . Moreover, the history of the Latin American countries offers many instances of the armed forces becoming the gravediggers of the liberation movement."⁵²

Guatemala in 1954 and Bolivia in 1964 are given as examples of the latter.

Moscow-printed *Soviet Foreign Policy*, in discussing the Soviet view of the interests of middle class and organized labor, states that:

"... the working-class struggle in Latin America is impaired by conciliators and opportunist elements, who are particularly numerous in the trade union organizations. They hold posts of prominence in the trade unions of many Latin American countries and are inclined to strike deals with the big local and foreign bourgeoisie (middle class capitalist), injecting division into the labor movement. . . . The national bourgeoisie (middle class, such as small merchants and industrialists whose interests are primarily nationalistic), which dreads the growing struggle for liberation and the social demands of the people, is hesitant and uncertain in carrying through measures designed to win economic and full political independence."

Nationalistic middle class seek the middle way instead of extremes.

"The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois (middle class, salaried workers) political parties, alignments and groups, joined in some countries by trade union leaders, follow a line of conciliation."⁵³

In other words, organized labor and the middle class are not revolutionary spirited. Indeed, there is no one large group interested enough by itself to enact the Communist strategy. Hence, the "united front" policy becomes almost a necessity.

Establishment of diplomatic, cultural, and commercial ties is a useful adjunct to the "united front" policy as a communications link to radical and subversive reformers and as a base for general propaganda and influence. In any event, *Soviet Foreign Policy* states,

"The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to invigorate relations with the Latin American countries. . . . Soviet relations with the Latin American countries. . . . have made progress despite the barriers artificially raised by in-

ternal reaction and the U.S. imperialists. . . . And even though the U.S. imperialists stop at nothing—not even at overthrowing lawful governments—to prevent Latin American countries from pursuing an independent policy, events will nevertheless take their own course."⁵⁴

Historical inevitability will triumph!

The Soviet Union maintains diplomatic relations with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay in the south; with Mexico in the north; and, as of January 1968, with Colombia, a bridge linking the north and south.⁵⁵ Uruguay is the principal distribution point for Communist propaganda, although there is a considerable amount in all the countries with Russian Embassies.⁵⁶

Binational cultural centers are established in a number of provincial cities in Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Uruguay. These centers and such things as cultural exchanges, trade fairs, and educational services serve as a point of entry into political and business circles. However, their effect on attitude has not been significant. A U.S. Information Agency research survey shows that:

"A large majority of the Latin American people continue to maintain strongly negative attitudes toward communism as a system of government which they tend to equate with totalitarianism, toward the Soviet Union and Red China as nations, and toward Castro and the Cuban experience. At the same time, these studies and surveys show a continuing reservoir of good will toward the United States, despite manifestations of misunderstanding, deep-seated criticisms and resentment of certain of our policies and actions."⁵⁷

This would seem to indicate that Soviet expansion of diplomatic, cultural, and commercial exchange has had little short term impact.

In summary, Soviet policy encourages radical nationalism through a combination of propaganda and "united front" cooperation of radical reformers and established Communist Parties. Its aim is to intensify anti-Americanism and internal discontent. However, success is partly negated by the anti-Communist nature of most nationalist groups. Direct Soviet contact is being increased by an expansion of diplomatic, cultural, and commercial exchange.

Communist Party Organization in Latin America. Communist Parties exist in all the countries of Latin America, with widely varying strength and status. In some countries, such as Chile and Uruguay, the Communist Party is legal and well established. In others, such as Nicaragua and Paraguay, it is illegal, and its activities are necessarily limited to clandestine operations.⁵⁸

All Communist Parties have been represented in recent international conferences, such as the January 1966 Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America held in Havana; the March and April 1966 meeting of the 23d Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow; and the Organization of Latin American Solidarity in Havana in July and August 1967.⁵⁹ The organizational meetings in Havana are of particular note in that they underscore an attempt for unity and the establishment of a permanent Latin American Solidarity Organization in Havana. However, even though the steering group for the Solidarity Organization was established in early 1966, it has yet to make much impact on the organization.⁶⁰ Nonetheless, the organization is a potential base for unified propaganda, material, and training support.

Numerous writings by Latin American Communists stress the need for party unity and condemn factionalism. A recent statement of the Communist Parties of the 7 Central American countries announces, "Each party has the right to pursue its own line in accordance with concrete conditions prevailing in the country."⁶¹ Basically, this

is aimed at curbing indiscriminate Cuban encouragement of revolution which, as it now exists, causes quandry in the local parties. In some local situations Cuban propaganda—Radio Havana is a major propaganda instrument—encourages young rebels and revolutionaries into premature action which is embarrassing to the local party. The local parties do not want to lose the support of young militants or bear the onus of being against those who are fighting with weapons in their hands, while at the same time they do not want to support operations which are bound to fail or may provide the local government with an excuse to crack down on the Communist Party.⁶² In summary, the orthodox Communist Parties strongly support the communization of Cuba but are opposed to Cuba's militant stand with the resultant in-country complications for them.

This situation presents several policy problems to the Soviet Union. In order to maintain influence over Latin American Parties, Cuba included, it must be responsive to their needs. It is doing this by supporting the need for unity and by offering a limited form of moral support to guerrilla groups that is acceptable to the local parties and partially acceptable to Cuba. It is by no means an ideal situation for Moscow; however, it does have the virtue of avoiding seriously embarrassing complications for the Soviet Union. This appears to be a realistic middle-of-the-road approach until such time as there is greater likelihood for successful Communist takeovers. As a policy that encourages local parties to give conditional support to nationalist reformist movements, it is consistent with the theory of noncapitalist development.

A future problem for Soviet policy may be that of having to choose between support of local Communists or non-support in sacrifice for its own political gains. As Soviet diplomatic and commercial ties increase, they may well be faced with a decision similar to that in Egypt, when Egypt declared the Communist Party illegal. When the political inroad was important enough, the Soviets have not hesitated to make political compromises, including acceptance of destruction of the local Communist Party. This situation has not yet arisen in Latin America, but it may arise as the Soviet Union seeks to gain acceptance by local governments. In brief, a nonmilitant policy is probably necessary to consummate political ties between the Soviet Union and the countries of Latin America, and it may require deemphasis of established parties.

Cuba. The surprise communization of Cuba in the early 1960's raised the expectations for communism's spread to other countries of Latin America. However, after the missile crisis of 1962, Latin American Communist Parties became less responsive to Cuba's call for revolution—a decline which has continued to this day. The main irritants in Soviet-Cuban relations since 1961 have been the debate over the correct means for Communist Parties to take power and the direction of Cuba's economic development. Both countries eventually yielded to accommodation.

In connection with Cuba's economic development, Castro acceded late in 1965 to Moscow's insistence that Cuba concentrate on increased agricultural output instead of industrialization. In turn, Moscow provided some degree of support for Castro's revolutionary goals.⁶³ This consisted of vocal support for armed struggle during the African, Asian, Latin American solidarity conference in Havana early in 1966. Also, prestige for Cuba was derived from the establishment of the Organization for Latin American Solidarity in Havana and associated continental meetings. Complete accommodation has yet to be achieved, although the present tendency is for all groups—Cuba, the Soviet Union, and local Communist Parties—to

Footnotes at end of article.

compromise. Nonetheless, Castro still appears to be a compulsive revolutionist and, to some degree, unpredictable.

R. A. Stevenson, who is coordinator of Cuban affairs in the U.S. Department of State, views the principal contributions of Cuba to trouble in Latin America as threefold—training, propaganda, and material support, in order of importance. In the same report, Brigadier General Brown of the Defense Intelligence Agency, reports the training and indoctrination of "several thousand Latin Americans" in Cuba and of at least 4 proven instances of direct Cuban support to insurgent groups. In propaganda, Radio Havana is the primary source of Cuban propaganda with an average at the end of 1966 of 163 hours per week to Latin America.⁶⁴ However, listener response is reported as "poor" due to difficulty in reception and "dull programs." Mr. Stevenson concludes, "In my personal opinion he [Castro] is still a threat. [However] I think that each year he is a failure and doesn't achieve all the things that he talks about, that his influence and his image are tarnished."⁶⁵ Recent emphasis in increasing unilateral ties between the Soviet Union and countries in Latin America is another indicator of Cuban decline. Additionally, the Organization of American States has taken an increasingly hostile view of Cuba and communism in Latin America, further decreasing Cuban prestige and effectiveness.⁶⁶

In summary, although the major irritants to Soviet-Cuban relations have yielded to accommodation, Castro is still a combination of bitter and sweet—an independent dependent. Cuba symbolizes Communist success in the American backyard. However, so long as Cuba remains defiant of both the Soviet Union and the established parties in Latin America, its usefulness as a staging area is downgraded.

III—CONCLUSIONS

Traditionally, Soviet policy in Latin America has been one of limited involvement. Until recently it sought to work through the local Communist Parties in the achievement of its goal, using the Russian revolution as a pattern for takeover. However, 2 major considerations have led to a shift in policy. First, the Soviet experience with the developing countries primarily in Asia and Africa, has led to a deemphasis of and less reliance on local Communist Parties, trade unions, and violent revolutions. Second, although established as a base for communism in the Western Hemisphere, Cuba has also created major economic problems for the Soviets and a challenge by Castro for leadership of the Communist movement in Latin America.

The subsequent policy has been one in which the Soviets seek more direct governmental contacts with the respective countries. By expanding their diplomatic, commercial, and cultural exchange ties with the countries of Latin America, the Soviets develop a closer association with elements that are both desirable and exploitable for Soviet encouragement of radical nationalism and anti-"U.S. imperialism." In seeking this association the Soviets have opted for the "united front"—a broad alliance between non-Communist reformist groups, the local Communist Party, and guerrilla groups. The "front" would promote radical nationalism and condemn U.S. influence.

This Soviet strategy has the appearance of being both realistic and opportunistic. It is comparatively inexpensive and limits the likelihood of prematurely establishing states that might require large amounts of aid, such as Cuba. At the same time it offers the possibility of undermining existing authority and U.S. influence. While this policy may not guarantee success, it is practical in terms of the present political climate in Latin America and keeps Soviet economic and military expenditures in this area within their ability to support. Also, this strategy has the

side effect of reducing the Castro influence in local Communist Parties and revolutionary groups.

Although there is no assurance that increased nationalism will necessarily lead to increased Soviet influence and penetration, the United States should not ignore this threat. Neither should it blindly resist nationalistic movements, for to do so would certainly be counter-productive. Fundamentally, U.S. policy for the next several decades should avoid an excessive U.S. presence or exposure, yet encourage and provide economic assistance for constructive regional and functional programs such as Latin American Common Market, regional fisheries, multinational transportation systems, land resource development et cetera. Success in these areas would sap energy from radical nationalism, thereby reducing the threat from a major Soviet tool for promotion of communism in Latin America.

"It is your attitude, and the suspicion that you are maturing the boldest designs against him, that imposes on your enemy."—*Fredrick The Great: Instructions for His Generals*, ix, 1747.

FOOTNOTES

*Robert Conquest, ed., *The Politics of Ideas in the USSR* (London: Bodley Head, 1967), p. 82.

¹ Elizabeth K. Valkenier, "Changing Soviet Perspectives on the Liberation Revolution," *Orbis*, Winter 1966, p. 953, and Herbert S. Dinerstein, *Soviet Foreign Policy in Latin America*, RM-4967-PR (Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand, May 1966), p. 43-44.

² Valkenier, p. 953.

³ Dinerstein, p. vii.

⁴ G. Kim and A. Kaufman, "Non-Capitalist Development: Achievements and Difficulties," *International Affairs* (Moscow), December 1967, p. 72-74. Also see O. E. Tuganova, "The Foreign Policy of the Developing Countries," *International Affairs* (Moscow), May 1967, p. 62-63. Leaders on the capitalist path to develop, such as most in Latin America, would be called bourgeois-democratic.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 73-74.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁷ R. N. Andreasyan, "Developing Countries and Foreign Capital," *International Affairs* (Moscow), May 1967, p. 72.

⁸ Kim and Kaufman, p. 73.

⁹ Y. M. Zhukov, "Contemporary Pace of Development of National-Liberation Revolution," *International Affairs* (Moscow), May 1967, p. 53.

¹⁰ V. L. Tyagunenko, "Capitalist and Non-Capitalist Development," *International Affairs* (Moscow), May 1967, p. 57-58. Professors Zhukov, Kim, and Tyagunenko have written extensively on political development in developing countries. Professor Zhukov is an Academician and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences. Professor Kim is a Doctor of History and Manager of the Department of Korea, the Mongolian Peoples of Asia, and Viet Nam at the Institute of the Peoples of Asia of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. Professor Tyagunenko is a Doctor of History and Head of the Section of Underdeveloped Countries at the Institute of World Economy.

¹¹ Valkenier, p. 966.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 953.

¹³ N. Prokopyev, "Problems of War and Peace in Our Age," *International Affairs* (Moscow), December 1967, p. 61-62. Also see Zhukov, p. 54.

¹⁴ Kim and Kaufman, p. 72.

¹⁵ Luis Corvalan, "Alliance of Anti-Imperialist Forces in Latin America," *World Marxist Review*, July 1967, p. 48.

¹⁶ Dinerstein, p. v-vi.

¹⁷ V. Israelyan, "The October Revolution and Foreign Policy," *International Affairs* (Moscow), September 1967, p. 9.

¹⁸ Quoted in "The Havana Three Continents Conference," *Communist Affairs*, January-February 1966, p. 12. The Organization

of American States in extraordinary session denounced the Conference as a violation of the United Nations Declaration of Non-Intervention.

¹⁹ Daniel Tretiak, "Cuba and the Soviet Union: the Growing Accommodation, 1964-1965," *Orbis*, Summer 1967, p. 443.

²⁰ Robert A. Stevenson, Coordinator of Cuban Affairs, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State, witness report in U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Communist Activities in Latin America, 1967*, Hearings (Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1967), p. 35.

²¹ "The Havana Three Continents Conference," p. 12.

²² Dinerstein, p. viii-ix.

²³ Roque Dalton and Victor Miranda, "Present Phase of the Revolutionary Movement in Latin America," *World Marxist Review*, May 1967, p. 49.

²⁴ Alvaro Delgado, "Latin American Reformism Today," *World Marxist Review*, July 1967, p. 72.

²⁵ L. Kamynin, "Inter-American Force—a Weapon of Neo-Colonialism," *International Affairs* (Moscow), May 1967, p. 27.

²⁶ G. Lovelko, "Vicious Circle of the Alliance for Progress," *International Affairs* (Moscow), November 1966, p. 32-37. R. Leonidov, "Aggressive U.S. Policy in Latin America," *International Affairs* (Moscow), February 1967, p. 54-59.

²⁷ Leonidov, p. 55.

²⁸ Delgado, p. 72-73, offered the following policy to counter the threat of reform:

However, in the event of the revolutionary forces following a correct policy, government promises and a reform here and there can be used to accelerate the revolution. This can be done by rallying the masses to demand that promises be honored immediately, by taking advantage of the instability that follows any more or less substantial reform, and by constantly stepping up the demands of the public, the more backward sections of which have believed that the loudly advertised reforms would bring about a radical improvement.

²⁹ Y. Godunsky and V. Selivanov, "Apostles of Peace in Latin America," *International Affairs* (Moscow), April 1967, p. 24-28.

³⁰ Kamynin, p. 30.

³¹ Dalton and Miranda, p. 46.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 46-47.

³³ Kamynin, p. 30.

³⁴ Robert M. Sayre, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, testified in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 81, and reported,

Our overall military assistance in equipment and services, to all of Latin America is limited . . . to \$85 million (in fiscal year 1967) with most of the program going for internal security and civic action activities. Our Public Safety program for assisting the police establishments of Latin America totals about \$5.3 million this fiscal year (1967).

³⁵ Y. Gvozdev, "Latin America: Wall Street's New Tactics," *New Times*, 6 September 1967, p. 18. Leonidov, p. 55.

³⁶ Louis Halle, *Dream and Reality* (New York: Harper, 1958), p. 173-174.

³⁷ "Brazil: Something Wild," *Newsweek*, 15 January 1968, p. 43.

³⁸ Kermit Brown, Assistant Director (Latin America), U.S. Information Agency, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 55-57.

³⁹ Tyagunenko, p. 56.

⁴⁰ According to Dalton and Miranda (p. 49 and 52), "Latin America is approaching the average level of capitalist development . . . National income per capita is roughly \$440, which is relatively close to the average world index," and "two or three times higher than in other parts of the 'third world.'" There are also significant economic contrasts from country to country and from urban to rural within each country. "Argentina with its average per capita income of \$780 annually," contrasts with "Brazil and Bolivia where the corresponding figure is \$390 and \$140." How-

ever, even sharper internal contrasts may exist between urban workers and rural peasants or Indians.

⁴¹ Dalton and Miranda, p. 52.

⁴² "The Latin American Working Class—Its Strength and Weakness," *New Times*, 23 August 1967, p. 2.

⁴³ A. Mazin, "Trade Brings Peoples Closer Together," *Pravda*, 15 December 1967, p. 4, condensed text in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 3 January 1968, p. 15. According to Milton Kovner, "Soviet Aid and Trade," *Current History*, October 1967, p. 220, the trade agreements with Brazil and Chile call for Soviet delivery of machinery and equipment on credit and Soviet acceptance of 25 percent and 30 percent, respectively, of the repayments in manufactured and semi-processed goods with the remainder of payment in commodities.

⁴⁴ Marshall I. Goldman, *Soviet Foreign Aid* (New York: Praeger, 1967), p. 157-195.

⁴⁵ Mazin, p. 4. Sol M. Linowitz, U.S. Representative to the Council of the Organization of American States, reported in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 81-89, that Cuban trade (export and import) totaled \$1,580 million in 1966. About 77 percent was with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, including about \$370 million in Soviet aid in the form of long-term credits and sugar price subsidies. The remaining 23 percent was with free world countries.

⁴⁶ Goldman, p. 157-158.

⁴⁷ "Twenty-third Party Congress Emphasizes Importance of Foreign Trade," *Vneshnyaya Torgovlya* (Foreign Trade), Moscow, May 1966, p. 3-5, translated text published in U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Joint Publications Research Service, *USSR International Economic Relations*, no. 63, (Washington: 1966), p. 2-4.

⁴⁸ Arthur P. Whitaker and David C. Jordan, *Nationalism in Contemporary Latin America* (New York: Free Press, 1966), p. 10.

⁴⁹ Oswald, p. 4.

⁵⁰ Brown, p. 57.

⁵¹ Whitaker and Jordan, p. 10.

⁵² A. Shulgovsky, "Arms and Politics in Latin America," *International Affairs* (Moscow), May 1967, p. 33-34.

⁵³ V. Israelyan, ed., *Soviet Foreign Policy* (Moscow: Progress, 1967), p. 174-175.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 190. Quote is from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Report to the 22d Congress of the CPSU.

⁵⁵ Brown, p. 57, and M. Kremnev, "Soviet-Colombian Relations," *New Times*, 31 January 1968, p. 15.

⁵⁶ Brown, p. 71.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 61-62. Mr. Brown did not define any of the policies or actions causing criticism and resentment and none of the Congressmen questioned what they might be!

⁵⁸ Sayre, p. 78. According to Sayre, party membership is largest in Chile and Argentina. The Argentine membership has been estimated at close to 60,000, and the Chilean party has approximately 30,000. In comparison, the Cubans claim a membership of about 60,000. Although technically legal, the Argentine party has not been allowed to participate in recent elections. According to Corvalan (p. 49-50), the influential Chilean party polled 354,000 votes in the April 1967 elections for about 15 percent of the vote. As a coalition, total Communist-Socialist vote was about 30 percent.

⁵⁹ "The Havana Three Continents Conference," *Communist Affairs*, January-February 1966, p. 17; "The 23d Congress of the CPSU," *Communist Affairs*, March-April 1966, p. 22; "At the OLAS Conference," *Pravda*, 6 August 1967, p. 5, translated in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 23 August 1967, p. 20.

⁶⁰ Sayre, p. 80.

⁶¹ "For Militant Unity—Statement of Communist Parties of Seven Latin American Countries," *Pravda*, 19 June 1967, p. 5, trans-

lated in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 12 July 1967, p. 22.

⁶² Dinerstein, p. 31-32.

⁶³ D. Tretiak, "Cuba and the Soviet Union: the Growing Accommodation, 1964-1965," *Orbis*, Summer 1967, p. 440.

⁶⁴ Burton R. Brown, Deputy Assistant Director for Intelligence Production, Defense Intelligence Agency, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 22, 57. Shortwave transmission to Latin America from the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Communist China was reported to total 312 hours a week at the end of 1966.

⁶⁵ Stevenson, p. 36.

⁶⁶ A historical listing of OAS action is provided by Sol M. Linowitz, U.S. Representative to the Council of the Organization of American States, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 81-89.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey for June 16 through July 3 on account of official business to attend International Labor Organization Conference.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. HUNT) for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROOKS), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter):

Mr. MCCARTHY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 45 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. HORTON.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. STAFFORD.

Mr. HUNT in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. KEITH in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOREMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. SCHERLE.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. BROOKS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. BARING in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in five instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. PODELL in three instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. SATTERFIELD in two instances.

Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. DADDARIO in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. DULSKI in four instances.

Mr. GRAY.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. CABELL.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. MARSH.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 11249. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such center (Rept. No. 91-309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2690. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(1) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2777. A bill to enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for potatoes by increasing consumer acceptance of such potatoes and potato products and by improving the quality of potatoes and potato products that are made available to the consumer; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9946. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim

retained rights in certain tracts of land to the Board of Education of Lee County, S.C. (Rept. No. 91-312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALLEY, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 12094. A bill to establish a Department of Maritime Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 12095. A bill to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12096. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12097. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its protection to workers employed in the demolition, dismantling, removal, and/or salvaging of public buildings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12098. A bill to amend the prevailing wage provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to include subsistence allowances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12099. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday which shall be celebrated on the second Monday in June; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12100. A bill relating to the construction, modification, alteration, repair, painting, or decoration of buildings leased for public purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 12101. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the limitation upon the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made after June 1969 under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 12102. A bill to encourage institutions of higher education to adopt rules and regulations to govern the conduct of students and faculty, to assure the right to free expression, to assist such institutions in their efforts to prevent and control campus disorders, and to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 12103. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that such chapter shall not apply with respect to the sale or delivery of certain ammunition for rifles or shotguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 12104. A bill to expedite delivery of special delivery mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12105. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if a brother of such member dies, is in missing status, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the

Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 12106. A bill to amend title III of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for a program of investment guarantees in Latin American countries to encourage local participation in self-help community development projects; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 12107. A bill to establish an independent agency to perform oversight functions with respect to procurement by the military departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12108. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 12109. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12110. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12111. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12112. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12113. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an established workweek, a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12114. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 12115. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CAREY, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 12116. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12117. A bill to authorize a park system for the Atlantic urban region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 12118. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12119. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the awarding of an appurtenance to certain campaign medals to indicate that the recipients thereof participated in combat during the campaigns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12120. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and

the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MARSH, and Mr. DONOHUE):

H.R. 12121. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1966 (80 Stat. 259), as amended by the act of December 12, 1967 (81 Stat. 567); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 12122. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12123. A bill to readjust the compensation of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12124. A bill to implement the Federal employees' pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Management-Labor Salary Survey Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 12125. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation relative to the Calapooda division of the Willamette River project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 12126. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12127. A bill to amend section 4009 of title 39, United States Code, to provide for the payment by the sender of all costs to the United States allocable to the sender, in connection with the administration of such section by the Postmaster General with respect to the mailing of pandering advertisements by the sender in violation of such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.J. Res. 776. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the centennial of Hunter College; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 777. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation directing the flag of the United States to be displayed at half-staff on the first day of each month in honor of the men and women who have died in the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BROWN

of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. REUSS):

H. Res. 439. Resolution urging the President to resubmit to the Senate for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 12128. A bill for the relief of William Heidman, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.