

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CAPTAIN BOLDEN—STAR IN THE
CAP OF ST. LOUIS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I humbly pay tribute to a man whose name will always echo in the history of St. Louis. Capt. Edward Bolden has made life better for a lot of people because of his understanding and concern for people. As a law enforcer, he has demonstrated that laws were written to protect and not to offend people. In truth, by his own character, he has shown us the compassion of the law. Capt. Edward Bolden has made many friends and he has influenced many people—just by doing his job well—and in so doing—he has distinguished himself far above and beyond any call of duty.

Capt. Ed Bolden—who is completing 35 years of dedicated service to the city and to the people of St. Louis—will enjoy a grand tribute upon his retirement. It will become him and his service and his unique capabilities in law enforcement.

I know Ed Bolden personally—he is the godfather of my eldest daughter, Vicki—and I feel confident in saying that this tribute, written by Nannie Mitchell Turner for the St. Louis Argue, June 20, 1969, will truly warm his heart. I add my salute, Captain Bolden, and my confident wish that your retirement will be an active one and that you will continue to play an active role in our community.

I commend Mrs. Turner for her insight into the man who has earned the highest respect of all St. Louis citizens. The article follows:

CAPTAIN BOLDEN—STAR IN THE CAP OF ST.
LOUIS

(By Nannie Mitchell Turner)

On July 22nd, the ballroom of Stouffer's Riverfront Inn will fill up with a great cross section of St. Louisans to pay tribute to Police Captain Edward Bolden.

Captain Bolden has been unique in so many ways that I would like to tell you about him. For I have known him for all of the 35 years he has served with the Police Department.

In fact, my husband William and his brother, J. E. Mitchell were numbered among Bolden's earliest and staunchest supporters.

J. E. was a power in the City and I remember his saying that if Ed Bolden could be moved forward he would pave the way for more of our race. For it was obvious even then that the young policeman had what it takes.

A native St. Louisan, Bolden was born in our World's Fair year at almost the exact site of the present Police Headquarters at 12th and Clark. He is the son of Stanley and Cora Bolden. The elder Bolden died when Ed was just three years old. So even as a young grade schooler young Ed had responsibilities on his shoulders.

One of his teachers at Dumas School, Sally Henderson, saw in him something special and encouraged the youngster to succeed. It will be a truly touching moment to see the two of them together again.

When Ed was just twenty he joined the Catholic Church. That was pretty much of a trail blazing decision in those days. But Ed took the faith and his Christianity with quiet dedication. So much so that the dinner will be honored by the presence of Cardinal Carberry.

As a teenager Ed Bolden worked for the United Railway Company, which was the forerunner of the Public Service Company and Bi-State Transit. Then in 1933 he joined the Police Force. Except for the war years, when he served with the Counter Intelligence Corps, he has been a policeman ever since. An outstanding one.

Ira Cooper, our first Negro Police Lieutenant, was helpful in having Bolden promoted to a patrolman's rank after 2½ years of duty. Five years later, in 1941, he made Sergeant. Then, in 1953 he was promoted to a Lieutenant. He became the first Negro Captain of Police in 1956.

When you count the reasons why St. Louis has been a better place than most any other city, place Captain Edward Stanley Bolden high on that list. In his leadership and dedication to duty, he paved the way for a St. Louis police structure that has had for many, many years a reputation as the best integrated police department of any major city in America.

Both in the department and on the street, Ed Bolden is known as a gentleman; one who gets the job done—more often than not, the easy way. He saves his legendary toughness for the toughest situations.

There are some of the reasons why on July 22nd, hundreds and hundreds of people, representing absolutely every segment and area of St. Louis life, will gather in honor of one of St. Louis' finest.

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH IN BE-
HALF OF SPANISH-AMERICAN
VETERANS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to call to the attention of my colleagues the brief but eloquent remarks of Dr. Manuel J. Reyes, Latin American Affairs editor of television station WTJV in my district, which he entered on Memorial Day in behalf of the veterans of the Spanish-American War. This is a testament to the cause of freedom and the friendship between the American and Cuban peoples. It follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. REYES

The Brave never die!
This is why, death will never defeat the Veterans of the Spanish-American War!

Those gallant men who in the year 1898, in the prime of their youth, renounced to all of life's wealth and as volunteers, (the first volunteers of the United States' Army) went overseas to defend freedom.

Strong men who, with their fighting, placed the United States in a category of first world power and as a country of hope for the poor and the oppressed.

Like I have done year after year, since I came into exile, I am here with you again, on this Memorial Day, to honor those who fell in 1898, fighting for the freedom and dignity of the human being.

Cuba was one of the countries where you

and your fellow-soldiers went on that noble task.

This is why, today, as a Cuban that I am and will be until the day I die, even if I die at the last corner of the world, but as a Cuban, I want to unite my prayers to yours, with the greatest respect and admiration, as true brothers. I want to unite my prayers to yours on behalf of a country and a people who were not born to be slaves, on behalf of the Cuban people in the martyred island and in exile. Because, if my people were not silenced by terror and tyranny imposed over them, I know that if my people could talk, they would be here today, praying for those who fell at San Juan Hill in Oriente Province, so that Cuba could be free.

And it is because our brotherhood is sealed with the blood of those who, on your part or ours, joined in a common fighting action to free Cuba. There was no other alternative at that time.

And today, faced with a similar situation, which has already prolonged itself for over ten years, the alternatives have disappeared little by little. There is but one way left for the noble Cuban people in their fight to overthrow the tyranny. A way which you, united to the Cuban Freedom Fighters, bravely took in 1898. A way thru which there is no return and leads to a Spartan climax: Freedom or Ashes.

You helped to free Cuba during the past century. But today Cuba is living the worst tyranny of all its history.

The tragedy of the Cuban people is so great; the suffering of the Cuban mothers is so great; the despair of its best men is so great. . . . and at the same time, the courage of that same people is so great, that the only way left is Freedom, or let Cuba as a whole be burnt to ashes thru the will of its people. So that from the ashes of Communism, a new Cuba, free, sovereign, independent and democratic, will arise.

And today, by joining my prayers to yours, two people who were born to be brothers, by praying to God for the eternal rest of those who gave their lives in the Philippines, in Puerto Rico and in Cuba; let's tell them that their sacrifice was not in vain. Let's tell them to rest peacefully in their graves . . . because their heirs, making their glorious history come alive again, have joined to proclaim at this cemetery, before their graves, a cry that will be heard in Cuba, a cry which will shake the island from one end to the other; a cry which will raise the people against the tyrant: Freedom or Ashes!

JOE McCAFFREY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Joe McCaffrey is this month celebrating his 25th year as a Washington correspondent.

I think that this tenure is a remarkable one. But I bring this to the attention of my colleagues not because of this tenure but because I think he has served his profession well as a newsman.

Since coming to the Congress 15 years ago I have had contact with him and over the years have developed a trust in his reporting. I think that my colleagues

will agree that he has been fair in all issues.

I would like to commend Joe for the fine work he has done in the past. The caliber of reporting has always been on a high plane and continues to be. I know my colleagues would like to join with me in wishing Joe McCaffrey our best wishes during this anniversary month and continued success in the future.

I regard Joe McCaffrey as a true objective professional.

BURDENS UPON PRESIDENT NIXON ARE INCREASED UNNECESSARILY

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a number of persons with responsible positions in the last administration were totally unsuccessful in achieving peace in Vietnam or elsewhere. Some of these persons are now telling President Nixon how to obtain peace. Some, with and without responsibility, are demanding that President Nixon publicly set forth a timetable for withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. Who would benefit most from the public disclosure of our prospective plans for terminating hostilities in Vietnam? Obviously the Vietcong, the NLF, the North Vietnamese and their Communist allies—the very persons and groups who have killed and harmed our troops and our prisoners of war and the very groups who have terrorized the South Vietnamese.

Certainly the public disclosure of our peace plans and our timetable for withdrawal ought to be confidential.

The persons in the Government, in the Congress, and in the news media who were totally unsuccessful before the inauguration of President Nixon ought to give this administration the same chance the last administration had to terminate the war. The continual interference and carping can only benefit the enemy, prolong the hostilities, and prejudice the South Vietnamese.

It should be quite obvious to all that the President is trying, that he is exploring all possibilities, that he is giving the aggressor every opportunity to respond to numerous overtures for peaceful negotiation and deescalation of hostilities.

An experienced, knowledgeable and astute observer of the political and international scene, Col. Allen Griffin, publisher of the Monterey Herald, a newspaper in my congressional district, has written a pertinent editorial which every Member of the Congress and every citizen should read. A reading of the editorial will help to clarify much of the clamor about troop withdrawal from Vietnam.

I include the June 19, 1969, editorial by Colonel Griffin at this point in the RECORD:

Although nobody knows what President Nixon's plan is or plans are for ending U.S. participation in the Vietnam war, there is no lack of politicians as well as schoolboys who try to get in on the act.

One of the noisiest is Senator Ted Ken-

edy, whose personal ambition is obvious to all. One of the most lurid is Senator McGovern, careless of word and reckless of phrase. Certainly the most sarcastic in whining southern diction is Senator Fulbright, too brilliant a Rhodes Scholar ever to be satisfied with anything except complete obedience. The most intelligent, years before Mr. Nixon came to office as President, was General Gavin with the enclave theory.

Now Clark Clifford has come out with a set of proposals and hopes in the July issue of Foreign Affairs magazine to give further advice.

There are good grounds for everyone to have some sympathy with President Nixon's desperate problem of trying to get some sort, perhaps any sort, of agreement, provided it is an agreement, out of the Paris peace talks. Even when making his last broad proposals, the first that had been made by anyone, he emphasized that they were not rigid but were "flexible", putting it up to the North Vietnamese to make counter-proposals for consideration.

This the North Vietnamese refused to do. They were dealing from a position of strength. They had the complete backing of the Russians, their willing and happy arms suppliers. They were feeling the ebb of American power. And they already knew that the will of the American people had been undermined and softened. Victory seemed to be coming closer every month.

This is the situation that threatens the hopes of President Nixon, whose planning had depended upon logic and some quid for a little quod and also the hope that the Russians might provide an assist. Despite the best laid plans of "flexibility", the North Vietnamese have held fast, knowing that more American leaders would fall into the trap of demanding that the President give way further in the invalid hope that the North Vietnamese would suddenly become reasonable if not loving. What they want is to win the war and win the peace, both as complete victories. And they may.

The article by the most recently retired Secretary of Defense has much of great interest in it from the historical point of view. He was a friend of presidents before he became secretary. He was a hawk until towards the end of his career in Defense. He adds an interesting side-light about President Kennedy's determined attitude to preserve SE Asia. But it is more than doubtful if publication of withdrawal of troops, which Clifford recommends, would hasten an agreement with the enemy that even Clifford would accept. That's the nub of the problem. And that shows something of the burden President Nixon must carry while the North Vietnamese in Paris rub their hands and say, "We've hooked another big fish."

JOSEPH McCAFFREY CELEBRATES 25 YEARS AS NEWS CORRESPONDENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this month Mr. Joseph McCaffrey has been a Washington news correspondent for 25 years. His fans, particularly the young ladies who undoubtedly swoon as he reports the news on channel 7, will find this difficult to believe. Since more people watch his news program than watch the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the secret may remain relatively intact.

I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. McCaffrey over nearly the entire

span of these 25 years and I have grown to admire him more as time goes by.

Mr. Joseph McCaffrey never knowingly did violence to the truth.

BLACK REPARATIONS WITH A RED TIE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with increasing frequency worship services throughout the country are interrupted by hoodlums demanding money. Other meetings are assailed with demands for money, called "reparations." The fact that such disruptions are unlawful—which is a euphemism for criminal—is quite plain. I do not know of any State in which extortion is not a crime. But for some very strange reason, nothing is done to the perpetrators of these outrages.

It is a matter of interest, and perhaps an explanation of the lack of prosecution, that the principal character in these demonstrations first gained his national status as a leader of SNCC, the misnamed Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, created with Communist funds by the equally misnamed Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The churches of the Nation, diverting the offerings of their parishioners to the so-called "civil rights" assault on the South, created a false image of decency for the throng of subversives, criminals and perverts which they financed. The Bible, in Matthew 7:6, speaks plainly of the result.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I called to the attention of our colleagues some of the background and activities of James Forman, the "non-violent" extortioner of the churches. I include an article from this Sunday's Parade magazine, biographical material on Jessica Mitford, Forman's Communist mother-in-law, and another viewpoint on the same problem by Gen. Thomas A. Lane in his June 24, 1969, column "Public affairs."

The articles follow:

[From Parade magazine, June 22, 1969]

Q. James Forman, the black militant who wants \$500 million in reparations from white churches and synagogues—isn't he married to a white woman?—Helen Maddox, Washington, D.C.

A. Yes. Forman is married to Anne Romilly, daughter of British-born writer Jessica Mitford, author of an expose on the U.S. funeral business called *The American Way of Death*.

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF THE LEFT—VOLUME III

(By Francis X. Gannon)

Jessica Mitford was born on September 11, 1917 at Batsford, Gloucestershire, England, daughter of Sydney Bowles and David Mitford (Lord Redesdale).

At the age of eighteen, Jessica married Esmond Romilly, a Communist. The newlyweds then went to Spain to fight alongside the Reds in the Civil War. In 1939, the Romillys moved to the United States. During World War II, Esmond Romilly was killed in action. (Depending on the whim of the moment, Jessica, in the course of interviews, sometimes says that her husband died while

in the Royal Canadian Air Force. At other times, she says he was killed while serving in the British Army.)

In 1941, Jessica went to work for the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D.C. After her husband's death, she moved to San Francisco where she continued working for the OPA. In 1944, she married Robert Treuhaft, an attorney with the OPA. (In later years, Treuhaft would become notorious for his legal work on behalf of individual Communists, the Communist Party, and Communist fronts. On several occasions, he was identified in sworn testimony as a Communist but when given the opportunity to contradict such testimony, he pled his privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment.)

While still with the OPA in 1944, Jessica became financial director of the California Labor School, which was subversive and Communist. By 1945, the Treuhafts' home became a popular meeting place for Communists. In 1946, Jessica was a successful fund-raiser as a county financial director for the Communist Party.

From 1949 until 1955, Jessica was secretary of the East Bay Civil Rights Congress. In a recent interview (Boston Globe, June 4, 1968), she described that outfit as "jolly subversive. It wanted to overthrow all sorts of segregation laws." On the other side of the coin, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Attorney General of the United States also cited the East Bay Civil Rights Congress as subversive—no jollity involved.

In 1956, Jessica worked a few months for the San Francisco Chronicle. She was fired from the Chronicle and shortly thereafter Jessica and her husband traveled to Communist Hungary in the wake of the Freedom Fighters' revolution which was crushed so barbarously by Khrushchev & Company. The Treuhafts, in an article for the Communist People's World (February 17, 1957), wrote a glowing account of life in Budapest. In 1958, Jessica went off on what appeared to be, at first glance, an unusual tangent. She launched an attack in Frontier magazine against undertakers. Meanwhile, in 1955, her husband had organized the Bay Area Funeral Society, a co-operative plan to finance burials. The set-up of the Society was socialistic and its directorship was studied with Communist frontiers.

Five years later, Jessica hit the best-seller lists with a major attack on the undertakers with her full-length book, *The American Way of Death—a hodgepodge of truth, half truths, innuendoes, and erroneous assertions.* The left wing showered praises upon Jessica for her battle against the "capitalistic" villains of the undertaking profession. Even such prestigious Communist publications as the *New World Review* and the *Moscow New Times* spared space to hail Jessica's anti-capitalistic crusade. And with the publication of her book, Jessica's name became a familiar by-line in popular magazines.

Jessica really did not need her book to win the favor of the extreme left. Over the years, she had labored tirelessly for Communist causes: clemency for the convicted atom spies, the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell; clemency for convicted Communist Carl Braden; a petition against the Internal Security Act of 1950; a defense in *Nation* magazine of the anti-House Committee on Un-American Activities riots of 1960 in San Francisco; and, service in 1961 and 1962 as northern California representative for the Southern Conference Educational Fund, the financial backbone of the black power revolutionaries.

In 1966, Jessica became an associate editor of the far leftist *Ramparts* magazine. In 1968, she covered the Benjamin Spock trial when the baby doctor, turned ban-the-bomb-boob, was found guilty of conspiring to counsel, aid, and abet young men to evade the draft.

Jessica represented the Ladies' Home Journal at the trial and she is under contract to write a book about the proceedings.

On many occasions under sworn testimony, Jessica Mitford (or as she is also known, Decca Treuhaft) has been identified as a Communist Party member and functionary, but when given the opportunity to confirm or deny either status, she has invoked the protection of the Fifth Amendment against possible self-incrimination.

BLACK MILITANTS DEMAND NEW WHITE SLAVERY

WASHINGTON.—From our own history, many Americans conclude that slavery is the ownership of black people by white masters. But that was only one facet of an ancient and widespread practice.

In the most primitive societies, tribes guarded their hunting grounds by making perpetual warfare against their neighbors. They fought to extend their own preserves or to resist intrusion from outsiders. Nature would support only a limited human population. The object of war was to kill off the enemy.

In the agricultural societies, war took a new turn. Although agriculture and animal husbandry made possible a higher standard of living, they also introduced the element of organized work. The work was drudgery. Citizens of the warrior state could escape it by enslaving instead of slaughtering the vanquished and using the slaves to do the work of civilization. In fact, slavery became the fuel of civilization. In ancient Rome, the work of empire and commerce, whether rowing galleys in the Mediterranean or tilling the fields of Campania or keeping the master's accounts was done by slaves.

In later times, traders who bought slaves from African chiefs or raided tribal areas to capture the victims were serving the labor needs of higher civilization, Christian and Mohammedan. The richer the civilization, the greater the demand for slaves.

From earliest recorded history until recent times, slavery had been a part of civilization. It spared the life of the vanquished but commanded his lifetime of work.

Now we come in the twentieth century to the new slavery. On May 4, James Forman, intruding into New York's Riverside Church, demanded that the white churches of America pay an indemnity of \$500 million to black citizens in compensation for past oppression and exploitation. On June 3, he raised his price to \$3 billion. On June 6, he demanded \$80 million of the United Presbyterian Church. On June 2, a group of his associates demanded \$100 million of the Christian Science Church. On June 9, Roy Innis demanded that the bankers of America provide a fund of \$6 billion for service to black Americans.

These are the traditional demands of conquerors. Having burned down the cities and destroyed the properties of white citizens in an act of war, the black militants now demand the labor of white citizens to the tune of \$9 billion so that black warriors may live in the indolence becoming to victors. The alternative is renewed warfare.

It is apparent that these warriors regard politicians, clergy and bankers as the weak links of our civilization. Their judgment cannot be faulted. If they had tried this preposterous blackmail on a labor union, they would have been hooted out of the hall. But some clergymen are giving the demands serious consideration.

Enslavement is the use of force to appropriate the labor of others without compensation. Nobody has been enslaved in the United States in one hundred years, unless you subscribe to the marxist rhetoric that all capitalist employment is exploitation of labor. Black militants do use and seem to believe the marxist cant. But that is additional reason to dismiss their posturing.

Any clergyman who undertakes to pay

such blackmail should be repudiated by his congregation. He is debauching the role of charity. In true charity, we voluntarily give the product of our labor to others who by misfortune are in need. To pretend that charity can spring from fear is a monstrous perversion. It conceals slavery in the garment of sweet charity.

A COLLEGE STUDENT SPEAKS OUT FOR MODERATION

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the June 17 issue of the *Washington Evening Star* included a most informative letter to the editor concerning campus unrest. I found it especially interesting in that it confirmed many of the findings of the informal congressional fact finding mission on 50 American campuses that I headed.

This letter is written by a single American college student, however, in many ways it reflects the feelings of the vast middle ground of students—a group of tremendous promise that we cannot afford to forget. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and include it herewith:

LETTER FROM COLLEGE

SIR: The following is a letter from my daughter, a freshman at a mid-western university. I have blanked out references made to certain locations on the campus of this university.

"Dear Mom and Dad: Enclosed is an article on the Students for a Democratic Society from *U.S. News and World Report*. This is, as the *King of Slam* said, "a matter of much concern to me." Every single observation made is entirely correct and applicable to (name of university).

"I have determined that there are three kinds of people on campus—SDSers and company, socialities (fraternities and sororities) and us. We are the ones who came to college to get an education (to use an overworked phrase) and really don't give two hoots about May Queen, the next football game, or president of Student Council. This is probably a bad attitude, but, seemingly, these things are of only fleeting concern and there is no time for them. They have no far-reaching or long time influence.

Joe College is unquestionably dead, and no amount of grave-digging is going to resurrect him. While there is much brain power in these groups, they have insulated themselves from the rest. They believe that their Joe College ideals are sacred and do not realize they have been swept away by the tide. They don't even know they are being attacked, let alone how to retaliate.

"The radicals are a small hard-core group, yet they control this university. I don't believe the SDS was Communist initiated. The Communists were pleasantly surprised with its appearance. They use it and wield it to meet Communist goals but did not originate it nor identify themselves to its leaders as controllers.

"Nonetheless, SDS is not a mere tool. It acts radically, malignantly, and eradicatedly on its own, and its tactics are brilliant, as the article points out. It seems to me that at (name of college) at least they employ Hitler strategy—taking a small injustice and blowing it way out of proportion. Basically, it is true. This is seen in our ruckuses of the past two quarters—women's government and open houses. These are two areas which real-

ly don't matter one way or the other. We really don't care which may they do it. Technically, these SDS attacks are correct, but they are using them only as a means to anarchy.

"YOUNG AND POWERFUL"

"What attracts students from white affluent or middle class backgrounds?" I think it is youth. SDSers are young and they are obviously powerful. I cannot think of two more mesmeric qualities than these. It is the same old kickback to rejection of parental authority. Deferred gravitation has taken on a completely new connotation. It no longer means doing without clothes, etc. in order to get a good education. It means working day and night to draft demands to school administration or to plan a take-over of campus buildings. They still don't have good clothes, etc., but they do have power and they have it when they are young. Grownups listen and if they're smart, they tremble. I believe this is a first in history.

"Attorney General Mitchell quoted some possibly fatal statistics in his address recently. Among other things, he said that only 200 schools (9%) have had disturbances. All right, but just look at which campuses have been disrupted—Columbia, Stanford, Harvard, Radcliffe, Cornell. These are our 'Ivy League' schools, the very best we have to offer. Of course these are the institutions which are going to come under attack. They're not starting with the little stuff and working up. They begin right at the top and hit hard. These figures erroneously lead one to assume that just because a school has had no trouble, no SDS exists. I said they were brilliant. I imagine that SDS could galvanize a murderous riot on any campus in the country, but it is not necessary. They already control the apex. (Why worry about the mares when they've got the stallion?)

"If it had been nipped in the bud—the administration could have easily done it. But educators, being a naturally passive lot, did nothing. It is now in our hands—the forgotten 98 percent (Mitchell said that less than 2 percent of our students had ever participated). And it would be so utterly easy for us to completely demolish them. One election where we crawled out of our test tubes, looked up from our slide rules, and put down our mugs of beer to nominate, elect and then support a good president and officers of Student Council. So simple, so very, very simple.

"GAGGING AT GNATS"

"But it is not going to happen. Maybe when the doors to ——— Hall are bolted shut and priceless fossils are being dashed to the floor, costly experiments are casually smashed, and ten years worth of research data is gaily burned—but then it will be too late. Perhaps even now it is too late if what the article says about moving into business is true. Then it will become the federal government's job; and as we all know, it is too busy gagging at non-existent gnats (military-industrial complexes) and will let this camel go smoothly by.

"What's more, I don't think that people outside of education can even begin to grasp the imminent danger. They seem to think it is just college kids acting up, a bit more forcefully than ever before, but just college students after all. This is completely, utterly false. This is not kids' stuff. It has not been kids' stuff since Berkeley. SDS is dangerous, chaotically, murderously, violently so. It has got or just about got education under its cap. I think the actual show of arms at Cornell was a final testing to see if they're entrenched as well as they thought they were. They are!

"SDSers are not hippies, yuppies, or drug addicts. They may look like them, but they're not. I think they use these groups as demonstrators and occupiers of buildings. It gives such people something to do and they easily follow along not even knowing what

they're following. If SDSers were drug addicts they could not function so well. But if people think about SDS at all, they think this is what they are, a bunch of sick individuals who will lose their influence pretty soon and die as all drug addicts do. They are going to be disappointed.

"Where do the militaristic demonstrators come from? Everybody knows hippies are loving and nonviolent. The Negro militants provide this now-needed service.

"I think I have dwelt too long upon this subject. But the more I think about it, the more connections I can see, and logical joinings together of events, and it's getting more and more frightening. The idea of not having any school to go to in the next couple of years, let alone the one I want, is just a little bit scary. Something had better be done quickly and effectively or it won't matter whether I want to be a geologist or a philosopher because I won't be able to be either one. There will be no more schools as such and then there will be no more business. And it seems to me that if you destroy a country's educational system and economy, you've pretty well got the country wrapped up.—Your Daughter."

PARENT.

JUSTICE IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a deplorable and outrageous series of events in South Africa, including government pressures brought to bear against a defense lawyer in the midst of proceedings, is reflected in the following statement by the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law—Arthur H. Dean and Louis F. Oberdorfer, cochairman—in a New York Times editorial, and in a number of articles appearing in South African newspapers:

STATEMENT BY THE LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW

(By Arthur H. Dean and Louis F. Oberdorfer)

The Lawyers' Committee has advised that the South African government has taken away Mr. Carlson's passport, thereby restricting his movements outside of the country. The Lenkoe inquest as a result of the diligence of Mr. Carlson, associated counsel and the testimony of Dr. Moritz and medical colleagues in South Africa, has cast doubt out on the manner of Lenkoe's death. This case has, over the past few days, received considerable publicity which has not been favorable to the police and prison officials.

In the opinion of the Lawyers' Committee any interference with and harassment of an attorney who has, under instructions from others, carried out his duties in the highest tradition of the legal profession, would be totally unwarranted. The Lawyers' Committee intends to continue to instruct and support Mr. Carlson in carrying out his professional responsibility. We hope that he will not be interfered with and that his freedom to travel, particularly while engaged in counselling clients will not be infringed. The lawyers' Committee will seek to continue its interest in the above matters and its established professional association with Mr. Carlson in the interest of the preservation of the rule of law, which includes the right of any counsel to carry out his duties in dignity and protect the rights of his clients without intimidation.

The Anglo-Saxon bar has an ancient tra-

dition that lawyers have a duty to defend in court persons accused of crime no matter how unpopular, or dangerous, and to be protected in their exercise of this responsibility by the bar, the courts and, indeed, all arms of a civilized government. We hope that this tradition can and will be preserved by our South African brethren at the bar.

[From the New York Times, June 17, 1969]

SOUTH AFRICAN "JUSTICE"

While trying to maintain the trappings of proper legal procedure, South Africa's Nationalist Government adds steadily to its arsenal of police-state laws and practices. Legislation now in Parliament would make the country's notorious security police immune from any effective public scrutiny.

The Bureau of State Security is already shrouded in secrecy, but the new bill provides severe punishment for any disclosure of a "security matter," specifically including any matter related to security police activities. No evidence could even be given in court if the Prime Minister or anyone designated by him declared it prejudicial to state or public security.

The timing of this move to give security police even greater immunity is not accidental. It is unquestionably related to the Government's seizure last week of the passport of Joel Carlson, an eminent white civil rights lawyer, and to the trial of Laurence Gandar and Benjamin Pogrud of The Rand Daily Mail on charges of publishing false information on prison conditions.

Mr. Carlson is involved in a case which has produced sensational evidence of the use of electric shock torture by security police. This corroborated one Rand Daily Mail disclosure as well as some testimony at the Gandar-Pogrud trial.

James Lenkoe, a Lesotho national, was seized by security police at his home near Johannesburg and his wife was later notified that he had hanged himself in his cell. She contacted Mr. Carlson, who obtained a second post-mortem which aroused the suspicion that Mr. Lenkoe had been electrocuted. Now an eminent American pathologist, Dr. Alan Moritz, has told an inquest that beyond reasonable doubt an injury on Mr. Lenkoe's body was caused by electric shock.

However the court cases turn out, this much is clear: Mr. Carlson has lost his passport because he was too skilled, even when up against monstrous laws and the apartheid system, in protecting the rights of Africans and exposing police barbarism. Messers. Gandar and Pogrud have been brought to trial not because their disclosures were false but for serving as alert and courageous critics of a tyrannical regime—and thus serving the cause of press freedom everywhere.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa)

Rand Daily Mail, June 17, 1969]

BELOW THE BELT

Punishment by administrative action has become part of the South African way of life. It takes various forms—banning, banishment and house arrest are examples—but a favorite is the withdrawal of a passport. There have been many striking demonstrations of the way this penalty can be imposed, the latest being the case of Mr. Joel Carlson, of Johannesburg. Like the others—a steadily growing number—on whom this disability has been imposed, Mr. Carlson has been given no reason for it. In some secret backroom sentence has been passed on him, but he is not even allowed to know what offense he is supposed to have committed.

An obvious inference whenever this simple process is used is that while the Government wishes to strike at a victim, it has no case to present to a court—even in terms of the many Draconian measures under which we South Africans now live. So it uses the below-the-belt tactic of withdrawing a passport.

The Nationalist Government was not the first in this country to use this trick. But, after the courts had intervened to assert passport-holders' rights as they then were, the Nationalists saw to it that the law was changed to enable the Government to issue, withhold or withdraw passports at its pleasure. It has exercised this power ruthlessly and without favouring the public with any explanation of the circumstances in which it considers the privilege of holding a passport to be forfeited.

Since Mr. Carlson has not been told why he has to give up his passport, the public is entitled to make its own deductions. The most relevant point that it will note is that he has, in his professional capacity, been concerned in a number of attempts to investigate allegations of ill treatment of people in custody. In this he has had the support and help, some financial and some on a high technical level, of American lawyers, churchmen and other authorities.

Little effort is needed to work out that this is Mr. Carlson's "offence"—that he has had help from abroad in trying to ensure that all the facts were uncovered in certain cases. For this he has been penalised, and the penalty carries the usual intimidatory message for any others who might be disposed to act as he has.

It has still to be seen whether Mr. Carlson's professional colleagues will, through their organisations, raise their voices over the action that has been taken against him and demand a public explanation. That is what they should do—loudly and urgently. For this process of administrative punishment is a subversion of the elementary principles of justice as they were once understood in this country.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 14, 1969]

LAWYER IN LENKOE INQUEST HAS PASSPORT SEIZED

Police yesterday seized the passport of Mr. Joel Carlson, the Johannesburg attorney acting in the inquest on Terrorism Act detainee James Lenkoe. Mr. Carlson, in recent years, has represented many political prisoners who claimed maltreatment during detention.

He is also representing the widow of Mr. Nicodemus Kgoathe at the inquest into his death while being held in police custody.

The passport was taken at the office of the United States Consul General after a notice had been served on Mr. Carlson at his city office.

His United States visa was about to expire and he was having it renewed "as a matter of formality."

"I had no intention of leaving the country or visiting the United States in the near future as I am heavily involved at the moment in litigation casts," he said.

He added he would ask Mrs. Helen Suzman, M.P. for his constituency, to raise the matter as soon as possible in Parliament.

SURPRISE

"The withdrawal came as a complete surprise to me. I am a South African citizen—born and bred here—and I am not a member of any political party. I have only acted in professional matters," he said.

A detective sergeant visited Mr. Carlson at his office yesterday morning and demanded that he surrender his passport immediately. Mr. Carlson had to go to the United States Consulate where he received the passport and handed it over to the police.

He is an official observer for the International Commission of Jurists and for the International Press Institute at the Prisons' Act trial.

DETAINEE

He is also chairman of the Johannesburg Home and School Council.

In a case at present before the Pretoria Inquest Court, he is representing the widow of James Lenkoe, a Terrorism Act detainee who was found hanging from a belt at Pretoria local prison in March after a day-long interrogation by Security Police.

Mr. Carlson was the instructing attorney for the defence in the terrorism trial in Pretoria.

INVESTIGATION

He has a long history of acting for political detainees in cases of alleged assault by police.

In 1964, he called for an investigation into the conditions of 90-day detainees, after collecting affidavits, alleging torture during interrogation.

He wrote personally to Mr. Vorster, then Minister of Justice, asking for a commission of inquiry. This was refused.

In the late 1950s, he appealed to the Government to investigate the conditions of employment and detention of farm labourers, but his appeal was ignored and the government claimed that forced labour did not exist.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Post]

TRAVEL BAN ON DEFENDER JOEL CARLSON

Mr. Joel Carlson, a Johannesburg attorney who has represented scores of political prisoners and who is the South African observer for the International Commission of Jurists, had his passport taken away by the Government this week.

Mr. Carlson, presently the attorney for the families of two detainees who have died while in Security Police hands, told Post that he knew of no reason why his travel papers should be taken away.

"I have no plans at present to travel outside South Africa," he said. "I have far too much work to do."

Last year he spent two months away from the country on a round-the-world trip that included 10 days in America.

AN ERROR

Mr. Carlson revealed that the order withdrawing his passport was the second attempt by the Department of the Interior to obtain it in recent months.

"Recently I was asked to hand my passport to the authorities because they had discovered there was an 'error' in it," he said. "I examined it myself and found no 'error'—so I did not hand it in."

Last week he handed the passport to the American consulate in Johannesburg to have his visa for the United States renewed. It was still in the hands of the Americans when the Government demanded it back on Friday and Mr. Carlson had to collect it from there.

Genial Mr. Carlson is well known to Reef Africans and well liked by them. He has devoted much of his career in the past 13 years to exposing injustice in South Africa and defending politicians or political prisoners in court.

His clients include both Nelson and Winnie Mandela. "I am at present struggling to let Nelson know that Mrs. Mandela has been detained by the police," he told Post. "I wrote a letter to Robben Island to Mr. Mandela. Its arrival has not been acknowledged and there has been no reply to my queries about it."

Mr. Carlson, a father of four, appeared somewhat shaken when interviewed by reporters at the American consulate on Friday afternoon, but showed little signs of strain when Post saw him again in the office of Advocate David Soggot yesterday afternoon.

He and Mr. Soggot were working hard on the Lenkoe and Kgoathe cases. Both these political detainees have died recently while in custody.

Mr. Carlson recalled that he had been involved in some of the most important political cases of the past 10 years.

These include the S.W.A. terrorism trial,

which attracted world attention, the Looksmart Ngudle inquest—Mr. Ngudle was the first detainee to commit suicide while in custody—and the Gabrielle Mabinde case.

Mr. Mabinde not only won R3,000 costs from the State in a Supreme Court interdict, but was given an undertaking by the authorities that he would not be prosecuted.

Mr. Carlson's most successful battle was the row over people who were unlawfully arrested and "sold to the farms". In this 1959 affair the Government at first denied that the forced labour scheme existed, but after the courts had upheld more than 20 habeas corpus applications by Mr. Carlson, the Minister of BAD ordered the practice to stop.

Mr. Carlson won the support of the Press, churches, the Black Sash and ordinary people throughout the country and received hundreds of letters and telegrams of support during this legal battle.

Tomorrow he will be in court again in Pretoria when the widely publicised inquest on James Lenkoe, who hanged himself in a Pretoria local prison cell after allegedly having been given electric shocks, continues.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Sunday Express, June 15, 1969]

LAWYER'S PASSPORT: APPEAL TO THE MINISTER (By Patrick Weech)

Mr. Joel Carlson, the Johannesburg attorney whose passport police seized this week, has asked Mrs. Helen Suzman to protest on his behalf to the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. Carlson is presently acting for the widows of two men who died in political detention recently. He is also official observer at the Prisons Trial for the International Commission of Jurists and the International Press Institute.

In Johannesburg yesterday, Mr. Carlson said: "I think the type of cases I have handled have not made me popular with the Government."

But, he stressed, "I have never made any political comment."

Referring to the "exposures" revealed in several cases, he said: "All the information received by me has been in my professional capacity. Where grave injustice has become apparent, I have written to the authorities advising them of the complaints."

On Friday night, Mr. Carlson sent a telegram to his Member of Parliament, Mrs. Suzman, asking her to "make representation on my behalf immediately to the Minister, protesting against this interference with my rights as a South African citizen."

NOT LEAVING

"I have no intention of leaving the country, of visiting anywhere. My family is here. I have four children. My house and practice are here. I am born, bred, educated and practise in Johannesburg which is my only home," the telegram said.

"I want to know the purpose and reason for removal of my South African passport, which was issued in December, 1965, to be valid for five years, until December, 1970."

Mr. Carlson said that about 10 days before his passport was seized, he received a telephone call "from some clerk in the passport office, asking me to bring my passport in to rectify an error."

"I examined my passport and as I found no error, I did not take it to them."

During the past 13 years, Mr. Carlson has often acted in matters where clients have alleged brutality while in custody. The allegations were brought to court in habeas corpus and other applications, and at inquest proceedings.

LABOUR SCANDAL

Mr. Carlson was largely responsible for the exposure of abuses in the farm labour scandal in the late 1950s involving allegations of brutality and ill-treatment. He acted in the case of Looksmart Solwandle Ngudle,

who in 1964 was the first 90-day detainee to hang himself.

He also acted in the case of Gabriel Mbindi, the 68-year-old detainee whose eardrums were perforated, and who was paid R3,000 by the State in settlement. Mr. Carlson acted for the accused in the Pretoria terrorism trial. He has campaigned for inquiries into conditions of political detainees, following allegations of brutality.

Mr. Carlson represents the widow of Mr. Nicodemus Kgoathe who died in custody. He is also instructing attorney for the widow of Mr. James Lenkoe, the Terrorism Act detainee whose body was found hanging in his cell in Pretoria Local Prison after interrogation by Security Police.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Sunday Times, June 15, 1969]

ATTORNEY'S PLEA TO MRS. SUZMAN: "WHY HAS MY PASSPORT BEEN SEIZED?"

(By Margaret Smith)

Mr. Joel Carlson, the Johannesburg attorney whose passport was seized by the police on Friday, has sent an urgent appeal to Mrs. Helen Suzman to make representation on his behalf immediately to the Minister protesting against "this interference with my rights as a South African citizen."

In his appeal to Mrs. Suzman, Mr. Carlson says: "For 13 years I have had cases which I have brought to court on behalf of clients involving allegations of brutality, starting with the farm labour scandal in the late 1950s, the appeal to the Minister involving allegations of torture during 90-day detentions, and more recently I acted for the South West African terrorists when this allegation was again brought up.

"I am at present acting for the widows of two detainees who died during interrogation—namely the cases of James Lenkoe and Nicodemus Kgoathe."

Mr. Carlson says in his appeal to Mrs. Suzman that he has no intention of leaving South Africa or of visiting anywhere.

MY HOME

"My family is here, I have four children, my house and my practice are here. I am born, bred, educated and practice in Johannesburg, which is my only home."

Mr. Carlson said he had never been a politician and had practised only in a professional capacity. He was not a member of any political party.

Yesterday he told me: "It is quite clear to me that although no reason has been given for the withdrawal of my passport, the powers-that-be disapprove of an attorney such as myself, who acts in a professional capacity for political clients and pursues their causes with energy and enthusiasm before the courts."

Mr. Carlson said that, time and again, questions had been asked about where the funds for the defense of his clients came from.

This was raised by the Afrikaans Press during the South West Africa terrorist trial.

"For this case, the money came from a most prominent member of the British House of Lords.

"I have also received funds from the most prominent and senior American lawyers who are concerned with injustices in countries such as South Africa.

"I have also received money from the National Council of Churches in America.

"The Government is well aware of the source of the financial support I receive.

"I have nothing to hide."

Mr. Carlson's passport was taken at the office of the United States Consul-General after a notice had been served on Mr. Carlson at his city office. His United States visa was about to expire, and he was having it renewed as a matter of formality.

Mr. Carlson was an official observer for the International Commission of Jurists and for the International Press Institute at the Prisons' Act trial.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 16, 1969]

CARLSON SAYS HIS TELEPHONE WAS TAPPED

Mr. Joel Carlson, the Johannesburg attorney acting in the Lenkoe inquest, claimed yesterday that for several weeks before the withdrawal of his passport, he had been watched and his telephone had been tapped.

Describing incidents preceding the withdrawal of the passport by a Security Branch officer, Mr. Carlson said: "From the first day of the Lenkoe application, I was suspicious of certain cars which seemed to have an unusual interest in my movements.

"I don't think the occupants tried very hard to hide their interest. This went on for a few weeks. On occasions I have approached gentlemen in Volkswagens parked outside my home, and asked if I could assist them. They said I could not."

Mr. Carlson said he had heard "strange clicking, echoing and fading disturbances" on both his home and office telephones.

"I hate to be a bedfellow of Barry Botha," said Mr. Carlson. "But I have many similar complaints about some of the improper uses to which State officials have been put in matters which shouldn't concern them or worry them in the slightest.

"Nothing I do should worry them. There is nothing subversive about my activities."

Mr. Carlson directly linked the withdrawal of his passport with the obtaining of expert testimony in cases involving allegations of brutality.

Particularly important, he said, was the "obtaining of evidence and advice of such a world-renowned authority as Dr. Alan Moritz."

The doctor testified about the cause of death of Mr. James Lenkoe, a Terrorism Act detainee, who died in Pretoria Local Prison after Security Branch questioning.

SUPPORT

Another probable reason for the withdrawal was the interest and support from American lawyers and churches, said Mr. Carlson.

"It is both difficult and expensive to obtain eminent doctors like Dr. Moritz to leave their heavy commitments in America to come and give evidence in proceedings here.

"This has only been made possible by the help of American lawyers who saw and spoke to Dr. Moritz, and persuaded him to come here and financed his journey.

"It is significant because it shows the concern of American lawyers in upholding the rule of law, not only in America but in South Africa and elsewhere where 'due process' is abused.

"Financial aid has been given by American lawyers and churches in cases involving the application of unjust laws which shock the conscience of lawyers upholding the principles of the rule of law."

SEARCHED

Mr. Carlson said he had been searched at Jan Smuts Airport on his return from visits to America in 1967 and 1968.

After the first visit, he said, he had been thoroughly searched. A letter carried from the Association of the Bar of the City of New York had been taken from him for about half an hour.

"I am sure a copy was made of the letter.

"In August, 1968, when I returned from America, I was thoroughly searched again and more documents removed temporarily."

Mr. Carlson said there was no secret about support he had received from America.

"The reason for the support is the horror felt by lawyers at the scope of some of our laws," he said.

Mrs. Helen Suzman, M.P., in whose constituency Mr. Carlson lives, has been asked to approach the Minister of the Interior about the withdrawal of Mr. Carlson's passport.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Star June 16, 1969]

APPEAL TO M.P. BY CARLSON

Mr. Joel Carlson, the Johannesburg attorney whose passport was seized by the police on Friday, has appealed to Mrs. Helen Suzman, M.P., to make representations to the Minister of the Interior on his behalf.

Mr. Carlson is acting in two inquests into the deaths of two African men who died while being held in custody by the Security Police. They were Mr. James Lenkoe and Mr. Nicodemus Kgoathe.

Mr. Carlson handed over his passport to the police at the American Consulate in Johannesburg. His visa to travel to the United States was about to expire, and he had handed the passport in to have it renewed.

In his appeal to Mrs. Suzman he said that he had no intention of leaving South Africa or of visiting anywhere. His family, home and practice were in Johannesburg, where he was born and educated.

He said he had never been a politician and had practised only in a professional capacity.

Mr. Carlson has linked the withdrawal of his passport with the obtaining of expert testimony in cases involving allegations of brutality and with the interest and support of American churches and lawyers.

NO POLITICIAN

He said over the week-end that the Government was well aware of the sources of the financial support he received. In the South West Africa terrorist trial the money came from a prominent member of the British House of Lords.

He had also received money from the National Council of Churches in America.

He claimed that for several weeks before the withdrawal of his passport he had been watched and his telephone had been tapped.

Mr. Carlson was an official observer for the International Commission of Jurists and for the International Press Institute at the Prisons Act trial.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 17, 1969]

MAGISTRATE TELLS OPPOSING SIDES: I'VE HAD ENOUGH

The magistrate at the Lenkoe inquest, Mr. J. J. H. Tukker, yesterday postponed the hearing to Friday despite protests of counsel—and after telling counsel and prosecutor he had had "enough of your arguments."

Mr. D. Sogot, who is appearing for Mrs. Julia Lenkoe, widow of Mr. James Lenkoe, who died while a Terrorism Act detainee, told the court it would be impossible for him to prepare by Friday to question a surprise witness brought by the State yesterday.

However, Mr. Tukker ruled that the matter would proceed at 2 p.m. on Friday, even though Mr. Sogot had stated that he had an appointment involving senior counsel fixed for that afternoon.

The inquest is into the death of 35-year-old Mr. Lenkoe, who was found hanging by a belt in his cell at the Pretoria Local Prison late on the night of March 10, after daylong interrogation by the Security Police.

A second post-mortem was performed on him after a special application had been brought by his widow.

Evidence about copper found in a wound on Mr. Lenkoe's toe, possibly indicating an electric shock, has been given at previous hearings.

Mr. Tukker, who is on the bench with a medical assessor, Dr. W. J. Scheepers, yesterday heard:

From a surprise expert witness brought by the State that copper is present in every human body.

From the pathologist who conducted the second post-mortem that a wound on Mr. Lenkoe's toe must—beyond reasonable doubt—have been caused by an electric shock.

THICKSET MAN

Testifying yesterday Mrs. Lenkoe said she and her husband were awakened about 11:30 p.m. on March 5 by knocks on the windows and door of their home in Soweto township.

She at first restrained her husband from opening the door. When she peered through the window she saw a short, thickset White man who identified himself as a policeman.

One of the men said: "Are you Mofokeng?" Before he could answer two hands gripped his wrists and pulled him into the doorway. Entering the house policemen asked her husband and her where they stole all the money which enabled them to live in their beautiful home. Her husband replied that he worked for his money.

An African constable clubbed her husband behind the bed, and the White policemen pushed her into the bedroom while another White policeman struck her husband three times on the head with his clenched fist.

After the room had been searched, the police took her husband away. She was refused permission to go to her neighbors and tell them what was going on, because she wanted witnesses and was not sure if the men in her house were really policemen.

Outside the house she saw two private cars and a police van. One car had a TPA registration. (Transvaal Provincial Administration) and because of this she soon afterwards made inquiries at the local Pretoria prison about her husband.

At the prison she was told she would not be able to see her husband for 180 days, but could come back on the following Sunday, bringing him clothing and food.

CONFIRMED

On the Sunday, when she returned, she was told at one gate her husband could not be found in the prison, and at another gate that she could not see or talk to him for 180 days.

On the following Tuesday two White policemen came to her home and demanded her husband's reference book. She searched in her bedroom for it but could not find it.

On the Thursday she went to town and, when she returned, her neighbours told her the police had called and that her husband was dead.

Next day, a Friday, an African constable confirmed that her husband had died.

The prosecutor, Mr. Jordaan, at this stage said that much had been said in evidence about the discovery of copper particles in a wound on Mr. Lenkoe's toe, and he was producing an expert witness.

The witness was Professor Bernard Meyer, professor of physiology and biochemistry at the University of Pretoria and author of 65 publications—seven of them on copper in the human body.

BALANCE VARIES

Professor Meyer said the skin was the biggest organism in the body, and the most involved. Virtually every kind of tissue to be found in the body was in the skin, which was made up of four layers.

The actual constitution of the skin differed from place to place on the body, and in some places the epidermis—the top layer—was as thick as 1 m.m. and at others as thick as 15 m.m.

Many factors could upset or affect the balance of the skin.

Much research had been done on the presence of copper in the body. It appeared with other trace elements, but differed in concentration from place to place in the body—and even in concentration in different parts of particular spots.

Generally there were about 100 milligrams of copper in the body, with generally the highest concentration in the liver, followed by the kidneys and the brain.

The amount of copper varied from organ to organ, and then even in the organs themselves from spot to spot.

The same applied to the skin. At one spot more copper might be found than at another adjoining spot.

It was also a fact that darker skinned people generally had more copper in them than light skinned people. There were also differences in the concentrations between men and women, and women in pregnancy or menstruation.

In fact he could, through measuring the presence of copper in a woman, show at a certain stage whether or not she was pregnant.

In addition many illnesses and conditions were linked with a more than normal concentration of copper in the blood, while only a few illnesses showed a decrease in copper concentration.

More copper could also be found at the source of a wound, because of the extra bleeding and blood supply to that wound.

Of spectrographic tests conducted to show the presence of copper in Mr. Lenkoe's wound, Professor Meyer said that all the test had proved was that copper was present in the tissue examined—but there was no quantitative basis to the test.

Questioned by Mr. Soggot, Professor Meyer said he preferred to answer questions put to him in Afrikaans. After a while Mr. Soggot reverted to English for his questions, with Professor Meyer answering them in Afrikaans.

He said hundreds of factors could influence the presence or concentration of copper in the body. Even in the case of two experimentally perfect, identical people there would be differences in copper content.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 17, 1969]

I BELIEVE BURN IS ELECTRIC ONE

Among the things which affected the concentration were the time of the day, temperature, the type of work, nutrition, exposure to sun, illness, cold, age, and even the type of shoes worn by the subject.

The percentage of copper in the case of a normal person in ideal conditions would be about 0.8, but actual human content could vary from 50 to 150 milligrams.

He had made no special study of copper in the skin, but believed that actual concentrations of the element could vary tremendously from minute spot to spot—as they did elsewhere in the body.

FROM TOE

Dr. Jonathan Gluckman, the pathologist who conducted the second post-mortem on Mr. Lenkoe, said he made slides of tissue taken from Mr. Lenkoe's body and there was no possibility of them having become contaminated by other metals.

The skin taken from the toe was a good deal smaller than a section taken from the neck.

He had reconsidered the slides and wanted to back fully evidence given last week by the visiting American pathologist, Dr. A. R. Moritz, that "columns" shown in the slides indicated the passage of electric current.

Dr. Gluckman said he agreed with Dr. Moritz's conclusions that Mr. Lenkoe received a thermal electric burn. These conclusions were based on the special microscopic appearances of the toe, the results of the spectrographic analysis which disclosed an excess of copper residue in the toe when compared with the neck and the peculiar columnar arrangements of the changes in the skin only found in electrical burns.

He was satisfied in his mind beyond reasonable doubt—and in the absence of any evidence indicating anything else—that Mr. Lenkoe's injury was thermal electric one.

Referring to a German scientist quoted

in the case by State witnesses, Dr. Gluckman said he wrote to the scientist, Boehm, in Munich, last week with certain questions. When he received no reply he telephoned Boehm on Friday, and established that Boehm's experiments so far were confined to charring conditions under high temperature.

Professor Boehm told him that he still hoped to study the effects of low voltage burns on the human body—the type of injury which he believed was being dealt with at the inquest.

Dr. Gluckman handed in to court an artist's representation of the metallisation that would be caused if a shock were administered to the skin through a paper clip—showing uneven points of electrical entry into the skin.

Questioned by Mr. Jordaan, he said he wanted to "leave the door open" but believed the burn was electrically caused. If other evidence were produced he could reconsider his position.

In the case in point it was the first time he had ever dealt with electric burns to the skin, but as a trained pathologist he was often called on to diagnose an occurrence on seeing a certain thing for the first time.

He could track down works on the subject, as he had done in the Lenkoe case. He had sent the microscopic slides off to Professor Moritz in America and had conferred at length with Professor Moritz.

Professor Moritz gave his opinion on the slides shortly before he flew out to South Africa to testify.

Recalled by the State, Mrs. Lenkoe said she and her husband used candles in their home, but there were street lights about 200 to 250 yards from the house.

Mr. Soggot objected to a question put by Mr. Jordaan, saying he was in effect cross-examining Mrs. Lenkoe—something which he himself had not done to a witness.

He also objected to more than one question being put to her at once, and Mr. Tukker said he wanted no arguments in his court.

Mr. Tukker said he had "had enough of your arguments" and ordered Mr. Jordaan to continue.

Questioned about the fear of Lesotho people—Mr. Lenkoe was a Lesotho national—she said she did not know any witchdoctor in Johannesburg. Therefore she need not be frightened of them.

She knew nothing about a wound on her husband's hand, or about evidence that might be produced that a witchdoctor had given him a powder to smear on it, to cure it.

IMPROPER

When the question of the adjournment was considered, Mr. Jordaan said Professor Meyer would be available on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and—with some difficulty—on Friday afternoon.

Mr. Soggot said this would not give Mrs. Lenkoe's legal representatives sufficient time to obtain the necessary transcript of Professor Meyer's evidence, translate it, and study it.

Professor Meyer had often been almost inaudible during his evidence and the evidence would have to be studied.

After telephoning the official court recording contractors, it was stated that the record would be ready at the latest by Friday morning.

Mr. Jordaan said that if he could prepare within days to question Dr. Moritz at earlier hearings—as he had done—Mr. Soggot could prepare to question Professor Meyer at short notice.

INVOLVED

Mr. Soggot said it was "wholly improper" to expect him to prepare himself in such a short time.

Mr. Tukker, after a short adjournment, ruled that the hearing would proceed on Friday.

Mr. Soggot said he failed to see why the public prosecutor's caprices should dictate to

the court what should happen. There was no reason why the matter should now suddenly become an urgent one.

Mr. Jordaan said Professor Meyer was only available this week. If the hearing did not continue this week he would not be available for a few months to come.

Mr. Soggot said there was no possibility that he could proceed with the matter tomorrow and that he was involved with an already planned consultation on Friday afternoon.

Mr. Tucker insisted that the inquest be resumed on Friday afternoon and adjourned the court.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Star, June 16, 1969]

WIFE TELLS OF MIDNIGHT DETENTION

The midnight detention in Soweto of James Lenkoe, a Lesotho national who later died in prison, was described by his widow in a Pretoria Inquest Court today.

Mrs. Julia Lenkoe told the magistrate, Mr. J. H. Tukker, that White men had woken her and her husband at 11:30 p.m. on March 5 and had taken her husband away without explanation. During the incident she had been pushed by a policeman, she had seen her husband hit on the head by a White man and an African had also hit him on the back of the head.

The inquest court is investigating the death of James Lenkoe, who was found hanging by his neck from a belt tied to the bars of his cell in Pretoria Local Prison on March 10.

Mrs. Lenkoe said that after hearing of her husband's death, policemen visited her to ask whether she could identify her husband's belt, but she had never been shown the belt.

SHOCK EVIDENCE

Previous evidence has been that Lenkoe was found dead after a day of interrogation by security police. Counsel for his widow has alleged that Lenkoe received an electric shock and expert medical evidence has been led in support of this.

Mrs. Lenkoe told the court that after hearing a knock on the door of their house on March 15 they opened it when a voice said it was the police.

Two hands grabbed her husband's wrists as he stood at the door and pulled him outside. When the men entered the house they asked her where she had stolen the money to enable them to live in such a good house. She told them the money had been earned through work.

USED FIST

Later, she saw an African constable hit her husband behind the head. The police then told her to go back to bed and when she remained standing at the door of the bedroom a White policeman pushed her into the room.

She said she then saw another White policeman hit her husband smartly three times with his fist on the top of his head. The men came into the bedroom and started searching. They found nothing but asked where goods they saw in wardrobes had been stolen from.

She said she looked out of the window and saw three vehicles—one of them a police van. As one of the vehicles had a T.P.A registration she knew she should make inquiries in Pretoria.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Post, June 15, 1969]

BOTH CAME TO JOHANNESBURG TO GET LEGAL ADVICE: THE WIDOWS OF SORROW MEET

Two widows whose husbands died in Pretoria while being held for interrogation by the Security Police, met for the first time yesterday at a lawyer's office in Johannesburg where they had come for advice.

They are Mrs. Julia Lenkoe, 33, of Naledi,

Soweto, whose husband, Mr. James Lenkoe, was found hanged in a cell in March. At the inquest on his death, which is still being heard in the Pretoria Magistrate's Court, an allegation was made that he was given an electric shock before he died.

The other is Mrs. Onica Kgoathe, 44, of Hebron, north of Pretoria. Her husband, Mr. Nichodimus Kgoathe, died in hospital on February 4 after being taken from the Silverton police cells where he was being held.

At the inquest on his death evidence was given that he had been assaulted, but the magistrate found that no one was to blame for his death.

Mrs. Lenkoe, a mother of two, told Post that she stopped working at a factory where she was a machinist on March 2, the day her husband was arrested by S. B. cops for questioning. He said she and her two children, Emelda, four, and Lorraine, two, were being looked after by her husband's uncle who also paid the rent for her four-roomed house.

"My husband," she said, "had been working for the railways for 19 years and was a barrier attendant at Park Station when he was taken away and died.

"It was a shock to me when the police woke us up on the night of March 5.

"They did not tell me why they were taking him away. I only learned next day that he was being held in Pretoria. I hired a car to go there and was told to come back on Sunday. I went there but I was told that I couldn't see him because he was a detainee."

Mrs. Lenkoe said the police came to her house again on March 11 and asked for her husband's pass. On March 13 she got a message from a neighbour that the police had been there to tell her that her husband had died.

Mrs. Lenkoe said her husband was buried in Leribe, Lesotho, where he was born and the funeral expenses were paid by the family. She is now being supported by her husband's uncle.

Mrs. Lenkoe was born in Soweto. She told POST that she intended looking for another job. She had no intention of remarrying because of the memory of her husband.

"I don't think I'll get someone who'll treat me as he did," she said.

Mrs. Kgoathe has eight children. She told Post that the eldest, a son, was working. Three others were in high school at the Hebron Training Institution. Two have now left the school as a result of their father's death. There is no money.

"I am now wondering how I am going to bring the children up. They were keen on schools," Mrs. Lenkoe said.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 13, 1969]

TRIALS DEBATE STARTS FUROR

A heated debate on the colour question last night followed addresses by four speakers on "Political Trials in South Africa" at the University of the Witwatersrand.

The speakers—three prominent members of the Johannesburg Bar and Professor John Dugard of the university's Law Department—addressed more than 200 students at a symposium organized by law students.

Professor Dugard, who opposed political trials, said in most cases the trials hoped to eliminate or discredit one's political foes according to some prearranged rules.

"In recent years," he said, "the trial process has been used for both propaganda and removal purposes."

His views were corroborated by the next two speakers. The last speaker's views, however, caused a furor which lasted for more than an hour after he finished speaking.

"Before we can question the necessity for political trials in South Africa, we have to decide whether it is necessary to deter people from political activities," he said.

"In this country we have societies with

incompatible values, and there is no justification for the tyranny of the majority under the guise of democracy."

He said that justice was no doubt an ideal state in heaven, but in his view a definition of justice could be that "equals must be treated equally and unequals must be treated unequally for the particular situation."

Jeers from the audience followed this statement, and he defended his view by saying that although people were taxed differently, this was considered just.

"You must realize," the advocate continued, "that all human rights are subject to restriction. We want freedom of speech, but this would not entitle us to libel our neighbours."

"Freedom connotes only an absence of restraint," he said.

Political trials were necessary as South Africa represented the "vanguard of the colour revolution in the world. By an accident of history we had amongst us a people who did not have the know-how technologically to advance themselves.

"We need political trials to prevent agitators from overthrowing the social system," he said.

He concluded his speech amid jeers from the students, and the meeting was thrown open to questions from the floor.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Star, June 13, 1969]

POLITICAL TRIALS ARE "DIALOG OF DEAF"

The exchange between prosecutor and accused in contemporary political trials in South Africa was often "a dialogue of the deaf," Mr. G. Bizos, a leading advocate, said in Johannesburg last night.

Mr. Bizos was one of four speakers at a symposium organized by the Law Students' Council at Wits. on political trials in this country.

Mr. Bizos said that the classical type of cross-examination seemed to have come to an end in political trials, at any rate as far as prosecutor and accused were concerned. Instead there was accusation and counter-accusation—"a dialogue of the deaf," in which each hurled moral accusations at the other.

To represent accused in political trials, particularly terrorist trials, was a difficult and onerous task, he said. Defending counsel's loyalty was often questioned by supporters of the status quo, and he was often criticized by opponents of the regime for not protesting vigorously enough.

TERRORISTS

"But the rights of unpopular causes should not be swept aside. There must be no untouchables in the legal profession. If terrorists, saboteurs and Communists cannot find anyone to defend them today, who will be next?"

Prof. John Dugard of Wits. said that from the Government's point of view the Treason Trial of 1956 had not been a success. "It dragged on too long—from 1956 to 1961—and the public lost interest." It evoked little support from the Whites, did not intimidate the non-Whites and caused the Government embarrassment abroad.

Political trials, he said, had two objectives: the removal of an opponent and the mobilization of public support against the accused.

But the Government had learnt from the Treason Trial—and by altering the rules was now fulfilling these two objectives. Some of the Government's innovations were: the introduction of summary trials to speed up the whole process, the replacing of "the vague definition of treason" by "wide definitions of sabotage and terrorism," and the detaining of suspects for interrogation.

PUBLICITY

Mr. P. J. Hare, another advocate, spoke of political trials in the Eastern Province during the period 1960 to 1964. Some 800 political trials had taken place in the Eastern Prov-

ince, he said, but they had received little publicity and few people knew of them.

A feature of these trials was the harsh sentences. One man, for example, was sentenced to five years' imprisonment, being a member of a banned organization and attending a meeting of the organization. But in the Transvaal men convicted of much more serious offences—sabotage, for example—had received similar sentences.

Mr. S. A. Cilliers, also a Johannesburg advocate, said that in South Africa the choice was "between control and revolution," and that the value of the law as it pertained to political offences was that it acted as a restraint and a regulator.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Star, June 16, 1969]

SOUTH AFRICAN PRISON SYSTEM—IN BOOK FORM

CAPE TOWN.—The Department of Foreign Affairs has launched the world-wide distribution of a 126-page evaluation of the South African prison system—a system, it says, is based on United Nations requirements and which measures up to the "highest standards."

It is an attempt to give the world a comprehensive picture of the South African penal system and to meet direct and indirect criticism. It will be sent to South Africa's 36 overseas diplomatic missions and it will go to all foreign missions in South Africa as well as criminologists and penologists in different parts of the world.

The expensively produced book contains hundreds of photographs of conditions and activities in a wide variety of South African prisons.

Throughout, the publication makes no distinction between White and non-White prisoners. It concentrates on the men and women sentenced to imprisonment and deals only briefly with prisoners under arrest or awaiting trial.

It makes no mention of people "detained" in terms of certain South African security legislation.

DEVELOPMENTS

The book said that for the last 50 years South African prison authorities had been in constant touch with other prison authorities and academicians, thus keeping abreast with new developments in prison techniques and methods.

It said the administration and management of penal institutions in South Africa were based on legislation conforming to the United Nations standard minimum rules and the major objective of the system was "rehabilitation with a view to preparing the prisoner for a normal and productive life on release."

The writer conceded that the checks and balances in the system sometimes failed, that irregular treatment of prisoners sometimes occurred and that the system was not foolproof.

The following are some of the points made in the publication:

The picture painted by overseas critics of the South African penal system was without foundation.

The Government never attempted to conceal prison conditions and had frequently granted access to prisons to "properly qualified observers." These included judges, magistrates, international Red Cross investigators, Members of Parliament and overseas criminal and penal experts.

The imposition of "cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment, or punishment involving placing the prisoner in a dark cell for disciplinary or other offences, is not only a crime, but cannot be concealed. . . . dark cells do not exist."

Medical services and food supplies were governed by the standard minimum rules, which were strictly applied.

Prisoners' rights and privileges were set

out in a handbook which was handed to prisoners on admission.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 14, 1969]

STATE MAY INVESTIGATE KGOATHE CASE

The attorney-general of the Transvaal is considering possible further investigations into the death of an African Terrorism Act detainee, Mr. Nichodimus Kgoathe, 47.

A spokesman for the Attorney-General's office said yesterday the record of the inquest into Mr. Kgoathe's death was still being examined.

At the Pretoria inquest, a district surgeon testified that Mr. Kgoathe, whom he had examined in the Silverton police cells shortly before his death, had marks on his body which could have been caused by a sjambok and wounds which could have come from an assault with the buckle of a belt.

BODY PAINS

Sergeant Gildenhuys of Silverton where Mr. Kgoathe was detained before being taken to the H. F. Verwoerd Hospital on January 21, said Mr. Kgoathe complained of body pains. Instructions were given for a doctor to be called.

He saw Mr. Kgoathe again at midday and he still complained of pain. Mr. Kgoathe told him he was assaulted by Security Police during interrogation.

Mr. Kgoathe did not want to lay a charge and refused to make a statement. An entry to that effect was then made in the police records, Sergeant Gildenhuys said.

In statements before the court, it was said that Mr. Kgoathe sustained certain injuries when he slipped and fell while having a shower at police headquarters on January 16.

A post-mortem report said the cause of death on February 4 was bronchial pneumonia.

The magistrate found that, in the light of the evidence and statements before the court, he was not in a position to conclude that any person was responsible for Mr. Kgoathe's death.

As standard procedure, a record of the inquest was submitted to the Attorney-General's office for consideration.

Should further investigations be considered necessary, instructions will be issued to the Chief of the C.I.D. General D. J. Bester.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Post, June 15, 1969]

TERROR ACT DETAINEES WILL BE TRIED

A senior officer at the headquarters of the Security Police in Pretoria confirmed yesterday that the people held during recent S.B. swoops were being detained under the Terrorism Act—and not the 180-day clause as reported earlier.

He said he expected some of the detainees to appear in court under the Act.

"But not all of them will be charged," he added.

As the matter will soon be before the courts the officer declined to say more.

The officer was confirming a statement made by Brigadier P. J. "Tiny" Venter, head of the Security Police, to a daily newspaper on Friday.

Brigadier Venter was commenting on the arrest and detention of Miss Shanti Naidoo of Doornfontein on Friday.

He explained that the detainees, who include photographer Peter Magubane, Winnie Mandela, Joyce Sikakane, a journalist and others were being held because of alleged activities in the African National Congress.

NAMES OF 25 HELD IN REEF SWOOPS

This week Post was able to get the names of 25 of the people held under the Terrorism Act after the recent police swoops in Soweto and Alexandra Township.

But POST could not get the full names

of five of them. Relatives are still guessing where they are being held.

Some said that they had been allowed to take clean clothes and cigarettes to their relatives.

Mr. Mendel Levin, a Johannesburg attorney has been briefed on behalf of Mrs. Winnie Mandela and others.

Detainees from Soweto: Winnie Mandela, Peter Magubane, Joyce Sikakane, Mrs. Mabena, David Motau, Paulus Mashaba, Albert Mashamba, Mr. Singo, Mohale Maharyele, Mr. Shabangu, Mr. Monnapula, Esther Nkosi, Charlotte Nasinga, Joseph Zikalala, Johannes Thage, David Tshotetsi, George Themba and Boyce Ndungwane.

From Alexandra: Joseph Skoshana, Douglas Nvema, Virginia Nkomo, Joyce Molefi and Martha Dlamini.

Another detainee is Ashanti Naidoo, a clerk of Doornfontein.

NEWSMAN HELD BY SECURITY BRANCH COPS

(By Percy Qoboza)

The security police yesterday detained one of South Africa's top African photographers, Mr. Peter Magubane. He is reported to have been held under the 180 days detention clause.

Mr. Magubane, who has been overseas on several occasions and whose photographs earned him international recognition and awards was taken from his place of employment.

Two cars bearing Pretoria registration numbers arrived at his Diepkloof home at 3 p.m. The police carried out an intensive two-and-a-half hours search before whisking him away to Pretoria.

NINE HELD

Mr. Magubane's detention now brings the total number of known people taken by the security police in Soweto to nine. Those taken include Mrs. Winnie Mandela, wife of Rivonia industrialist Nelson Mandela who is serving a life sentence on Robben Island, and Miss Joyce Sikakane, a reporter and colleague of Peter Magubane.

After the first swoop in Soweto, the chief of the Security Branch, Brigadier Tiny Venter, said that all the people detained were being held in connection with activities of the African National Congress.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 14, 1969]

INDIAN WOMAN IS HELD UNDER TERRORISM ACT

Security police detained an Indian woman, Miss Shanti Naidoo, of Rockey Street, Doornfontein, at her home yesterday.

Miss Naidoo, 34, was detained under the Terrorism Act.

It is believed that about 40 people have been detained under the Act recently in connection with alleged activities of the banned African National Congress.

Brigadier P. J. "Tiny" Venter, head of the Security Police, confirmed yesterday that Mr. Peter Magubane, the African photographer who was detained on Thursday, was being held in connection with the alleged activities of the A.N.C.

Brigadier Venter corrected a statement made by one of the officers who detained Mr. Magubane to the effect that he was being held under the 180-day Detention Clause. He said that Mr. Magubane was being held under Section Six of the Terrorism Act, which defines the "detention of terrorists and certain other persons for interrogation."

The security chief declined to discuss whether there was any possible connection between the detention of a large number of non-whites in connection with alleged ANC activities and the detention of a British subject, Mr. Philip Golding, under the Terrorism Act.

He said as the matter was likely to come to court the subject was *sub judice*. He added that none of the non-Whites detained in

connection with alleged A.N.C. activities was being held under the 180-day clause, that is as potential witnesses.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Star, June 13, 1969]

ANOTHER AFRICAN NEWSMAN ARRESTED

Another Soweto resident has been arrested by the Security Police.

Mr. Peter Magubane, a Press photographer and winner of several photographic awards, was detained yesterday. He lives at Diepkloof Township within the Soweto complex.

He is the second African newspaperman in Johannesburg to be detained by the Security Police. Another journalist, Miss Joyce Sikakane, was detained last month with Mrs. Winnie Mandela and others.

A day before the detention of Mrs. Mandela, Miss Sikakane, Mr. David Motau and Paul Matshaba, Mr. Magubane was picked up but later released.

He recently visited Pretoria on several occasions, in an effort to give parcels to Miss Sikakane and Mrs. Mandela.

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Rand Daily Mail, June 17, 1969]

WINNIE MANDELA WELL, SAY POLICE

The Security Police have given an assurance that if the condition of Mrs. Winnie Mandela—at present being detained under the Terrorism Act—shows any deterioration, a specialist will be called in for a consultation.

Mrs. Mandela, wife of the Robben Island prisoner, Nelson Mandela, is said to suffer from a cardiac condition.

Mr. Mendel Levin, a Johannesburg lawyer, who informed the Security Police of Mrs. Mandela's condition, said yesterday that the police told him Mrs. Mandela was examined and found to be in a good state of health.

WAR VETERANS BEING GOUGED BY HIGH INTEREST

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great number of letters and complaints from citizens in my district in opposition to the unnecessary advances of interest rates by the big eastern bank monopoly.

The protests that have been coming in to Members of Congress in both bodies against high interest gouging and the fabulous, and in many instances, fraudulent loopholes given to big oil, big foundations, big real estate, and so forth, are almost totally ignored by the leaders of the Ways and Means Committee, and many Members of Congress. This morning, I received a letter from Edmund A. Shelley, of the Shelley Real Estate and Insurance Agency of Highland, Ind., which I submit for the information of our colleagues. This letter is merely one of dozens received in my office complaining about interest rates, high taxes, tax loopholes, and so forth.

The letter follows:

THE SHELLEY AGENCY,
Highland, Ind., May 27, 1969.

Congressman MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: This letter is about the problem of availability of money for financing guaranteed VA and FHA loans.

Keeping in mind the fact that there is no, or very little, risk involved by mortgage companies when they make these loans. Even with this insurance or guarantee, these mortgage companies, in the face of constantly rising interest rates, are still making these loans at an outrageous discount rate.

As a large percentage of these lenders are life insurance companies, it might be well to check and see where this money is going. Life insurance premiums are not coming down! Dividends are not going up! To this citizen, all the above merely adds up to subsidized profits to the large lenders because of the Government Guaranteed basis on which these loans are made.

As a suggested cure for this unfair situation, I believe that ALL discounts should be outlawed on federal insured loans and if the mortgage institutions withdraw from the mortgage market, then the Federal Government should lend on these insured mortgages direct.

I am by no means a socialist, but where else can the Federal Government get a return of 7½% on its money? When private industry proves itself incapable of doing the job, then the government is usually forced to step in.

When we also consider that a large percentage of present day sellers are veterans of World War II, it seems that it is poor thanks for serving their country by being victimized by ruinous discounts. This situation is also part of the cause of the present rising market on real estate. Adding to the inflationary spiral and causing our present day veteran buyers to pay more for housing after serving their country.

Also conventional mortgages are going at a 7% interest rate in the Chicago area, against 7½% for FHA and GI (guaranteed) loans. I believe this is the first time conventional loans have gone at a lower rate than GI or FHA loans.

Very truly yours,

EDMUND A. SHELLEY.

FREEDOM BECOMES ILLEGAL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision by the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals represents some of the more tragic judicial legislation in the public school field since our country became a Republic.

Who would ever believe that Federal judges, sworn to uphold the Constitution, would rule that freedom of choice in public education is illegal unless it accomplishes some bureaucratic theory of "desired goals."

In so ruling the U.S. court of appeals reversed 36 parish school boards and two city school systems, all in the State of Louisiana. Back in 1961, Federal judges had given their stamp of approval to the "freedom of choice plan," under which many of these boards were operating in good faith.

Not only is it becoming more and more obvious that Federal judges are being forced to run schools—a field in which they have no training or experience—but it is forcing them to trample under foot the greatest American birthright which it has traditionally been their duty to defend; that is, freedom.

When courts decree "freedom is a crime" it is later than most people would like to admit. Chief Judge E. Gordon West, of the Eastern District of Louisiana, in scathing comments accompanying the Fifth Circuit mandate plainly stated that most Americans know—that there is no law to support the decision.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be followed by the court decision in No. 27391 and news clippings, one outlining the handicaps of abolishing a school system in the South designed to meet local needs with the resulting loss of jobs and opportunities to educated, willing-to-work Americans.

The material follows:

[No. 27391]

JOYCE MARIE MOORE, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES, VERSUS TANGIPAHOA PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, ET AL., DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS

[Civil Action No. 15556]

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

(May 28, 1969)

Before Brown, Chief Judge, Godbold, Circuit Judge and Cabot, District Judge.

GODBOLD, Circuit Judge: We have before us appeals from three district court decrees covering thirty-six parish school systems and two city school systems, all in the state of Louisiana. These cases were submitted and argued April 21, 1969, two years after the en banc decision of this court in *Jefferson II*,¹ and eleven months after the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Green v. School Bd. of New Kent County*.² All of the school districts involved are under the uniform decree that *Jefferson II* required for school systems in the Fifth Circuit operating under freedom of choice plans.

I. BACKGROUND

Twenty-nine of the districts are appellees in appeals from an en banc decision³ of the District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, which declined to order modification, requested on the authority of *Green*, in existing desegregation plans.⁴

Eight parishes are appellees in similar appeals from a decree of the District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.⁵

The Tangipahoa Parish School Board is appellant in an appeal from another decree of the Eastern District⁶ directing it to change from a *Jefferson*-decree freedom of choice plan to one calling for the assignment of students "by adoption of geographic zones, or pairing of classes, or both."

We begin with principles both basic and familiar to all who are concerned with the complex problem of ending the dual school system in the South. There can be no doubt of the duty of school boards to act affirmatively to abolish all vestiges of state-imposed segregation of the races in the public schools *United States v. Indianola Municipal Separate Sch. Dist.*, 5 Cir. 1969, — F.2d — [No. 25655, Apr. 11, 1969]; *Henry v. Clarksdale Municipal Separate Sch. Dist.*, 5 Cir. 1969 — F.2d — [No. 23255, Mar. 6, 1969]; *Adams v. Mathews*, 403 F.2d 181 (5th Cir. 1968); *Jefferson II*, *supra*.

The respective burdens and roles of school boards and district courts are articulated in *Green* itself:

"The burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work now.

"The obligation of the district courts, as it always has been, is to assess the effectiveness of a proposed plan in achieving desegregation. There is no universal answer to complex problems of desegregation; there is obviously no one plan that will do the job

Footnotes at end of article.

in every case. The matter must be assessed in light of the circumstances present and the options available in each instance. It is incumbent upon the school board to establish that its proposed plan promises meaningful and immediate progress toward disestablishing state-imposed segregation. It is incumbent upon the district court to weigh that claim in light of the facts at hand and in light of any alternatives which may be shown as feasible and more promising in their effectiveness. Where the court finds the board to be acting in good faith and the proposed plan to have real prospects for dismantling the state-imposed dual system "at the earliest practicable date," then the plan may be said to provide effective relief. Of course, where other, more promising courses of action are open to the board, that may indicate a lack of good faith; and at the least it places a heavy burden upon the board to explain its preference for an apparently less effective method. Moreover, whatever plan is adopted will require evaluation in practice, and the court should retain jurisdiction until it is clear that state-imposed segregation has been completely removed." 20 L. Ed. 2d at 724.

If under an existent plan there are no whites, or only a small percentage of whites, attending formerly all-Negro schools, or only a small percentage of Negroes enrolled in formerly all-white schools, then the plan, as a matter of law, is not working. *Henry v. Clarksdale, supra; Adams v. Mathews, supra.* The good faith of a school board in acting to desegregate its schools is a necessary concomitant to the achievement of a unitary school system, but it is not itself the yardstick of effectiveness.⁷

The majority of the school boards involved in these appeals did not begin any type of desegregation of their schools prior to being ordered to do so for the 1965-1966 school year.⁸ All have been operating for the 1967-68 and 1968-69 school years under *Jefferson*-decree freedom of choice plans for pupil assignments, which under numerous decisions of this circuit are required to be uniform.

All now know, judges, lawyers and school boards, that freedom of choice, *Jefferson* variety or otherwise, is not a constitutional end in itself but only a means to the constitutionally required end of the termination of the dual school system, *Green, supra; Jefferson II, supra.* Since *Green* this court explicitly has rejected freedom of choice plans that were found to be demonstrably unsuitable for effectuating transition from dual school systems to unitary nondiscriminatory systems. See, e.g., *Anthony v. Marshall County Bd. of Educ.*, 5 Cir. 1969, — F. 2d — [No. 26432, Apr. 15, 1969]; *United States v. Greenwood Municipal Separate School Dist.*, 406 F.2d 1086 (1969). See also *Graves v. Walton County Bd. of Educ.*, 403 F.2d 189 (5th Cir. 1968); *Bd. of Public Instruction of Duval County v. Braxton*, 402 F.2d 900 (5th Cir. 1968).

II. THE WESTERN DISTRICT CASES

The Western District Court, sitting en banc, found that the operation of *Jefferson*-type freedom of choice in the school districts before it "has real prospects for dismantling the dual system at the earliest practicable date. . . ." and concluded that the best method available to eradicate the dual system of schools in these districts is freedom of choice.⁹

Appellants in the Western District cases contend that the statistical record manifestly reveals that the dual system continues and that freedom of choice has failed to produce meaningful results. They urge that the statistical record requires reversal when considered in light of *Green* and the cases in this circuit following *Green*.

The appellee school boards insist that

Green does not foreclose the continuation of their *Jefferson*-decree freedom of choice plans. They read the statistics as revealing that progress, though in most instances statistically nominal, has been made toward the elimination of the dual system. They urge that the district court appropriately could conclude that the uniform *Jefferson*-decree freedom of choice plans under which they are operating do provide the effective relief referred to by *Green*, because, in the language of *Green*, they are operating in good faith and under plans which have real prospects for dismantling the state-imposed dual system "at the earliest practicable date." 20 L. Ed. 2d at 724.

We turn to the facts. In the Appendix to this opinion we set out the best statistical data made available to this court for the 1967-68 and 1968-69 school years, and such data as presently is available for 1969-70 (recognizing that the latter necessarily is not complete: see note 2. to the Appendix.) In the current school year, 1968-69, in every one of these school districts there is at least one all-Negro school, in most districts many more than just one.

In all of the twenty-nine districts, for the current school year, only two white students exercised their freedom of choice by electing to attend all-Negro schools. To the extent data is available for the 1969-70 school year, from choice forms already exercised and reported to us since oral argument of these cases, no change of substantial consequence in this situation can be projected. See Appendix.

The number of Negro students attending formerly all-white schools has risen slightly since the adoption of the *Jefferson*-decree plans, but for the current school year the percentage this represents of the total Negro student population is minimal—only five of these twenty-nine systems have more than ten percent of their Negro children attending formerly all-white schools. Four parishes have less than one percent integration.

In no instance does the data made available to us for expected 1969-70 pupils assignment vary the situation existent for the current year sufficiently that compliance with constitutional standards can be projected.

We do not abdicate our judicial role to statistics. But when figures speak we must listen. It is abundantly clear that freedom of choice, as presently constituted and operating in the Western District school districts before us, does not offer the "real prospect" contemplated by *Green*, and "cannot be accepted as a sufficient step to 'effectuate a transition' to a unitary system." 20 L. Ed. 2d at 726-727.

In addition the boards are required to examine other alternatives. The presence of other and more promising courses of action at the least may indicate lack of good faith by the board and place a heavy burden on the board to explain its preference for an apparently less effective method. *Green*, at 20 L. Ed. 2d 724. If there are reasonably available other ways promising speedier and more effective conversion to a unitary non-racial system, freedom of choice must be held unacceptable. *Id.* at 725. *Anthony v. Marshall County, supra; United States v. Greenwood, supra.*

We reverse and remand these cases to the district court in order that a new plan may be put into effect in each school district. The obligation is upon the school boards to come forward with realistic and workable plans, and the assessment and initial review and approval or rejection of each plan is for the district court, not for this court, removed as we are from "the circumstances present and the options available in each of [twenty nine] instance[s]." *Green, supra*, 20 L. Ed. 2d at 724; *Anthony v. Marshall County, supra; United States v. Greenwood, supra; Adams v. Mathews, supra; Bd. of Public Instruction of Duval County v. Braxton, supra; Henry v.*

*Clarksdale, supra.*¹⁰ This is not to say that the district court on the scene may not, if it thinks best, require a uniform approach by all districts.¹¹

There are many methods and combinations of methods available for consideration, either on a district-by-district basis or on a uniform basis if the district court so directs. Some of these are geographic zoning if it tends to disestablish the dual system, *Davis v. Bd. of School Comm. of Mobile, Ala.*, 393 F.2d 690 (5th Cir. 1968),¹² pairing of grades or of schools, educational clusters or parks, discontinuance of use of substandard buildings and premises, rearrangement of transportation routes, consolidation of schools, appropriate location of new construction, and majority-to-minority transfers. The resources of the Educational Resources Center for School Desegregation, at New Orleans, are available to the boards and may be utilized.¹³ We set out in the margin the approach recently taken by the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, sitting en banc in *Whittenberg v. Greenville County School District*, — F. Supp. — (D.C. S.C. March 31, 1969) a case concerning 22 of the 93 school districts in South Carolina.¹⁴

We are urged by appellants to order on a plenary basis for all these school districts that the district court must reject freedom of choice as an acceptable ingredient of any desegregation plan. Unquestionably as now constituted, administered and operating in these districts freedom of choice is not effectual. The Supreme Court in *Green* recognized the general ineffectiveness of freedom of choice.¹⁵ But in that case, concerning only a single district having only two schools, the court declined to hold "that 'freedom of choice' can have no place in . . . a plan" that provides effective relief, and recognized that there may be instances in which freedom of choice may serve as an effective device, and remanded to the district court with directions to require the board to formulate a new plan.¹⁶

While we have directed most of our discussion to pupil assignment, integration of faculty is of equal importance, and the boards must come forward with affirmative plans in that regard. "[T]he school board must do everything within its power to recruit and reassign teachers so as to provide for a substantial degree of faculty integration," which includes withholding of teacher contracts if necessary, *United States v. Indianola, supra; United States v. Greenwood, supra.* The pattern of teacher assignments to a particular school must not be identifiable as tailored for a heavy concentration of either Negro or white students. *Davis v. Mobile County, supra; United States v. Greenwood, supra; United States v. Indianola, supra.*

Also a plan which will "effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system" must include effectual provisions concerning staff, facilities, transportation and school activities—the entire school system.

III. THE EASTERN DISTRICT CASES

In the Eastern District cases the district judge concluded that freedom of choice was working well and was the best available method for the school boards to reach their constitutional obligations.

Appellants and the school boards make the same contentions in these cases as were made in the Western District cases. Again, the statistical evidence makes abundantly clear that the freedom of choice plans as presently constituted, administered and operating, are failing to eradicate the dual system. See Appendix. For the current year not one of these districts has as many as ten percent of its Negro students enrolled in formerly all-white schools. The 1969-70 data shows that Iberville Parish has achieved ten percent, up from 9.2% for the current year.

Footnotes at end of article.

In all these districts no white student chose to attend an all-Negro school in the current year, and none has chosen an all-Negro school for 1969-70. Forty-six all-Negro schools exist in these parishes in 1968-69. As in the Western District, the partial 1969-70 data supplied to this court does not indicate any real chance of attainment of constitutional standards in 1969-70. The boards must adopt new plans.

In addition, in evaluating the plans before him the district judge did not apply the standard of whether the plans are working but rather that of whether they could work. This is an erroneous standard. When testing the sufficiency of a plan that has been in operation sufficiently long to produce meaningful empirical data, that data must be considered and a determination made of whether the plan is effectuating a transition to a racially non-discriminatory school system. And *Green* requires the district judge to weigh the existing plan in the light both of the facts at hand and of any alternatives which may be shown as feasible and more promising. The district court must consider the alternatives.

Also the district court erred in holding that segregation which continues to exist after the exercise of unfettered free choice is "de facto" segregation and as such constitutionally permissible.

These cases must be reversed and remanded under the same directions as the Western District cases.

IV. THE TANGIPAHOA PARISH CASE

Pursuant to *Green* the district court required the Tangipahoa School Board to present a new plan to replace the existing freedom of choice plan which on October 15, 1968 it found to be ineffective. The court conducted hearings, similar to those now mandated to be held in the Western District and for the other Eastern District cases, and approved a new plan. This court has said repeatedly what we say in this opinion, that the responsibility for structuring and administering existing and new plans for disestablishing the dual system is upon the school boards and the administrators, and the primary responsibility for assessing and reviewing the plan and adopting necessary changes is upon the district court on the scene rather than at the appellate level. In the *Tangipahoa* case the district court correctly applied this policy, after a review of the facts. We affirm its decision.

V

Moore v. Tangipahoa Parish, No. 27391, is affirmed. All other cases are reversed and remanded to the district courts with the following instructions.

(a) These cases shall receive the highest priority.

(b) No later than thirty days from the date of the mandate each school board shall submit to the district court a proposed new plan for its school district to be effective with the commencement of the 1969-70 school term. Provided, however, if the district court desires to require a uniform type of plan, or a uniform approach to the formulation of plans, or issue instructions to the boards of methods that it will or will not consider, or other appropriate instructions, it shall enter its order to that effect within ten days of the date of the mandate. If the district court enters such an order the maximum time for filing plans shall be thirty days from the date of such order.

(c) The parties shall have ten days from the date a plan is filed with the district court to file objections or suggested amendments thereto.

(d) For plans as to which objections are made or amendments suggested, or which in any event the district court will not approve without hearings, the district court shall commence hearings beginning no later than ten days after the time for filing objections has expired.

(e) New plans for all districts effective for the beginning of the 1969-70 school term shall be completed and approved by the district courts no later than July 25, 1969.

Because of the urgency of formulating and approving plans to be effective for the 1969-70 school term it is ordered as follows. The mandate of this court shall issue immediately. This court will not extend the time for filing petitions for rehearing or briefs in support of or in opposition thereto. Any appeals from orders or decrees of the district court on remand shall be expedited. Any appeal may be on the original record. The record on any appeal shall be lodged with this court and appellant's brief filed, all within thirty days of the date of the order of decree of the district court from which the appeal is taken.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.*, 372 F. 2d 836 (5th Cir. 1966) [hereinafter, *Jefferson I*], *aff'd with modifications on rehearing en banc*, 380 F. 2d 385 (5th Cir.) [hereinafter, *Jefferson II*], *cert. denied sub. nom.*, *Caddo Parish Sch. Bd. v. United States*, 389 U.S. 840, 19 L. Ed. 2d 103 (1967).

² *Green v. County Sch. Bd. of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 20 L. Ed. 2d 716 (1968).

³ *Conley v. Lake Charles Sch. Bd.*, 293 F. Supp. 84 (W.D. La. 1968).

⁴ By order of January 9, 1969, without opinion, this court, after a poll of its members, denied the motion of appellants in the Western District cases that those cases be heard by the court en banc. *Cleveland v. Union Parish Sch. Bd.*, 406 F. 2d 1331 (5th Cir. 1969). The dissenting opinion to that order appears in 406 F. 2d at 1333.

Both the Western District and the Eastern District cases were among those consolidated on appeal in *Adams v. Mathews*, 403 F. 2d 181 (5th Cir. 1963).

⁵ —F. Supp. — (E.D. La. 1969).

⁶ —F. Supp. — (E.D. La. 1969).

⁷ "Here the district court found that the school board acted in good faith. But good faith does not excuse a board's non-compliance with its affirmative duty to liquidate the dual system. Good faith is relevant only as a necessary ingredient of an acceptable desegregation plan."

Henry v. Clarksdale Municipal Separate Sch. Dist., *supra* at — (Slip op. at 2).

⁸ Twenty-two of the school boards were ordered to integrate their school systems beginning with the 1965-66 school year. Two boards commenced with the 1964-65 school year. Nine began in 1966-67, and five did not begin until the 1967-68 school year.

⁹ "With every ounce of sincerity which we possess we think freedom of choice is the best plan available. We are not today going to jeopardize the success already achieved by casting aside something that is working and reach blindly into an experimental 'grab big.'" 293 F. Supp. at 88.

¹⁰ See the concurring opinion of Judge Rubin in *Duval County*:

"*Green* emphasizes that school officials have a continuing duty to take whatever action may be necessary to provide 'prompt and effective disestablishment of a dual system.' If one method is ineffective, they are to try another. Hence, no single plan is or can be judicially approved as a catholicon.

"*Brown I* and all of its successors, as well as *Green*, *Monroe* and *Raney*, contemplate that school plans will be prepared by local officials and school boards, not by courts. But if local officials fail to assume their responsibilities under the Constitution, district courts must continue to attempt to formulate the plans that should be prepared by school officials based on their expert knowledge, training and skill." (Citations omitted.) 402 F. 2d at 908.

¹¹ See, e.g. the discussion of *Whittenberg v. Greenville County School District*, (D.C. S.C., March 31, 1969), at note 14, *infra*, and accompanying text.

¹² But a plan which contributes toward preserving segregated schools by incorporating zones corresponding to racially separate residential patterns is unacceptable, *United States v. Indianola*, *supra*.

¹³ A hearing has not yet been held on whether the Center's plan will be adopted. At least two district judges in Louisiana have ordered the use of the facilities of this center. *Tangipahoa Parish*, before us on this appeal, was ordered on October 15, 1968 to produce a plan for the 1969-70 school year for unitary operation of its school system. When the school board informed the court that it was unable to find a plan better than the one in existence, the court appointed the Center to prepare a plan.

In *Harris v. St. John the Baptist Parish Sch. Bd.*, Civ. No. 13212 (E.D. La. Apr. 23, 1969), the school board, after it did not come up with a plan of its own, was ordered to consult with the Center. A hearing was set on the Center's plan. The board came in with two plans of its own. The district judge accepted one of the board's plans, which incorporated some of the Center's suggestions.

¹⁴ The district court directed that all school districts submit to the Office of Education, HEW, their existing method of operation, along with any changes proposed by them, and to seek to develop in conjunction with HEW an acceptable plan of operation "conformable to the constitutional rights of the plaintiffs . . . and consonant in timing and method with the practical and administrative problems faced by the particular districts." If a plan is agreed upon by the school district and HEW, the South Carolina district court will approve it unless the plaintiffs show it does not meet constitutional standards. If the school district already is operating under a plan approved by HEW, it will be adopted by the court absent a showing of constitutional infirmity. If no agreed plan is developed, the court will hold a hearing and enter its decree, considering the respective proposed plans of the district, the plaintiffs, and HEW.

¹⁵ The Supreme Court said: "[T]he general experience under 'freedom of choice' to date has been such as to indicate its ineffectiveness as a tool of desegregation." 20 L. Ed. 2d at 725.

See also the opinion of District Judge Heebe in *Moses v. Washington Parish School Board*, 276 F. Supp. 834 at 851-852 (E.D. La. 1967):

"If this Court must pick a method of assigning students to schools within a particular school district, barring very unusual circumstances, we could imagine no method more inappreciable, more unreasonable, more needlessly wasteful in every respect, than the so-called 'free-choice' system.

"Under such a system the school board cannot know in advance how many students will choose any school in the system—it cannot even begin to estimate the number. The first principle of pupil assignment in the scheme of school administration is thus thwarted; the principle ought to be to utilize all available classrooms and schools to accommodate the most favorable number of students; instead, this aim is surrendered in order to introduce an element of 'liberty' (never before part of efficient school administration) on the part of the students in the choice of their own school. Obviously there is no constitutional 'right' for any student to attend the public school of his own choosing. But the extension of the privilege of choosing one's school, far from being a 'right' of the students, is not even consistent with sound school administration. Rather, the creation of such a choice only has the result of demoralizing the school system itself, and actually depriving every student of a good education.

"Under a 'free-choice' system, the school board cannot know or estimate the number of students who will want to attend any school, or the identity of those who will eventually get their choice. Consequently,

the board cannot make plans for the transportation of students to schools, plan curricula, or even plan such things as lunch allotments and schedules; moreover, since in no case except by purest coincidence will an appropriate distribution of students result, and each school will have either more or less than the number it is designed to efficiently handle, many students at the end of the free-choice period have to be reassigned to schools other than those of their choice—this time on a strict geographical-proximity basis, see the *Jefferson County* decree, thus burdening the board, in the middle of what should be a period of firming up the system and making final adjustments, with the awesome task of determining which students will have to be transferred and which schools will receive them. Until that final task is completed, neither the board nor any of the students can be sure of which school they will be attending; and many students will in the end be denied the very 'free-choice' the system is supposed to provide them." (Emphases in original.)

¹⁶ See *Davis v. Mobile County, supra*, in which this court required a zone plan for urban areas but left freedom of choice in effect in rural areas. See also the dissenting opinion to the denial of en banc hearing in the instant cases, 406 F.2d at 1338-39: "I am not suggesting that freedom of choice should necessarily be abandoned in favor of zoning . . . There is nothing necessarily unconstitutional about freedom of choice or geographic zoning or a combination of the two."

[From the Morning Advocate, Baton Rouge, La., June 10, 1969]

JUDGE WEST URGES SCHOOLS TO APPEAL
INTEGRATION RULE
(By Gerald Moses)

U.S. Dist. Judge E. Gordon West, relaying an appeals court ruling for eight parish school boards to end the "freedom of choice" desegregation plan, Monday urged the school boards to appeal the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court.

"I believe a full review of this entire matter by the Congress and by the Supreme Court of the United States is long past due," Judge West said.

"The issue is clear and serious. The issue is simply whether or not the federal courts, by judicial decree, shall be allowed to continue to substitute their version of what they think the law ought to be or what the legislative branch of the government has decreed it to be."

In an eight-page brief, Judge West entered his sharpest criticism of the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals on school desegregation matters. He dutifully relayed the appellate court's order to the school boards.

FEDERAL COURT INEPT

"I make these observations because I fear for the very future of the public school system in this country if the federal courts, who have clearly demonstrated their ineptness at running public school systems, persist in their present policy of governing school boards by personal decree rather than simply requiring them to administer the schools in accordance with the clear language of the law as enacted by Congress."

Judge West stressed in his remarks that the 5th Circuit decision to junk the "freedom of choice" desegregation plan is based on neither earlier decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court nor the present civil rights laws as enacted by Congress.

He cited a Supreme Court Ruling (*Green vs. School Board of New Kent County*) in which the highest court refused to disqualify the "freedom of choice" plan of desegregation.

And he quoted section 401 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which states ". . . desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools, in order to overcome racial

imbalance," and also the section forbidding the busing of students from one school district to another in order to achieve racial balance.

The 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge West said, cited "no legal authority for their conclusion" that "de facto" segregation is unconstitutional "because they could find none."

DE FACTO PERMISSIBLE

"De facto" segregation," Judge West continued, "is under the present state of law as enacted by Congress, clearly permissible."

West, who is chief district judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, also quoted the appellate court as saying:

"If under an existent plan there are no whites or only a small percentage of whites attending formerly all-Negro schools, or only a small percentage of Negroes enrolled in formerly all-white schools, then the plan, as a matter of law, is not working."

"As a matter of what law?" Judge West asked. He said the only law the appellate court could cite "is two of the 5th Circuit's prior decisions."

LAWS COMPLIED WITH

Judge West said all constitutional and statutory laws are complied with "when all students, regardless of race or color, are, in fact, allowed to attend the school of their free choice.

"There has been no showing of any kind that such is not the case in all of the districts involved here," he said.

Judge West's order concerns only the school boards of St. Helena, Iberville, Pointe Coupee, Livingston, West Baton Rouge, West Feliciana and East Feliciana parishes.

The 5th Circuit Court's ruling, however, was a sweeping mandate that 37 school districts in Louisiana must submit new desegregation plans to take effect at the start of the 1969-70 school term.

The ruling sets a new precedent in school desegregation battles from Florida to Texas—the jurisdiction of the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1969]

INTEGRATION DROPS THOUSANDS OF NEGRO
TEACHERS

(By Bruce Galphin)

ATLANTA.—During a century of segregation, teaching was one of a very few high-status jobs for southern Negroes. In many towns and small cities, teachers and their families were about all there was of a black middle class.

But as the dual school system gradually has been abolished under the pressure of judicial and Congressional mandates, the luster has worn off the teaching profession for Negroes. The one-time security is gone. Integration has cost thousands of Negro teachers their jobs, and it has been particularly rough on black principals.

The biggest upheaval is still to come. This fall, under Justice Department action and HEW guideline enforcement, there will be more new desegregation in the Deep South than in the 14 years since the Supreme Court desegregation decision.

Many small Negro schools will be closed. Others will lose black pupils, and thus black teacher allotments. Still others will gain substantial white enrollment, and along with it, white principals.

No agency has comprehensive figures on the number of Negro teaching personnel facing dismissal or demotion—neither HEW's civil rights office nor the National Education Association nor Negro state teachers' associations nor civil rights organizations like the NAACP.

But a survey made last month in 30 north Georgia counties gives some idea of the dimensions of the problem.

In those 30 counties, chosen because they had made significant progress in eliminating

the dual school system, the number of black principals had been cut by more than half in a five-year period (from 54 to 24) and the number of black teachers by more than a quarter (from 734 to 535).

The figures show the total number of schools shrank during that period. In north Georgia, the percentage of Negro population generally is small, and maintaining a dual system always was costly.

School officials complied with HEW guidelines simply by doing what they had known for years was economically sensible: they abolished small, all-black schools.

In sections of the South with heavy Negro populations, compliance patterns vary, but the net result for black principals and teachers is the same. Even if the school remains in operation, it is almost sure to have a white principal if there is any substantial degree of integration.

HEW compliance guidelines require faculty desegregation, but local school boards retain broad authority over principalships and faculty shrinkage.

The situation has aroused the ire and concern of the Georgia Teachers and Education Association, a black organization soon to be merged with the white State Teachers' Association.

GTEA, which made the survey of the north Georgia counties, is trying to raise \$400,000 "to combat the elimination of black teachers, principals and supervisors." It is asking 13,000 member teachers for one day's pay to fund the campaign.

GTEA already has filed suit in two school districts: Gainesville, where four Negro teachers have lost their contracts, and Pike County, where dismissal of a Negro principal touched off weeks of black student boycotts, protest marches and confrontations with state troopers.

"The elimination of black educators must be stopped not only for the welfare of the educators themselves, but also because the continued loss of professional positions will discourage black students from aspiring to become teachers and other professionals," said Dr. Horace Tate, GTEA executive director.

With a limited budget and staff, GTEA has no clear idea how widespread the problem is outside the 30 counties it surveyed.

In Washington, the National Education Association runs a computerized service to match jobless teachers with professional opportunities. Although the operation was established in part to help black teachers displaced by integration, officials say they have no breakdown on how many of the job-seekers are victims of the process.

Ruby Hurley, southeastern regional director of the NAACP, was unable to give any estimate either. She said the problem was "accelerating," but that "I was tired of telling my people to file complaints with HEW when they don't get any action."

The Atlanta regional office of HEW's civil rights section has received only 30 complaints of faculty demotion or separation since last fall, but Director Paul Rilling agrees that this probably represents only the tip of the iceberg.

If numbers are uncertain, however, the pattern is not. It was established in the border states in the first few years after the 1954 ruling, and pretty much repeated in the upper South following passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

NEA sponsored a study of the 1965-66 faculty displacement and downgrading problem, and warned that it "will likely continue for several years."

At that time, the NEA found few cases in the Deep South, simply because there was little faculty integration.

But in other states of the region, the study documented 668 displacements between May and September of 1965 and conceded that "quite probably no one will ever know the actual statistic."

Part of the effect is masked by growth and turn-over in urban systems. "Negro teachers simply aren't employed in any great numbers for openings in integrated schools," the study found.

To prove the point, the NEA team surveyed 45 predominantly black colleges in the region and found 1,900 out of 51,000 graduates in teaching had found no jobs.

The nub of the problem is the resistance of whites—both educators and laymen—to the notion of black principals over white teachers or black teachers for white pupils.

Preferential treatment for white teachers frequently is defended on grounds that Negro teachers in general have poorer academic preparation.

"Obviously," the NEA report said, "a double standard has been used heretofore (in segregated schools) in employing Negro and white teachers if the Negroes are not regarded as of sufficiently high quality to teach white children in desegregated schools."

Yet NEA does not deny that the academic gap exists. It is the result of decades of segregated, unequal education, and the study strongly urged institution of "imaginative" post-graduate programs to upgrade skills of underqualified teachers.

Although there have been workshops on the subject at Atlanta University, Florida State University and elsewhere, school officials generally have found it simpler just to dismiss or demote black teachers.

The pressure is about to reach its peak because HEW has made this September the deadline for abolishing the dual school system in most districts, and September, 1970, for the remainder.

Both black and white tempers are mounting. In the most segregationist areas of the South, whites are bitter and alarmed about wide-spread integration. Negroes are resentful of the treatment of black teachers and principals. There are increasing indications that black high school students as well as adults and college students are preparing for protest demonstrations in many cities.

It could be a long, hot autumn.

PAUL E. NEVILLE, EDITOR IN
BUFFALO, DIES AT 50

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, my home community of Buffalo, N.Y., was shocked and saddened this past weekend by the fatal illness of the editor of one of our two daily newspapers, Paul E. Neville, 50, executive editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. Neville was stricken at his desk last Friday as he worked to put out another day's edition of the News. He passed away Sunday.

Although he had been in Buffalo for only a dozen years, called to take a top executive position in the News' editorial department, he had assembled a wide circle of friends and was highly respected both locally and nationally in his profession.

The News family has lost one of its own, our community has lost one of its leaders, the journalistic profession has lost one of its ablest technicians and I have lost a friend.

Mr. Speaker, the News tells the story of Paul Neville in its editorial which appeared in its June 23 edition as follows:

PAUL E. NEVILLE

Suddenly and tragically, in the prime of his career and at the moment of his greatest sense of civic pride and satisfaction, the executive editor of The Buffalo Evening News, Paul E. Neville, was seized with a massive stroke at his desk Friday and today he is dead.

Throughout the entire News family, the loss has caused a numbing shock made worse by its abruptness and by the special sadness of a life of tremendous potential snuffed out long before its potential was achieved.

Paul Neville had just observed his 50th birthday; he had just rounded out his third year as executive editor; he had completed a tour as president of the New York State Society of Newspaper Editors and had been elected by his fellow editors to the board of directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

He was just coming into nationally recognized full flower, in short, as one of the leading metropolitan newspaper editors and executives in America. Through Friday's first editions, he was eagerly on the job, still feeling the glow of civic satisfaction at seeing a campaign on which he had personally worked harder than any other at The News, the struggle to assure construction of a multi-sports domed stadium, brought to fruition. But today he is gone, a brilliant career, a dynamic personality, a perceptive and witty mind suddenly all blanked out.

A thorough professional with a newsmen's instincts through and through, Mr. Neville loved nothing more than to be in the middle of a big story. His wide-ranging curiosity and gregarious concept of his editorship caused him to spend as much of his time out in the community as inside the office. A Buffalonian by adoption rather than birth, he undoubtedly had a wider local acquaintanceship in his 12 years here than most newsmen acquire in a lifetime. Generous with his time, talent and energy, he spent himself all too freely, as his untimely death attests.

Forceful and quick in his news and policy judgments, he worked easily and well with people, respected "no-men" as much as "yes-men," valued suggestions, delegated authority well, and nourished a team approach to doing any civic or journalistic job. To most of the staff, he was just Paul or known by the familiar initialed signature of his many memos, "pen." While personally imaginative and receptive to new ideas, one of his greatest if less obvious strengths was a deep regard for continuity and proper form and style—for "doing it right," thinking and acting "first class."

It was this balanced sense of continuity and innovation that particularly marked his three-year editorship at The News, as he introduced many small and gradual changes but shunned large and splashy ones. Yet perhaps his greatest contribution in his whole 12 years as a News executive has been his sharp alertness to and awareness of underlying community trends—this in a time of social and generational upheaval where alertness to swiftly changing undercurrents is indispensable to a successful news-media operation.

Of all the qualities he brought to The News, it could be this instinctive feel for the developing trend beneath the news that will be missed the most. For today, though, it is a sudden absence of the sheer vitality, the brisk plain-talking personality, the down-to-earth good humor of an editor who should still have a whole brilliant career before him that fills The News with a sense of loss and sadness—and of the deepest sympathy for Mrs. Paul E. Neville and the five children in whom their father took such pride.

MINORITY GROUP COMPLETES
UNIQUE CONSTRUCTION-ESTIMATING COURSE

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

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

MINORITY GROUP COMPLETES UNIQUE CONSTRUCTION-ESTIMATING COURSE: PRATT GRADUATES 13 FROM CLASS TO HELP THEM COMPETE WITH WHITE CONTRACTOR

NEW YORK, June 14.—Thirty-one minority-group students have completed a nine-week course on construction estimating at Pratt Institute to enable them to compete more effectively with white contractors. The course, which ended with the awarding of completion certificates at special ceremonies June 12, was the first of its kind offered anywhere in the nation.

The unique program, for blacks and Puerto Ricans who are carpenters, painters, bricklayers, etc., began April 14 and met for two evening sessions weekly at Pratt's School for Continuing Professional Studies under the direction of Dean Gurth I. Abercrombie.

Instructors were two of the top professionals in the construction engineering and architectural fields: Jay Sam Unger, head of the architectural and planning firm of Jay Sam Unger Associates; and Seymour Berger, vice president of McKee-Berger-Mansueto, Inc., construction consultants and engineers.

Pratt Institute is just outside the 653 blocks of Bedford-Stuyvesant, the nation's second biggest black neighborhood (South Side Chicago is the largest). Poverty and progress exist in this six-square-mile ghetto and the black residents plan to rebuild their own community under the federal government's Model Cities Program, begun in 1966. Among the 12 U.S. cities selected for special government funds was New York's Bedford-Stuyvesant area, for which \$29-million was allocated.

"Inexperience in the construction field has been a major problem of minority groups," says Jules Mirel, director of the Pratt School of Continuing Education. "Several residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant approached us for help in learning something about the construction and estimating business, and we promised to do what we could to assist them," he said.

According to Gabriel Prince, organizer of the "United Black Contractors" group, "It does not take any special amount of brains to figure out that many parts of this city, including my own Bedford-Stuyvesant, are going to be built up again, and that black contractors are going to be doing the work. I want to be qualified! The Ford Foundation and the Model Cities Central Policy Committee have had similar courses under consideration for at least 18 months, but all have been slow in starting," said Prince. "Finally, it seemed clear to me that nobody was about to do anything for us in time for it to do any good when the Model Cities funds were distributed in mid-June," Prince said, "so I went to Pratt and asked to be put into the best course in construction estimating."

George M. Raymond, director of Pratt's Center for Community Improvement, a division of Pratt Institute, said he would be interested in helping the Bedford-Stuyvesant area by providing a special course in "The Principles of Construction Estimating." The genesis of the course was this:

David D. Shobe, Government Programs coordinator at Pratt, involved Ron Shiffman, assistant director of the Pratt Center for Community Improvement, who serves under Raymond.

"Financing the program was a primary problem," said Dean Abercrombie. "It would cost \$500 per student, and Pratt offered to pay \$200 of each enrollee's fee, with the hope that the Model Cities Program or the Ford Foundation would pack up the balance. Those enrolling in the course offered to pay as much of it as they could themselves: so far, some have paid as little as \$25; others paid as much as \$100."

"We were so overwhelmed at these fellows' eagerness to dig into their poverty-ridden pockets to invest their own money in such a course," said Pratt's Jules Mirel, "that we decided to go ahead, without knowing where the balance would come from. We wanted to get the best teachers possible for them, so we approached Sam Unger and Seymour Berger of the Pratt teaching staff. They are two of the top people in the construction and architectural fields," Mirel explained, "and they were eager to help because the whole idea was something they strongly believed in."

"I'm particularly interested in helping these people rebuild their community," said Unger, "because I was born in Bedford-Stuyvesant. My philosophy is this: Don't build a curriculum; give them what they need day to day."

Berger expressed his feelings this way: "Hopefully, the end result of this course, and of future courses, will be black contractors who can compete successfully in the construction industry. They are here to learn estimating methods and procedures in construction management that would normally take years to achieve," he continued. "What is needed are more experienced and knowledgeable construction people to teach, so that this great potential can be developed as quickly as possible for the betterment of all."

The course began with 20 students, and ended with 31. "So enthused were those enrolled that, instead of the first class ending at 8:30, as we had planned, it lasted until after 11 p.m." according to Mirel. "We had 103 per cent attendance throughout the nine-week course, with some students bringing friends and wives to classes."

One of the Bedford-Stuyvesant residents who helped initiate the program was Phil Lewis, a Model Cities associate. Lewis, who will soon take a special course on management at the Harvard Business School, said: "Our main desire is to compete!"

"We're tired of promises not being fulfilled," continued another black ghetto resident. "We want results! We need more people like Senator Waldaba Stewart of the city's 18th Senate District, who has been instrumental in helping to organize the black contractors and their programs."

"The phenomenal success of this course has been very gratifying to us," says Pratt's Dean Abercrombie. "We hope a way can be found to continue helping our neighbors in Bedford-Stuyvesant with another course in the future," he said.

Among the many guest lecturers in the nine-week course were: Harry Carroll, chief plan examiner for the New York City Building Department; Irving Gerber, chief of construction for the New York Housing Authority; Edward Kroop, a specialist in plumbing and heating; and Ralph Friedman, an authority on electrical contracting.

Columbia University sent observers to Pratt's special course, with the hope of starting a similar, but probably more expensive, minority-group course in the construction field at a future date.

REPORT OF THE BROCK CAMPUS TOUR

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of leading a group of 22 colleagues in a volunteer tour of American campuses. Organizing into six regional groups, we visited over 50 universities of all types and sizes and personally met with over a thousand students, as well as many faculty, administrators, and other concerned adults. Our main purpose was to listen, not to lecture, and we came away with a new insight into student outlooks. One important result was the following written report, which we submitted to President Nixon on June 18.

Because of the publicity it has received in the national press, the high level of interest it has achieved, and the numerous requests we have received from fellow Members, I insert the report following my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1969.

The President,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We submit to you the following report of campus unrest. The critical urgency of the problem cannot be overstated.

This report reflects our impressions of student attitudes and problems, along with some proposed solutions applicable at local, state and national levels. It represents a general consensus of our 22 man group. However, because each of us undertook this task as individuals, we must reserve the right of members to expand upon, or even disagree with, any specific point.

It is our hope that the findings included in this document will be of use to you in your continued efforts at solving what has become a major national problem.

Respectfully yours,

BILL BROCK, EDWARD BIESTER, GEORGE BUSH, LOU FREY, DONALD RIEGLE, BILL STEIGER, JOHN BUCHANAN, LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, MARVIN ESCH, JAMES HASTINGS, LARRY HOGAN, MANUEL LUJAN, DONALD LUKENS, PETE McCLOSKEY, JACK McDONALD, JERRY PETTIS, ALBERT QUIE, TOM RAILSBACK, PHIL RUPPE, GUY VANDER JAGT, LOWELL WEICKER, WILLIAM WHITEHURST.

REPORT OF THE BROCK CAMPUS TOUR

PREFACE

A deep concern about today's problem of unrest among our youth, and the realization that we possessed little reliable information about events on the American campus prompted us to go out to a variety of colleges and universities to talk with students, faculty, administrators, and other officials on their own ground. We had nothing to sell, no speeches to make, and offered only a desire to know and understand the factors which appear to threaten the destruction of many of our most respected institutions and the alienation of many of this nation's finest students.

The problems confronting higher education are so complex that no study or analytic effort yet mounted can really claim to be compre-

hensive. We recognize the need for continued in-depth research. Nonetheless, we believe we achieved substantial success with respect to our main concern—the acquisition of some degree of personal understanding of the nature of the problem.

We came away from our campus tour both alarmed and encouraged. We were alarmed to discover that this problem is far deeper and far more urgent than most realize, and that it goes far beyond the efforts of organized revolutionaries. By the same token, we were encouraged by the candor, sincerity and basic decency of the vast majority of students we met. Too often, however, we saw their idealism and concern vented in aimless or destructive ways.

If one point is to be emphasized in this report it is that violence in any form, in any measure, under any circumstances, is not a legitimate means of protest or mode of expression—and that it can no more be tolerated in the university community than in the community at large. If there is to be orderly progress and a redress of legitimate student grievances, student violence must be averted.

As Erwin N. Griswold, Solicitor General of the United States, has said:

"The right to disagree—and to manifest disagreement—which the Constitution allows to the individual . . . does not authorize them to carry on their campaign of education and persuasion at the expense of somebody else's liberty. . . ."

It is clear that if violence on our campuses does not end, and if the reaction to it is on the one extreme too lax, or on the other extreme too harsh and indiscriminate, the vast moderate student majority may be forced into the arms of the revolutionaries, and those few who seek to destroy the fabric of higher education will have succeeded.

We agree with the editorial in the June 8 *New York Times*:

"If lasting damage to the independence of the universities is to be avoided, if the society's attention is to be redirected to its larger, more serious problems, violence has to cease and tranquility has to be returned to the campuses."

There is on the campus today a new awareness of potential student power and the emergence of a large group, probably the vast majority of student leaders and a substantial number of intelligent, concerned and perplexed young people, which has genuine concern over what it feels is the difference between the promise and performance of America. While these students have no monolithic leadership or single set of goals, they are fairly united in questioning many of the values of our system. The revolutionaries on campus who desire to destroy our system are few in number. The vast majority of students are not poised on the edge of revolution and have not lost faith in our system. However, many students can be radicalized when violence or confrontation on campus occurs. Also disillusionment in our system by students can grow, even without violence, if we place one label on all students and fail to understand that they raise many areas of legitimate concern.

Perhaps our most important and pressing conclusion is that rash legislative action cutting off funds to entire institutions because of the actions of a minority of students would play directly into the hands of these hard-core revolutionaries. Legislation which treats innocent and guilty alike inadvertently confirms extremist charges that the "establishment" is repressive and indifferent to citizen needs and concerns. We must not put ourselves in the position of aiding the handful of anarchists.

In a period of conflict and turmoil, deep divisions on campus as well as between campus and community are understandable, but

the danger exists that these divisions are polarizing America into two distinct camps. On neither side has there been enough willingness to listen and discuss problems before the fireworks have begun and emotions have been inflamed. Obviously it is time for our traditional American sense of fair play and tolerance to be evidenced by the responsible majority of this nation, young and old. The alternative of students, intolerant and unwilling to reason, and their elders, intolerant and unwilling to reason, constitutes the ingredients of chaos.

To the extent that our universities can foster an environment of trust, participation, involvement and interaction, we believe that the danger of violent confrontation (and the emotional climate which is its prelude) can be reduced. To the extent that this nation can foster an environment of quality, excitement and challenge throughout its total educational system, creative leadership can be developed. In this report we offer proposals aimed at implementing these goals. We can envision no greater tragedy for this nation and the free world than for us to allow our educational system to slowly settle into obsolescence, losing touch with reality and becoming incapable of responding to the needs of students and society.

We also suggest more positive contact between the campus community and the greater community—increased social action programs, volunteer projects and similar activities which provide students with an opportunity to work on pressing human problems side by side with other concerned citizens.

We are convinced that such experiences can be an important supplement to the classroom, acting to restore student faith in the basic soundness of the American system. Additionally, they can demonstrate in positive fashion the sincere good intentions of a significant portion of the adult community—which many students and faculty with whom we met so readily charged with hypocrisy.

Finally, this nation has an enormous stake in preserving our system of higher education. "The task of the university," as Alfred North Whitehead has written, "is the creation of the future as far as rational thought and civilized modes of appreciation can affect the issue." The creation of a better future will indeed be impossible if the free and orderly pursuit of knowledge is jeopardized by the destruction of our colleges and universities either through anarchy, or through a refusal to consider pleas for necessary improvements.

This report, in listing a series of ideas for consideration, is offered not as a panacea, but, hopefully, as a bridge to greater understanding of the problem.

FACTORS IN UNREST

In an effort to most accurately and clearly represent what students were saying and thinking on the campuses we visited, we have listed below areas of concern as they were described to us by the students themselves. In reporting student views, we are in no way passing judgment, but merely trying to convey a better understanding of what the students feel.

Where we have reached conclusions of our own, they have been specifically noted by indentation and italics, so that there can be no confusing the reportorial and analytical portions of this report.

Internal factors Communication

On campus after campus we found widespread criticism from students who feel unable to communicate with administrators and faculty. They believe that no adequate channel is open to them to make their views known. Channels which do exist provide only limited access to individuals who will take responsibility for major decisions.

In some cases, the university structure itself seems at fault. In these instances the modern university is so large, and decision-making so fragmented, the student often finds it difficult to identify the individual or organization that has the final responsibility for a particular policy.

Operating within a large bureaucracy, administrators find it easy or necessary to avoid definitive answers to student inquiries; they pass the inquiries to the faculty, the regents, or the legislatures. These agencies in turn seem even more isolated from the student point of view and even less open to communication.

An immense frustration is built when the student feels he once again must go through a channel which is not "plugged into" the policy-making power of the university.

Charges of communication gaps are leveled against faculty, administrators, and governing boards alike. In many instances students charge that the actions of the overseeing bodies, i.e., regents, trustees, etc., are determined by outside business and political influences. Such boards are looked upon as keepers of the status quo who make no attempt to consult with students on any decisions, including those decisions which directly affect the students.

Students, in turn, seem unaware of the factors and pressures that the governing board must consider and endure.

Faculties are criticized for time spent on consulting work for the government or for private industry, and for spending too much time researching and publishing. These activities, however worthwhile, are seen as isolating the faculties from the concerns and problems of the students.

In our view the non-teaching activities of some faculty members, particularly in large universities, are excessive. The "publish or perish" phrase is not simply a cliché. In many areas it implies a valid criticism.

Responsiveness

Claims of inadequate channels of communication frequently were linked with complaints about the lack of responsiveness to student demands.

This situation is aggravated where there is a lack of agreement, or of shared perspective, between administration and faculty. Despite protestations to the contrary, such circumstances are hardly unusual. Faculty and administration often are at odds on everything from the way to reply to student requests to the quality, method, and timing of university response to student protests.

When university action is taken, or problems are at least under serious review, students who are not involved in the step-by-step deliberations fail to understand the amount of planning required and the complexity involved in the solutions they propose to the university.

Since many universities do not seem to be geared to initiate or administer either quick or long lasting change, increasing passion mounts on both sides of an issue with resulting polarization and alienation of more moderate students who may or may not sympathize with some of the basic requests.

The students feel that it is the administration and the faculty who decide which students will be accepted as student spokesmen. Even when some students are in positions of consultation with the university, administration and faculty, a majority of students may deny that actual representation or communication occurs. On one large campus, for example, a list of student leaders drawn up by the Dean of Students and a list prepared by the editor of the student newspaper had no names in common.

We feel that these and similar situations can only lead to a conclusion that a lack of real or visible responsiveness has been an ingredient in campus conflict.

Student Intolerance

Although most students would deny it, and many would be genuinely surprised by the charge, the intolerance of a substantial portion of students is a contributing factor to the general unrest. Often insulated from day-to-day social responsibilities and contact with other age groups, some students seldom have the opportunity to see our society solving problems or meeting human needs. In the course of study and discussion, however, they are continually exposed to society's many real failures and seeming inconsistencies. The result for many has been a combination of deep social concern and a disenchantment with traditional institutions and approaches to problems.

Frequently students are strong in framing ideal solutions and weak in analyzing the factors involved in the problem and in its solution. Some demand immediate solutions and failing that, rush into confrontation as the "only alternative course". They may resort to "non-negotiable demands", a technique that is often cited as evidence of student intolerance.

The more militant students insist on acting as a group, feeling that their hope of success lies in refusing to deal with opponents on an individual basis. Refusal to negotiate may indeed indicate merely a desire to disrupt for the sake of disruption but it may also reflect a lack of understanding and a lack of skill and confidence in the bargaining techniques long vitally employed in of democratic society.

Such intolerance contains dangerous seeds of self-destruction. Unchecked, it can only breed a like degree of intolerance on the part of those who have made higher educational opportunity available to more young Americans than any society in history.

It should also be recognized that some of the intolerance displayed is purposeful and perhaps irreversible. The revolutionary is determined to remain unappeased in the hope of prompting administration reaction of a sufficiently excessive or violent nature to "radicalize" the moderate student majority. He must seek this goal because radicalism as a force to destroy can achieve no objectives, can obtain no real results on our campuses today without the tacit or even open support of far more responsible and moderate students who may be captured by the events of the moment. In order to be "radicalized", these students must have their emotions preconditioned by a situation (or series of situations) which would generate an initial expression of sympathy toward the avowed aims of the revolutionaries.

Hypocrisy

Students complained that the university, like society, fails to practice what it preaches. They point to teaching and the transmission of learning as the center of a university, and contrast this with faculty efforts to reduce teaching loads in order to have more time for research. Many students accused university administrations of applying a double standard in enforcing regulations. They claimed that students who violated rules as part of a politically motivated or anti-institutional protest were more heavily penalized than those who violated the same rules for other reasons. Replying to the university's often expressed concern for social problems in the community, students point to university expansion into ghetto neighborhoods through programs students call "urban removal."

They charge that academic freedom is a myth when the university's purpose and direction is "subverted" by massive infusion of funds for military and industrial research. In response to the effort to educate the disadvantaged, students charge that too few are admitted and that those admitted find the institution unresponsive to individual needs and problems.

Relevance

Underlying specific issues is a fundamental dispute about the structure of the university and its role in society. A vast gulf exists between the views of faculty and administrators and the views of the students.

It is characterized by the recently published statement of a university student:

"Most of them (the faculty) hold the ideal that the university is a neutral institution, devoted to objective truth. But the people who have power in America have pervaded this institution. The university could never be neutral in our present society—profit making and war making—I'd be skeptical that the university could assume a neutral posture. The university ought to be a partisan of the progressive forces in society."

This student's view is an obvious departure from the generally held public view of a university as an isolated tower that transmits and enlarges knowledge in the process of preparing individuals for careers. This student opinion requires that the university be relevant to our era and its problems, that it be committed to an active role as a progressive force. What is important about this perspective is that it is expounded not by a minority of revolutionaries but by very large numbers of sincere and highly motivated young people.

For the student, a clear definition of this relevancy is very difficult, since its development is in a formative stage and its meaning changes from area to area. On one hand, for the university to be relevant, it is held that it must cease to uphold traditional "establishment" institutions and systems. In this context, many universities have seen demonstrations against campus recruiting by various corporations involved in defense contracts, against the inclusion of ROTC in the curriculum, and against certain research projects. On the other hand, it is suggested that these ties must be replaced with new commitments to support urban improvement, and the extension of civil rights. Clearly many complaints about specific course requirements are closely related to this concern for the university's relevance. The students ask, "What is a university? What should the relationship be between the university and the surrounding community?" They are asking to what extent higher education should be radically altered to prepare graduates to go into society to change things.

They are asking how much of what they learn is "relevant" to today's society. They would like to see a closer relationship between their courses and the problems they see. They are asking for courses which can provide answers to problems of race, poverty, and economic oppression, and they regard present course offerings as noticeably lacking in this relationship. In one notable instance these demands would be satisfied by nothing less than student control of the curriculum, but large numbers of students who do not make such radical demands are nonetheless asking for a more "relevant" education.

Some students appear to be more caught up in contemporary problems rather than in the difficult process of learning needed to toughen and strengthen their minds to achieve workable solutions to unsolved problems. In these students we found an impatience with and a lack of appreciation of method and process, whether it be the intellectual method of abstraction and generalization or the process of practicing democracy as a value in itself.

Over-reaction

The student voices deep concern about methods used to respond to student confrontations. Many feel that the university has over-reacted with excessive force. They point to incidents involving clubbing and gassing demonstrators and bystanders, as ex-

amples of an "oppressive system." On numerous occasions moderate leaders of peaceful demonstrations cited the subsequent inability to prevent individual acts of provocation and violence by radical students, thereby permitting a confrontation to erupt into violence. Likewise, students pointed to numerous instances of over-aggressive reaction by individual law officials which had the effect of radicalizing otherwise passive on-lookers, turning a relatively small-scale disturbance into a general battle.¹

Many individual students pointed to the Dartmouth procedure (a court injunction against the occupation of a building, and the peaceful and quiet arrest of demonstrators) as the best approach.

Lack of combined faculty-administration action aggravates a situation, and in some instances, a slow response due to a reluctance to act created further difficulties. In other instances an immediate resort to excessive force exaggerated the problem.

The student frequently complains of double jeopardy—prosecution by civil authorities and then by the university. He maintains that those who violate a university regulation in the more traditional manner, as a prank, are treated more lightly than those who violate the same rule for a political purpose.

Additional stress is borne by the administrator because of his role of buffer between the faculty and the governing board. He is subject to the direction of both and often the approval of neither.

Blacks at Predominantly Black Institutions
There is a depth of bitterness in even the most moderate of black students at black institutions that surpasses anything found among the whites.

The black student expresses bitterness about our system from personal experience. Many white students expressed concern about problems such as discrimination, poverty and hunger, but unlike the black students, most of them stated they had not personally experienced these problems. As more than one black student said—"You have to be black to understand."

A substantial number of black students at predominantly black institutions stated that they have lost faith in our political system, which over the years has promised them much, but in their opinion, delivered little. They say there "are political wolves in the South and political foxes in the North." Many of the blacks want desperately to believe in the system, but can see no real progress being made. Their problem is more external than internal. They are concerned about non-college problems which they identify as discrimination, economic oppression. They ask to be respected and desire true loss of identity, poverty, hunger and racism. economic opportunity. Words and promises will no longer suffice.

In many cases the militant blacks at predominantly black campuses are looking for a dramatic and, if necessary, violent upheaval in the United States. They would acknowledge our good intentions, but felt that the faster and more complete the failure of moderate programs, the sooner the final and absolute confrontation would occur. When asked how they would change the system, or what changes they would make, they didn't have an answer—but said that problem would take care of itself.

The black feels that the white radical is playing a game, and only need shave his beard and cut his hair in order to melt into the mainstream of the establishment, while the black student cannot.

The main goal of the majority of black students seemed to be service to their "black brothers and sisters". Some said that they

¹ For a more detailed treatment of this process, see the appendix "Dynamics of a Confrontation."

would rather die for their people in the streets of the United States than in Vietnam.

The black students in most cases stated that their schools are inferior to white institutions, even when operated by the same authority, such as a state board of regents. In many cases, they also stated that, because of their inferior primary and secondary education, they are unable to compete with the white graduate or in predominately white schools. Many black educators and students felt that the H.E.W. guidelines should be revised until our entire educational system is corrected, to allow for the continued existence of predominately black schools. The rationale offered was that the black schools would allow many blacks to attend college who couldn't get, or stay, in white colleges. Further it would allow the blacks to retain their own pride and identity and find themselves, instead of being submerged in predominantly white schools. The black schools would be able to offer many courses and programs in college which would allow the blacks to "catch up" to their white college counterparts who have received a better primary and secondary education.

The educators and students also suggested more programs, based on the Head Start concept, in the high schools or between high school and college to raise the educational level. They emphasized that the programs would work best if blacks were involved at all levels, i.e., they felt only a black could truly understand the problems faced by another black.

Relative to the relaxation of HEW guidelines, we discovered that the black institutions are making a concerted effort to recruit white students and faculty. While they have been moderately successful as far as faculty are concerned, they say it is extremely difficult to convince white students to attend a predominately black institution.

Non-White Student Issues

The primary concern of minority students is to acquire the kind of education they perceive as essential to being able to return to their communities and better the conditions of their people. They want their education to provide the training they need to deal with the problems of minority groups in America, and they see higher education as the best avenue to their personal development.

A particular example of the demand for relevance has been the widespread support for minority studies programs by blacks and other non-white minorities. Most of the activity in this area has taken place on predominantly white campuses, and is often discussed within the framework of the problems of minority group students when they find themselves in a basically all-white environment. The students like to compare their position on a campus where they constitute less than two per cent of the student body, to the problems faced by a white student if he were to attend a university where the student body was 98 per cent black. Both faculty and students said that without thorough preparation of internal college processes and organization, increases in non-white admissions can result in the severe disillusionment of non-white students and a backlash among others on campus. They expressed the feeling that the courses offered by the university do not give adequate coverage to blacks and other minorities in American history and in other subjects dealing with the processes of American society. They feel that such courses are cast in terms and events totally foreign to the experience of most black students. It is claimed that an economics course which fails to present "accurate" views of economic conditions of ghetto life is not relevant, and history courses designed for middle class whites are not relevant for blacks.

The minority groups say that much of the difficulty turns on the inadequacies of the

public school systems in deprived areas, as well as disadvantages which pervaded their early lives. Failure to respond to these concerns, we were told, would threaten to drive the black activists into the ranks of the revolutionaries.

Demands for Black Studies Departments, minority student centers and the admission of large numbers of minority students who often lack adequate preparation are issues not easily resolved. A number of universities are beginning creatively to make the kinds of adjustments needed. Of special interest are the programs now in operation at a few schools to accept students who do not meet normal requirements for entrance, to provide financial aid, special tutoring and courses, and enrollment in a five year program leading to a degree.

It is important to make a clear distinction between the purposes and goals of black militant students and white revolutionaries. Aside from similarities in tactics, there are substantial differences. Without doubt, the alienation and bitterness among some black students is so great that they have completely lost faith in the ability of the nation to remove obstacles to full equality (see preceding section). Many black student activists on predominantly white campuses, however, appear to be seeking to reform the university, to make it better suited to serve their needs and desires, to create the mechanism for training students from minority groups to go back into their communities to deal with major social and economic problems, and not to destroy the university. This is in contrast to the goal of destroying the institution held by some white and black revolutionaries. Thus black student militants have held the white revolutionaries at arm's length—forming alliances when useful but preserving their separate identity and independence. By the same token, the formal involvement of black student groups in issues not directly related to minority student problems has been, in most cases, limited.

Large Versus Small Institutions

An immediate difference appears in the ability of smaller institutions to deal with some problems more readily and with greater acuity than the multi-university. Size affects responsiveness, communications and many other needs. Meeting them at larger schools is more difficult, but it is not impossible, and the effort must be made.

Obviously, there are very good reasons for the tremendous growth of some institutions in recent years. The population explosion, increasing demand for mass education, university financing, and the national reputation of specific institutions have all resulted in the development of a number of very large schools.

The challenge is to find ways to preserve the benefits of size while overcoming its disadvantages. We must seek ways to strengthen the ability of our universities to provide close personal relationships and the experiences available in small group settings. Greater development of community colleges, and even cluster colleges around the large university, can also play an important part in "rehumanizing" the learning process.

External factors

As with the section on internal factors of student unrest, our main concern is to clearly depict what the students themselves told us. All interpretation and analysis by ourselves is included in separate indented, italicized passages.

Students relayed to us deep feelings about "the System", "the Establishment", etc. The word, System, covers a good deal and its components vary from campus to campus. In all we have discerned certain common threads. The System, as they define it, is characterized essentially as follows:

Racism

The student perceives the gulf between the promise and performance of this nation

with respect to race relations. He sees inequality of opportunity, failure of the educational system, and he relates these to the country as a whole as well as to the university. For the most part, we found a perceived neglect of human problems to be the single largest motivating force behind the alienation of today's student. Whether in black studies questions, or in the university's relation with its surrounding community, an over-riding concern was the status of minority groups.

Military Industrial Complex

There is considerable student opposition to our formidable Defense budget. Why, they ask, do funds for domestic and educational programs get cut while the Defense budget goes almost unchallenged? They see a close relationship between the academic community and the military. They see university presidents sitting as members of boards of large industrial corporations. They see cuts being made in funds to hire teachers while boards of trustees authorize new buildings and facilities in order to receive greater Federal research funds.

Poverty and Hunger

In this age of affluence the medium of television brings home to people the gap between well-to-do and the poor. There is a growing dissatisfaction on the part of students with the response of the nation to the disadvantaged. They are not willing to wait to overcome decades of poverty and racial intolerance, and they question apparent past inaction. The immediate problems around the college campus often become the focal point for their attention. The failure of many institutions to act with regard for the neighborhood around them has caused the student to take as his own the cause of the Harlem or Woodlawn resident.

Certainly, student involvement in such matters is not new: witness the civil rights marches of the early 1960's. What is new is the intense impatience with change or the apparent lack of change in the lives of many Americans.

Imperialism and the Third World

On a number of campuses a recurring question related to the role of the United States and the problems of what is termed the "Third World" (blacks, Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, etc.). The view expressed was that we are the imperialists in Vietnam, in Formosa, in Latin America, and that the emerging nations are a new force with whom we have not yet come to grips. Some feel we are not treating other people in the world fairly, and from the view of the student, we are paying the price of not heeding the views and needs of others. In their view, self-determination, as expressed by the United States, is a pious proclamation which relates only to those with whom we agree.

Police State

The experience of one school more clearly demonstrates this problem than any other. When the students left in the summer of 1968 the campus police wore no weapons. When the students returned in the Fall of 1968 the campus police were equipped with billy clubs, guns, and mace. For a school that had experienced no difficulty, the students questioned why this was done. As violence grows, and as counter-violence escalates, the student views his relationship with both the university and the outside world as increasingly beset by the police and National Guard. Each demonstration brings with it the threat of violence on both sides.

Economic Oppression

The readiness of legislatures and alumni to strike back at campus turbulence seems only to reinforce the student's view that big government and big industry more and more dominate the university and society. What has happened at Peoples Park in Berkeley, on Mifflin Street in Madison, and other places, are examples of a new concern for

matters outside the university, yet, in which the university plays a role. Student housing, the increases in rent rates, merchants who charge higher prices to students (as they do to ghetto residents) are examples used by students to justify their claims of oppression.

Remoteness From Power

A very large part of the alienation of students stems from their feeling that they cannot control their own destiny. Institutions are too large, and too remote for the individual to have an opportunity to change that which he does not like. The multiversity concept is often pointed to here, as is the overwhelming size of government, industry, and labor unions.

Misplaced Priorities

Over and over again we heard about priorities and the feeling that these are "out of whack" in the United States. The space program, large farm subsidies, cuts in education, the Defense budget, and more, all were cited as examples of the failure of our society to meet its urgent domestic needs.

Vietnam

It is apparent that Vietnam originally served as one of the major factors in radicalizing students. It is still a major source of alienation and dissatisfaction with our society and our national government. Many consider the war immoral and unjust. An increasing number vow to take any steps necessary to avoid military service.

However, it was repeatedly brought home to us by radicals and moderates alike that an end to the Vietnam war would not mean an end to campus unrest—or even a major, long-range, reduction of tensions.

The Draft

Coupled with Vietnam the operations of the Selective Service System serve as a significant problem among students. The present administration of the draft is viewed as totally unsatisfactory, as being unjust to minority groups particularly, and as a tool of the Federal Government to enforce discipline. Faculty and students alike tend to equate expulsion from the university with compulsory service in Vietnam.

Values: Materialism

As one student put it, "This is a 'thing' culture, and I want it to be a 'people' culture." In the midst of affluence the students see a society in which a high value is placed on material things. There is a longing for a belief, a belief in something other than material things. There is a deep conviction on the part of many students that they want to do something to help others, not only themselves. This is part of a rejection of materialism as viewed by the student. Moreover, there is a questioning of the fundamental values of our society, and our system of government.

Over-reaction

As can be seen from the portion of this report which analyzes confrontation, the efforts to control violence—as well as those steps leading to violence—too often create an over-reaction on the part of all concerned. In our view there has been an over-reaction on the part of students to what they consider to be the unresponsiveness of the institutions to legitimate calls for change.

This compounds what under the best of circumstances is a complex problem. But an excessive reaction from the outside world, aroused and disturbed as it is, does little to help. In a violent situation, students, faculty, administration and the community, are caught in a tangled web of sympathy, fear, reaction and frustration. Obviously then, as the Eisenhower Commission on Violence has said in its most recent report: "Over reaction in response to a violent illegal situation can be very dangerous."

The idea that campus violence comes from only a few is a myth. There are many dedicated, bright students who are concerned

about the problems but who are not yet violent. They have not, however, rejected completely the view that they should resort to violence. Unfortunately, they can point to some campuses where violence has produced results.

Hypocrisy

Through all the external and internal factors runs this thread. Each campus would produce differing examples of this theme, but it is an underlying feeling on the part of the students.

Students believe that our society is hypocritical. They point to the treatment of blacks while contrasting this to the ideal of the Declaration of Independence; they see poverty in the midst of plenty.

The Media

Most of the people we talked with stated the opinion that superficial mass media coverage was contributing to the widening disillusionment and misunderstanding between the public and the nation's campuses. The media, particularly that utilizing the visual impression, concentrates on the dramatic, the sensational, the vivid acts of violence or disorder.

There is altogether too little effort made to thoughtfully explore the underlying issues and problems that concern the vast majority of students and educators who genuinely want to change things for the better. Not only does this distorted coverage inflame the worst fears and stereotypes in the public mind, but it adds to the frustrations of those trying to work for progress and constructive change on campus.

We believe the media can and must become a more powerful forum for bridging the "perception and understanding" gap between the public and our universities.

The very nature of modern communications—visual, instantaneous—plays a role both in determining the tactics of demonstrators and in shaping public opinion about events on a campus. The public focuses on disorders, and these have occurred with sufficient frequency to leave the impression that little else is taking place in higher education.

The point to be made is that the media can offer a mechanism by which misconceptions can be corrected. Although some publications and broadcasting networks have devoted substantial time and effort to excellent indepth studies of the factors discussed in this report, more is required if understanding is to be created.

IDEAS FOR CONSIDERATION

As we learned, there is no single answer, nor any set of answers, to the problems faced by students or our society. The internal and external factors which we have tried to catalogue here lead us, nevertheless, to suggest for your consideration, Mr. President, a series of ideas which we believe merit urgent consideration.

1. No repressive legislation. Any action by the Congress or others which would, for example, penalize innocent and guilty alike by cutting off all aid to any institution which has experienced difficulty would only serve to confirm the cry of the revolutionaries and compound the problem for each university. This holds, also, for any action which would establish mediation or conciliation on the part of the Federal government. In our opinion, the fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community.

2. Establish a Commission on Higher Education. In light of our findings we believe that a Presidential Commission on Higher Education would be a valuable step. Running through our report are examples of problems which students, faculty, and administrators have raised and which deserve further exploration. What is the role of the Federal government in research? What has this contributed to creating priorities within the

university? How best can communication be opened and maintained? How well does this report reflect the reality of the American college scene? These and more would be appropriate questions for such a Commission which we believe should include a thoroughly representative selection of students, faculty, and administrators together with the general public. We do not foresee an investigative body but rather one which can help to create understanding among members of the academic community, as well as the general public.

3. Open communication to university community. We have found that many were surprised by our visit and by our willingness to listen and learn. There is a need to expand lines of communication. We urge that Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, the White House staff, and others in the Executive Branch begin an increasing effort for this kind of two-way street of listening, learning and responding. Once our communication has become established it will be important to sustain it. Some of the questions raised by students were truly the kind which deserve and demand answers. Some of the viewpoints expressed by students deserve understanding. And some of the misconceptions of the system of government within which we operate desperately need correction. This can best be done, we believe, through an ongoing program of communication.

4. Lower the voting age. There is no question that the American college student for the most part is better educated and more vitally concerned with contemporary problems in our country than at any previous time in our history. We feel that active involvement in the political process can constructively focus his idealism on the most effective means of change in a free society.

The right to vote will give Young America the chance to become a responsible, participating part of our system. In essence they will have the chance to put their performance where their words are.

Between the time they become eligible for the draft, and the time they presently become eligible to vote, there is a natural tendency to lose interest in politics and government because there is no right to participate. An extension of the franchise to the age of 18 when their interest is high can help engender in our youth (and our future leadership) an awareness of the full meaning of democracy.

5. Draft reform. In line with your own recommendations for reform of the Selective Service System, we believe Congress should move to act promptly on this important issue. It is a matter which affects hundreds of thousands of American young people and it is presently a sword over their heads. This can be improved and positive action on the matter would be significant.

6. Encourage student participation in politics. We found that the overwhelming majority of students with whom we visited hold little regard for either political party. The questioning of our system of government points to a loss of confidence in established institutions and that includes political parties. An increase in this loss of confidence poses a serious danger to the viable functioning of American government. Just as government must be responsive, so must political parties be responsive and open.

7. Expand opportunities for involvement. We found an encouraging desire on the part of many students to do something to help overcome the problems of our society. This dedication or commitment to help others is a hopeful, important area which should be encouraged. Specifically, we recommend establishing a *National Youth Foundation*. We believe this concept should be initiated in order to better utilize the energy and resources of student groups. Models of student-community involvement were found at the

University of South Carolina, Radcliff and Michigan State University, among others, and we urge legislation to foster and encourage this opportunity for experience, learning and participation.

We also recommend establishing a *Student Teacher Corps*. Many more students are considering entering the teaching profession and this idea is one which we feel should be encouraged. In concert with the Teacher Corps, the student teacher concept can be a valuable tool to tap student potential and expand the learning opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Further, we recommend increasing our support of the *College Work-Study Program*, *National Defense Student Loan Program*, and *the Educational Opportunity Grant Program*. These three Federal programs would be beneficial in meeting the needs of students and the institutions in responding to student concerns. They are budgeted at levels far below the authorization, and we believe they should be increased.

From the community at large, American business, which has played such a large role in financially supporting higher education, must commit human resources as well. Expanded job-opportunity programs, work-studies programs, business men and other community leaders teaching on campus, intern and apprentice efforts, leadership in student-community problem solving, attendance at campus forums, among others, could measurably enhance the experience-learning process.

8. Coordinate youth programs. We think it would be helpful if an effort were made to coordinate all the present youth programs of the Federal government through one central office. At the moment there is considerable proliferation among many agencies as well as duplication of effort. In order to more effectively use the present resources of the Federal government we urge your consideration of a mechanism to coordinate and follow-through the work of our numerous programs and agencies.

9. Perspective. There is a need to mobilize opinion and resources. A sense of perspective is lacking on the part of the students and on the part of the public. What students are saying is, in some cases, the same as what the average American is saying regarding priorities, responsiveness, and humanization. Presidential leadership, governmental concern, and communication are all a part of the necessary work which must be undertaken if we are to replace revolution with reform, and despair with hope. Clearly we have found that violence is no answer, and that violence as a means to achieve an end is counter-productive. The crucial factor in the widening gap between students and others is the student's perception of reality. That must be understood by all who seek solutions. This requires of us comprehension, and of the student, understanding.

10. Balance. Henry Thoreau observed that, "There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root."

To take an isolated view of our universities as the one weak link in our educational system is to unfairly single out college students, their parents, professors and school administrators.

We must remember that the average college freshman has already undergone a dozen years of formal education before he enters the gates of the university. Obviously, he is going to reflect, at least in some measure, the strengths and weaknesses of the training he has already received. Many of his attitudes and many of the factors which may lead him into difficulties on campus, have already been implanted.

Therefore, a sweeping change in campus conditions alone is no guarantee of a return to orderly progress in our universities. There exist imperfections in our educational sys-

tem from pre-school programs to graduate studies. These flaws in American education deserve the immediate and thorough attention of the nation. The problems which have already surfaced on the college campus exist in various dormant forms in our secondary schools, and the inadequacies which foster them can often be traced back even further. Until consistent, challenging, quality education becomes a reality, the problem will remain.

APPENDIX

Dynamics of Confrontation

Every stage of college confrontation—"before", "during" and "after"—is represented among the Task Force visits, including:

Tranquil campuses: With no history of, and little likelihood of, disruption.

Uneasy campuses: With some of the ingredients of discontent.

Troubled campuses: With various forms of group civil disobedience, e.g. sit-ins, protest rallies, occupation of buildings.

Paralyzed campuses: With civil war and open military siege.

Convalescent campuses: With diverse groups struggling to heal the wounds of confrontation and resolve differences. But the seeds of instability remain and there are conflicting opinions as to whether real progress or continuing instability will result.

Although schools vary widely in region, size, student body profile, structure, governance, and campus issues, there does emerge a common and almost predictable pattern of escalating circumstances through which a university can slide from dissent to open confrontation and chaos. This progressive breakdown is by no means inexorable on every campus, since only a few hundred of the nation's 2500 colleges have experienced disruption.

On many campuses a good mix of conditions, plus cooperation among students, faculty, and administration continues to make it possible to resolve differences without open confrontation and to make progress as a community. These influences toward rational progress are mentioned elsewhere in the report.

The temptation to oversimplify cause and effect relationships should be resisted—keeping in mind that some schools with much trouble have been working hardest, albeit unsuccessfully, to develop progressive change and self-governance.

However, the frequency of confrontation has increased at such an alarming rate over the last year, that it is well to look at the negative conditions which seem to accompany crisis. Once the dynamics of this process start to spiral ahead, the forward momentum and the fragility of any equilibrium lead to an almost inevitable escalation of risk, danger, and lack of coordinated civilized control over events.

Anatomy of conflict

1. The underlying malaise and frustration with both societal and personal issues—coupled with the existence of hardened revolutionaries among students and their sympathizers or even counterparts among the faculty.

2. Identification of an emotional issue which has broader appeal to the target group—non-violent moderates. The issue may be local and narrowly defined, e.g. minority studies, student participation, education reforms—or it may be broader and more symbolic, e.g. the "people's park," military involvement like ROTC or research, reaction to police or military force.

3. In most cases, confrontation comes only after frequent requests for change have failed or gotten bogged down. These attempts may cover several months during which there appears to be little or no action or responsiveness other than perhaps talk or committee wheel spinning. These complaints and/or demands may be legitimate, or they may be a deliberately escalating sequence designed to

force confrontation. The reasons for slow action become less important than the absence of results—even though, ironically, the problems are sometimes not within the complete control of the immediate university community. Occasionally, militant radicals may seek violence and confrontation immediately, though this often fails from lack of moderate student support.

4. During this period, faculty and administration are unable to coalesce around initiation of prompt change. This usually results in increased polarization and alienation of more moderate students who sympathize with some of the basic ideas for change.

5. At some time, often almost spontaneously, there is a student-initiated provocation or minor confrontation, which might take the form of a sit-in or rally. Sometimes, incidents such as rock-throwing, yelling obscenities and destruction of property occur. Lack of good, clear, timely communications among faculty, students, and administration begins to exacerbate the crisis. Misinformation becomes more common than good information.

6. This provocation is then often met by excessive and/or indiscriminate rebuff, including the use of out-dated and unenforceable disciplinary procedures or even police in large numbers, weapons, etc. At this point, the moderates, carefully preconditioned to a general feeling of sympathy by events, by fellow students of a more radical orientation, and even by some faculty, and motivated by their lack of confidence and respect for the establishment, as well as by the immediate violation of "their community", join the fray in ever-increasing numbers. It is not difficult to imagine the recruits gained from witnessing a clubbing, tear-gassing, or firing of riot guns. Such an overwhelming situation can readily give the revolutionary cause legitimacy in the eyes of thousands of campus moderates. Thus, it accelerates the process of "radicalizing" a major portion of the student body. In most cases this change is irreversible once made. By this time, the original issue has given way to far broader symbolic implications—and the original core of radicals, whether SDS or some other, have been swept aside by the tide of events. No matter—they have achieved their objective.

7. Positions of all parties become hardened, alternatives narrow as everyone stands on "principle", and virtually no one has full control over events. Finally, because of the excesses on both sides, there usually ensues a period of negotiations where all sides respond to pressures and some sort of compromise is worked out—but only because the pressures are so intense.

8. Relative calm returns, but left behind is an atmosphere of latent crisis. Student attitudes are more embittered and there may be a polarization among faculty, administrators, and most certainly, the surrounding public. To many, there is a general verification of the principle that only the strategy and tactics of confrontation can produce meaningful change, at least in the short run. Others sometimes see a few seeds of progress along with continuing, and perhaps more serious problems.

WHO WILL WEEP FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, activities in the recent days make it more and more apparent that the mothers and fathers of America are not going to permit violation of their children's sexual privacy by schools under some farfetched theory of neoeducation.

Several letters and news clippings follow my remarks:

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.,
May 28, 1969.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read the Congressional Record containing your comments on the monstrous sex education programs designed to devour the moral fibre of American youth. Please accept my gratitude for your courageous attack on the anti-God crusaders promoting this filth. It's too bad that all your colleagues aren't also All American. Too many of them have never bothered to learn that they are supposed to be representing people of a nation founded under God; therefore, have lent their services to any and every anti-American and anti-God movement making the headlines of a controlled press.

Your comments about "Hitler's Children" stirred my memory. (April 16, 1969—E-2796) Years ago, while in my teens, I wept for these children. The movie, "Hitler's Children" should be required viewing for today's young people. Perhaps many of them would do as I did and identify with the teenage girl carted off to a breeding camp and later sterilized because she refused to become sexual community property. Still vivid in my mind are the strong character traits this girl possessed. These were instilled by a school teacher!

Today, via the educational process, our children are being instructed in the technique of coitus; are being told they must decide for themselves whether premarital sexual relationships are moral or immoral; are being given contraceptive information in some schools . . . to spare them the "burden of unwanted children"; and being told the old "thou shalt not's" no longer apply.

Parents who protest this evil animalistic teaching are told they must face the necessity of an ethical-humanistic-religious approach toward sexuality. Those who refuse to swallow this hogwash are vigorously attacked by the NEA, PTA, SIECUS, SHES, Sexology, and all the other organized psycho-sexual gulls. Even U.S. Education Commissioner James E. Allen (according to a UPI report) said, "The biggest problem in sex education is not the children, but the damn parents." The uneducable intelligentsia and Humanist devil's angels promoting sexual instruction that degrades, demoralizes and arouses sexual curiosity in public school children, K through 12, have a string of labels for disagreeing citizens. These include those long ago coined by the Communist party . . . "fascist"; "right-wing extremist"; "sexual hangup"; "illiterate"; "Birchers"; "conservatives"; and lately, apparently the dirtiest name of all, "Christian Crusaders". I almost forgot, these parents and God-fearing Americans are also called "a minority" and there are no laws to protect them.

In the state of Illinois, such parents are excluded from appointment to the Sex Education Advisory Board by a law that reads in part, "The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall appoint 4 persons to the Advisory Board who shall be members of, and shall represent the general public. In making such appointments, the Superintendent shall give due consideration to the recommendations of various religious, professional, civic and educational groups interested in providing sex education in public schools." (emphasis added)

So you see, Sir, by the very law itself, parents who treasure the responsibilities and privileges of parenthood; who not only are willing to but do impart sex education to their children and who do not want the public school system invading this area of personal privacy, are no longer a part of the "general public" in Illinois.

A policy statement from the Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board sets forth the following double talk: "... family life and sex education in Illinois should not violate the religious principles of the students or parents." Three paragraphs later this same board states, "... We are now moving toward a more ethical-humanistic-religious approach based upon both facts and values."

An ethical-humanistic-religious approach definitely violates Judeo-Christian religious principles. It further violates the principles of any person believing in a Supreme Being because "humanism presupposes man's sole dependence on natural and social resources and acknowledges no supernatural power. Humanists believe that morality is based on the knowledge that men are inter-dependent and, therefore, responsible to one another." (*Gale's Encyclopedia of Associations*, 5th Edition.)

This Humanist pack of anti-God, anti-Christ promoters also plans to "promote ethical educational curricula as an alternative to religious training" in our nation's public schools. Already, their educational susceptes are force-feeding this "ethical educational curricula" and the Humanist religion to American children under the guise of sex education, family life, group dynamics, rational thinking and other equally enticing names.

A sweet little old lady "friend" is fitting around the countryside spouting polly-adlerish advice to boys and girls, even using four-letter words describing sexual activity sans embarrassment. Sexologists with degrees in higher perversion are writing and filming some of the material teens and tots are told to absorb. Computer makers are helping program nothing-is-wrong-with-looking-at-the-genitals-of-the-opposite-sex data into students' minds. Smut peddlers, filth purveyors and sex orgy organizers are drooling over their anticipated financial gains; and the United States of America is indeed almost the "over-ripe fruit" ready for the picking by the beast of Communism.

Without a doubt, Education USA is playing hide and sleaz with parent-reared children who have been taught to obey the Ten Commandments. Now HEW plans to use taxpayers' money to give future sexologists a headstart. They plan to protect children of the poor from the corruption of a family environment; save them from a mother's warm and loving arms; and deliver them from the evil joy of affectionately sharing a meager treat with siblings.

Perhaps HEWers subscribe to the high calibre publication *Phi Delta Kappan* which circulated an "Early Childhood Education Special Edition" in March, 1969. In this issue, James B. McDonald, professor of education, University of Wisconsin, penned an article entitled "A Proper Curriculum for Young Children." I quote Mr. McDonald: "... Much of the rest of a child's 'normal' life holds similarly competing possibilities. Playing with mother's pots and pans will fascinate the very young and is of great interest and value; but if the child were placed in a school setting with blocks and other carefully selected objects for developing perception and dexterity, would this not be a potentially much better environment?"

"For many years many of us have assumed that putting the child in school at an early age takes him out of his natural environment and puts him in a contrived setting. Only recently has our understanding of the ecology of human living and the nature of man's relationship to his technology clearly forced us to realize that the choice for educating young children is not between a contrived and a natural environment, but between a planned and haphazard man-made environment. This new understanding suggests that we should as a society deliberately intervene, as early and as often and for as long a time as possible, to provide the optimum man-made environment for our chil-

dren... (this environment) must have qualities which elicit and shape human potential in an ethically acceptable way..."

Such mousey-tongue philosophy denies the wisdom of Almighty God! He placed His only begotten Son in a family setting for proper rearing! Woe unto them who think themselves wiser than God!

Childhood for those already born is criminal, therefore should be abolished, according to the Communist International Conspiracy (CIC).

Preventing future births is the duty of sex educators? Illinois Sex Education Advisory Board member Howard S. Hoyman has said children are growing up in a society losing its consensus on such issues as abortion, contraception, premarital coitus and masturbation. He also said a new, more permissive sex standard for both sexes is emerging. This educator says, "I now believe that, whether we like it or not, we will have to face up to teaching about contraception in our secondary schools." (*The Educators Digest*, Feb. 1969).

With the Humanist morality and situation ethics "friends" teaching our youngsters how to prevent pregnancy while having coitus; HEWers preventing tots from ever hearing the teaching of God's doctrine and rules for moral conduct; parental authority being usurped by the public school system; George Orwell's 1984 will come long before that year. The hammer and sickle welders predict 1972.

Why are so many parents too blind to see and to apathetic to care that their babies will have the security of slavery?

Yesteryear, America wept for "Hitler's Children". Tomorrow, who will weep for her's?

Sincerely,

FRANCES H. PURCELL.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 6, 1969]

SEX EDUCATION FOES ASSAILED BY HEAD OF
TEACHERS' UNION
(By Marvin Coble)

The president of the Montgomery County Education Association charged yesterday that opponents of sex education are using the issue "as a club to attack public education and representative government itself."

"While it is the responsibility of the school administration to defend the philosophy of the sex education curriculum, the teachers association itself must defend against the thinly disguised political attack which is being made upon public education," said Dr. J. David Eberly.

His comments are contained in a special 16-page report being sent to MCEA's 3,800 members.

CALLS IT 'COVER UP'

Citing a rally held in the county last week by 700 persons opposed to sex education, Eberly said:

"This rally wasn't what it seemed. It was a cover-up for a much larger and much more dangerous motive than to ban sex education programs in the schools. It is a deliberate attempt by forces hostile to the spirit of public education to use an emotional issue to inflame and distort public opinion."

Eberly said the rally was marked by the "communist plot and devils-are-at-work philosophy" espoused by the John Birch Society, the Christian Crusade, the American Education Lobby, the Liberty Lobby "and the raft of other extremists."

He warned the teachers to fight any attempts by "extremists to take over," warning that they then might seek elective office.

"And what might they do if they were in the educational drivers' seat?" Eberly asked. "Watch out for textbook censorship, firing of teachers who disagree with the 'official line' and the end of funded budgets for the educational programs we've all been fighting for."

Last week's rally, sponsored by the fundamentalist American Council of Christian

Churches of Maryland, kicked off a statewide drive for the repeal of Maryland's 1967 education law requiring a sex education program in all grades, starting in kindergarten.

Montgomery now gives sex education in the 8th and 11th grades and conducts a pilot sex education program in 11 elementary schools. Most criticism has been directed at the elementary program, which will be expanded next year to include 15 or 20 additional Montgomery schools.

EXPLAINS PROGRAM

The county's school system has explained its sex education program in a leaflet given to children to take home to their parents.

This leaflet says the "Family Life and Sex Education" curriculum guide being used in the 11 elementary schools contains 216 pages, only 10 of which "deal with what is commonly referred to as 'sex education'."

"The average child, over his seven-year elementary school career, in kindergarten through sixth grade, would devote about 250 hours to family life education," the leaflet says. "At most, six to eight hours, and all of that in the fifth grade, would be devoted to the study of human reproduction."

The school board will hear a report on the school system's sex program at 10:30 a.m. Tuesday. The public is invited to attend.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State Times, June 16, 1969]

BLUEPRINT FOR SEX EDUCATION
(By Russell Kirk)

In nearly every state, this year, boards of education, legislatures, public school teachers and parents are involved in controversies about whether public schools should offer instruction in the mysteries of sex—and, if so, how. This controversy has been hottest in California and Louisiana. Your servant attended the final hearings, this spring, of California's State Board of Education on this topic.

The guidelines adopted by California's board ought to be useful elsewhere in this country. I summarize them here. California's constitution prescribes that the public schools work for moral improvement. The board believes that instruction in family life and health education to be a part of that improvement—including prudent instruction in sexual matters. As the board points out, much misunderstanding of the nature and powers of sex exists. What can or should the public schools do about this?

"The primary responsibility for sex education is that of the home," the California Board of Education resolves. "However, the school, along with the church, has a secondary role in supporting and supplementing the home's responsibility."

Instruction concerning sex should be conducted, say the California guidelines, "by a team of qualified instructors, including professionals who have shown an aptitude for working with young people and who have received special training; and utilizing physicians as recommended by local medical societies as consultants, advisers and resource persons."

All materials in such courses should be studied by a citizens' committee, the board recommends—such committees to consist of doctors, nurses, school administrators, representatives of parent groups, clergymen, representatives of police and the like.

Such programs should be voluntary, not mandatory.

There should be no depreciation in such courses of religious beliefs or of parental teachings; moral values and the family should be emphasized.

Instruction about human reproduction should not be presented to children less than nine years old.

Parents should be made acquainted with materials used in the classroom and for instruction at home; they should participate in all evaluation of such materials.

Evaluation of such programs should be continuous, and successful programs should be studied.

Finally, the California Board of Education declares that "sex education" materials from the Sex Information Council of the United States (SIECUS) should be eliminated from public schools.

This last recommendation will be of interest in most states; and this commentator heartily concurs with the California board. SIECUS is a kooky outfit; and despite its imposing name it has no connection whatever with the federal government, nor any subsidy from public funds. For the most part, SIECUS is an offshoot of a little eccentric group called the American Humanist Association—not to be confused with the great humanists of the Renaissance.

So unless you court trouble with parents, dear school administrator, give the SIECUS materials short shrift. SIECUS tries to impart a "new morality" that would be anathema to the great majority of parents and responsible citizens in any community.

DRUGS, SEX, NARCOTICS, PORNOGRAPHY AND THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND THEM

(By Mary Ann Hamren)

Narcotics is one way to break down morality and sex is another. Which comes first—you can decide. As you will see, the ultimate goal is total degradation of womanhood and the moral breakdown of your youth (boys and girls). Perhaps it will be necessary for women to defend their femininity. The goal of our opposition is to create chaos—it has been successful with the adults and we cannot blame our young people. Adults are confused, too.

Before I start I want to quote "An Open Letter to Man." This was circulated and read on the radio and on television. It carries an excellent message.

"I am a woman. I am your wife, your sweetheart, your mother, your daughter, your sister . . . your friend. I need your help. I was created to give to the world gentleness, understanding, serenity, beauty and love. I am finding it increasingly difficult to fulfill my purpose. Many people in advertising, motion pictures, television and radio have ignored my inner qualities and have repeatedly used me only as a symbol of sex. This humiliates me; it destroys my dignity; it prevents me from being what you want me to be—an example of—beauty, inspiration and love. Love for my children, love for my husband, love of my God and Country. I need your help to restore me to my true position . . . to allow me to fulfill the purpose for which I was created. I know you will find a way." Gentlemen, we do need your help.

I will not elaborate much about what is going on in the schools and SIECUS—others are doing that today. Perhaps this will be a different viewpoint, at least for those of you who are not familiar with what is going on in San Francisco and Berkeley.

On October 16, 1968, the San Francisco Chronicle announced a National Forum on Sex and Drugs. This forum has been given a \$20,000 grant for the first year by the Gilde Foundation, the Van Ameringen Foundation, and the Spectamur Agenda of New York. Two sociologists, Dr. Joel Fort, M.D., Public Health Specialist, sociologist-criminologist and nationally known expert on drug use and abuse, and Rev. Ted McIlvanna, director of operational education for the Gilde Urban Center in San Francisco, made the announcement.¹ This forum of sexual instruction will include heterosexuality, homosexuality, abortion and birth control, prostitution, pornography, development of sexual attitudes and behavior and sex laws. The drug part will go into "patterns of use and abuse, treatment, prevention, laws relating to alco-

hol, tobacco, marijuana, stimulants, sedatives, narcotics, LSD, etc.² The forum's board of advisors include Albert Ellis, director of The Institute for Rational Living. (Remember this group—Institute for Rational Living.) Dr. Frederick Meyers, U.C. School of Medicine, is also on the forum's board of advisors.³ The brochure covering this forum of courses has an introductory course on human sexuality and mind-altering drug use and abuse, sexual sensitivity group for couples, aesthetics of sex. Of further interest is the fact that Joel Fort was (perhaps still is) World Health Organization Consultant on Drugs and United Nations Social Affairs Officer; he has worked with the United Nations in Geneva.

During January of last year (1968), there was a movement for the Dr. Joel Fort legal support fund. This was because of the dismissal of Dr. Fort as director of San Francisco's Center for Special Problems. Two of the issues involved with his dismissal were: (1) Dr. Fort symbolizes the public health and sociologic approach to homosexuals and drug users which radically contrasts with the punitive law enforcement approach. (2) Dr. Fort has been a creative, innovative public health leader. . . . The removal of one innovator from the public sector limits the effectiveness of city government and makes creative change more difficult.⁴ (This is what Dr. Fort's supporters believed.)

SIECUS frequently recommends reprints of sexology magazine articles such as those written by Dr. Albert Ellis. Ellis is not a SIECUS Board member, but is one of its "status" resource persons, whose writings are recommended.⁵ Dr. Ellis (speaking of pornography) thinks that "Even for youngsters—skimming is much more dangerous." He does not believe that pornography contributes to abnormal sexual behavior.⁶ A contrasting opinion to this was made during the Fortas hearings in September 1968 with regard to a case where a young boy had witnessed a stag film. On the way home at an intersection he got into a car, he commandeered the car, he took the girl and raped and killed her. During the congressional hearings, James Clancy, Attorney, stated that "there are two dangers. One is that it will cause criminal conduct." And he says, "We are not so concerned with this. But the second is that it will cause the youth to believe that because it is tolerated in the community, it is an acceptable standard. And this is what we are concerned with."⁷

Another statement worth mentioning which Dr. Ellis made was "A significantly higher percentage of Californians have liberal attitudes towards premarital sex relations, nudism, wife-swapping, homosexuality, and other forms of non-traditional sex behavior."⁸ Now we will start to discuss pornography—from the Sunbathing Magazine, Dr. Albert Ellis and Dr. Kirkendall (of SIECUS and Sexology Magazine) both are being quoted, but Dr. Ellis says to the question, "Is a girl's psyche endangered by her having premarital relations? No, her psyche is only endangered if she erroneously believes that she is a horrible person for having such relations."⁹ Dr. Ellis' speaking engagements in California include talks at Esalen Institute at Big Sur and San Luis Obispo County Mental Health Association.¹⁰ These are the places they send this expert to speak. Note Esalen. In True Magazine—Ellis encourages—indeed, even urges—young Americans to perpetrate almost any sexual act their cunning little minds can devise. In Ellis' view, a man is not only wise to engage in trial marriage but insane if he doesn't. Above all, Ellis preaches against feeling guilty or remorseful. Peace of mind lies in promiscuity, salvation in sin, sanity in education. . . . Doctor Ellis practices what he preaches. . . . Such a man might be labeled immoral and his ideas relegated to the absurd

and the pornographic—except that he speaks from a platform of respectability.¹¹ This was the end of this one quote from True Magazine—and there are a total of four pages.

Back to Joel Fort—in the Berkeley Barb of March 29, 1968, headlined "Pot Meet"—Heads Disappointed by Compromise Stance: While the audience listened to Dr. Joel Fort, the San Francisco psychiatrist, call for the removal of all drug matters from the hands of the police into the hands of the medical profession, no other speaker went even that far. . . . Many heads said they were irked by the fact that the participants so carefully avoided any reference to their own use of marijuana, but talked at such great length about patterns of drug use among the young. In the same article, Dr. Fred Myers, Professor of Pharmacology at U.C., and Dr. David Smith of Haight Ashbury Medical Clinic stressed the difficulties of doing adequate research about marijuana under the current laws.¹² I wish I had more time to read this whole article to you—these are the experts.

This brings me to the Journal of Psychodelic Drugs, edited by David E. Smith, M.D. and published by Haight-Ashbury Medical Clinic. There are two volumes, one on drugs and religion and one on drugs and the law. Among the writers are David Smith and Frederick Meyers. This is published by the Medical Center Psychopharmacology Study, Department of Pharmacology, University of California Medical Center—more experts teaching our sons and daughters to be well trained in our medical profession. On page 59 we are referred to the Bible and some kind of a recipe. I shall quote: "The priests are instructed to put it on their garments, on the tabernacle, and on the hangings of the tent. I can guarantee you that if the priests did so, whoever went into that tent for longer than fifteen minutes was turned on, because the ingredients of that oil are a volatile spice, frankincense, and myrrh, the mixture of which will produce a turned-on experience."¹³ And so the experts teach about the Bible, and this is in a medical school.

Another platform of respectability would be the California Teachers Association. At the CTA State conference on educational research, held November 14-15, 1968 in San Francisco we find many stimulating speakers. In the Research Résumé of this CTA conference we read about the different sessions which include subjects such as Drug Abuse, Sex and Activist Youth, Race Relations, Alienated Youth, Youth Breaks the Rules, Sexual Freedom in the Schools. We find speakers such as Dr. Eleanore B. Luckey, Dr. Joel Fort, David Smith (Haight-Ashbury), Frederick Meyers (remember the Berkeley Barb), Dr. Ralph Eckert, Dr. Lester Kirkendall, Nathaniel Colley, Ian Grand (Experimental College—S.F. State), Bruce Hartford of SDS and Peace and Freedom Party, and the most famous Paul Cook of the Anaheim Schools. I wonder how the members of the different panels fared with the experts—there were many other names but we will save time by not pursuing this further.

Near the end of the résumé we come to a discussion by George Isaac Brown, "The Esalen-Ford Project for Innovation in Humanistic Education." This is where they utilize, especially when working with disadvantaged students, principles of Gestalt therapy to the classroom. This is where they are selecting approaches that could be adapted for the public school curriculum. Here, too, we include sensitivity training and encounter groups, improvisational therapy games, body awareness techniques, creativity training, etc.¹⁴ Good descriptions, don't you think? Note—we are back to Esalen and we have a Ford Foundation grant on this one.

Another platform of respectability—the same organization, California Teachers Association—the publication is the January 1969

Footnotes at end of article.

Journal. Here we find an article by Eleanor B. Luckey, "Sex Education, Why?" and she refers to the writings of Isadore Rubin. Another story by Joel Fort called *Drugs and Sex*. Here Dr. Fort says, "The preparation of the teacher, and subsequently of the teacher's students, should include ability to think through the lies, distortions, and glamorizing about sex and drugs by advertising, politicians, and drug police, and to desensationalize and demythologize the subject matter. An ability to be honest and open and to handle controversial material is necessary and the teacher must resist extremist pressures. . . . If a teacher sees nothing undesirable about alcohol or marijuana or indiscriminate sexual intercourse, it would seem best for him not to teach and not to be assigned such a course."¹² Likewise, if he is convinced that masturbation or cigarette-smoking makes a student totally evil, he shouldn't have this responsibility. Extreme sanctions or penalties have been ineffective in eliminating drug or sex "deviance," and have been destructive of hundreds of thousands of young lives. This is the CTA magazine. These are the experts.

I am running short of time—we have not even started with the visual aids. These tie in SIECUS with pornography. We could talk about the philosophy of "sex, a positive social action, and violence, a negative." Mr. Champlin, Los Angeles Times entertainment editor, said in Sherman Oaks at a PTA meeting in November 1968 that he is more concerned with violence.¹³ We read of Dr. Roger S. Johnson stating at the California Hospital Medical Center in November 1968 that "perhaps the more we promote intimacy, the less manifestations of violence we should have." "In sexuality, the growth of intimacy, there may be a possible way of channeling and redirecting these impulses."¹⁴

We read in the *Weekend Jaybird* about the Elysium Institute and its members who were arrested. Mr. Stanley Fleishman (attorney) claims that the Los Angeles County ordinance against nudity is unconstitutional. Mr. Lang of Elysium Institute is pleased that the court has recognized the inherent decency of the naked human body. Man was created in God's own image and it's time we admitted that either our belief in a God after whom we have been patterned is wrong—or that our shame at the sight of our bodies is ridiculous. We must admit to the inherent decency of the naked human body.¹⁵

Now we can see the publication of Elysium Institute. Their address is on Fernwood Avenue in Los Angeles. We find under the Elysium Institute Directory that the Elysium Research and Development Institute is compiling reference material on the growing number of organizations in this country and abroad which are concerned, as is the Institute, with seeking means to enhance man's physical, emotional and intellectual development in an environment of openness, understanding and tolerance. Some of these organizations are:

American Humanist Association, University of Humanism, Institute for Rational Living, Ketros, American Sexual Freedom Movement, Human Betterment Association, American Sunbathing Assn., Castalia Foundation, Round Table, School of Living, SIECUS, Underground Press Syndicate, Pacifica Foundation Institute for Bionergetic Analysis, Human Potentialities Research Project, Institute for the Study of Non-violence, Institute for Social Research, Sexual Freedom League, Social Science Institute, Bridge Mountain Foundation, Esalen Institute, Neo-American Church, Human Resources Development, Topanga Human Development Center, and Society for Human Abortion.

The Elysium signs off by telling readers to write to them: "If you would like to know more about the work being done by any of the above groups, or by others in related

fields of endeavor, we may be able to assist you. The Elysium Institute will attempt to provide the most current information on, or referral to, the projects and activities on which inquiry and interest are displayed."¹⁶ Note: SIECUS and Esalen are both here.

Just to show you how far-reaching Esalen is—these charts have been made to show interlocking groups.¹⁷

Now we will go back to Elysium and more of their "visual aids" and the philosophy—it is a philosophy.

Show: *Nude Lark* magazine,¹⁸ *Nude Living* magazine,¹⁹ *ANKH* magazine.²⁰

The symbol of the ANKH which is worn by many members of the hippy culture is used by Elysium Institute on its printed materials and also as the title of its magazine ANKH. This symbol is an ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic for "life," eternal or otherwise.

Just a word about a few other people involved with Esalen. George B. Leonard wrote a story in the December 24, 1968 *Look* magazine called "The Man and Woman Thing." This key phraseology SIECUS uses—"man and woman." George Leonard is *Look* senior editor; George Leonard of *Look* magazine is also Vice President of Esalen.²¹

Also we find Virginia Satir, director of Esalen, who conducts family therapy programs. She was founder of Mental Research Institute.²² Virginia Satir thinks marriage should be a five-year contract subject to either renewal or cancellation. . . . When a marriage is dissolved on one of the five-year renewal dates, any children would be turned over to the substitute parents—specially trained in child rearing "because the significance of blood ties is mostly in our heads."²³

We find Alan Watts working with Esalen²⁴ (one of the people who wants to enhance man's physical, emotional and intellectual development in an environment of openness, understanding and tolerance) a popularizer of Zen Buddhism, who is working to unify science, philosophy and religion. He advocates the use of LSD.²⁵ In October of 1968, according to the Los Angeles Free Press, Mr. Watts was advertising the Topanga Human Development Center and the Forum for Humanistic Psychology.²⁶

Gerard Haigh, psychologist now busy in Topanga, working with the Topanga Human Development Center and their Psychomat²⁷ a Laboratory for Exploration. Dr. Haigh is also working with the Esalen group.²⁸

I cannot resist showing you a couple of other magazines which were of interest—but not involved with Elysium, SIECUS—or such:

This is *Continental Naturalist*—and it leads us to UNESCO.²⁹

Roulette magazine takes us back to the Hitler era. Note the swastikas as a design and the swastika on the armband of the man torturing the girl.³⁰

Jaybird Showcase portrays a clear picture of Devil worship, occult, youth and drugs and nudism added.³¹

An additional thought—Anthony Rose of Western Behavioral Sciences Institute in La Jolla said he would like to see the creation of a center, possibly government run, where people can go to "turn on."³² Sounds like the Behavioral Science people have "great plans."

And so—we learn just a bit about "who" is going to expand the mind of man and the intertwine of the organizations.

As I close—I want to conclude by saying that "Sin did not start with the apple on the tree, but it actually started with the pair on the ground."

FOOTNOTES

¹ San Francisco Chronicle, October 16, 1968.
² Brochure of National Sex and Drug Forum.

³ San Francisco Chronicle, October 16, 1968.

⁴ Flyer from Citizens for Creative Social Change.

⁵ Dr. Gordon Drake, "Is the School House the Proper Place to Teach Raw Sex," p. 8.

⁶ Daily Breeze, March 21, 1965.

⁷ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 19, p. 25554.

⁸ San Fernando Valley Times, June 25, 1968.
⁹ Sunbathing Magazine.

¹⁰ San Fernando Valley Times, June 25, 1968.

¹¹ True Magazine, March 1966.

¹² Berkeley Barb, March 29, 1968.

¹³ Journal of Psychedelic Drugs, Volume I.

¹⁴ California Teachers Association, Research Résumé.

¹⁵ California Teachers Association Journal, January 1969, pp. 10 and 22.

¹⁶ San Fernando Valley Times, November 13, 1968.

¹⁷ Los Angeles Times, November 22, 1968.

¹⁸ Weekend Jaybird magazine.

¹⁹ Sundisk Magazine.

²⁰ Esalen Charts.

²¹ Nude Lark magazine.

²² Nude Living magazine.

²³ ANKH magazines.

²⁴ Look magazine, December 24, 1968.

²⁵ Psychology Today, December 1967.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Los Angeles Times, November 29, 1968.

²⁸ Psychology Today, December 1967.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Los Angeles Free Press, October 11, 1968.

³¹ Santa Monica Evening Outlook, November 15, 1968.

³² Psychology Today, December 1967.

³³ Continental Naturalist magazine.

³⁴ Roulette magazine.

³⁵ Jaybird Showcase magazine.

³⁶ San Diego Evening Tribune, October 5, 1968.

IN 50 WAYS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Newark Evening News represents, to my mind, a precise and realistic statement regarding a situation that will, sooner or later, become a major issue before the Congress.

While the Department of Transportation conducts its 2-year study of automobile insurance practices in the United States, the frustrations and the inadequacies of the present auto insurance system inexorably build up. In the Department of Transportation's research outline for their study they mention that the "apparent rising tide of dissatisfaction over costs, delays, and access to insurance coverage, the consuming public has been largely unheard from as to what it wants from the system."

I submit that the public is more aware at this moment of the unworkability of the present insurance system than it is of almost any other issue before the American people.

The article follows:

IN 50 WAYS

A committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners wants the federal government to leave regulation of auto insurance to the states, which means to the commissioners. It has set forth a program of basic requirements which, in some states, are as likely of realization as a politician's promise. These include ready access to insurance, prompt payment of claims, protection against

arbitrary cancellation, and a full statement of coverage, written in English.

The flaw in the committee's argument is that 50 different regulatory programs mean 50 different levels of interest in the protection of the motorist. Some states are diligent, while others apply virtually no standards. That leaves insurance companies to deal with one commissioner at a time, seeking to make up from one what they cannot get from another. And it allows 50 different ways of appraising experience records, investment of policyholders' funds and other elements that determine what premiums buy.

No one relishes the prospect of more federal intrusion, but until the commissioners do more than talk about establishing minimum, and reasonably strict, uniform requirements on their own, there will be continuing demands that Washington do the job for them.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on June 6 of this year a distinguished group of scholars and military historians gathered at the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kans., to commemorate the 25th anniversary of D-Day. Plans for the D-Day celebration and the symposium at Abilene were initiated sometime before General Eisenhower's death, and it was his suggestion that Dr. Forrest C. Pogue deliver the keynote address to set the stage for the conference on the subject of "D-Day, 25 years later."

Dr. Pogue is executive director of the George C. Marshall Research Library at Lexington, Va., on the grounds of the Virginia Military Institute. Some years ago, under a personal directive from General Eisenhower, he wrote the "Supreme Command," an authoritative study of the operations of the Supreme Allied Command in northwest Europe during 1944 and 1945.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Pogue's address, entitled "D-Day, 1944," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

D-DAY—1944

(Address by Forrest C. Pogue)

At 0645 on the morning of June 6th off Omaha Beach a young lieutenant of the 1st Division Lt. John M. Spalding of Owensboro, Kentucky, was swimming for his life. His section of 32 men had unloaded from a larger craft into LCVPs some ten miles out nearly four hours earlier and had joined other small boats as they headed in for their appointed beaches. Loading in a very rough sea, many men became seasick immediately and others joined them as they moved in to the shore. Shortly before 0600, they saw the first flashes of fire from shore but were uncertain whether they represented Allied bombardments along the beaches or German artillery. Fifteen or twenty minutes later they caught sight of land, through mist and smoke and dust stirred up by heavy naval fire. At 0630, the boat halted and the skipper ordered the ramp dropped and the men to go ashore. The lieutenant jumped out into water to find himself up to his waist but, assuming that shallower water lay ahead, commanded his section to follow him in. He found, as many

others did that morning, that the crews had been fooled by sandbars and that after a short time they were over their heads.

With a strong undercurrent carrying them toward the left, the men were soon floundering and in danger of drowning because of the heavy equipment most of them were carrying. They ended by abandoning most of it in the water or at the water's edge. An 18 foot scaling ladder, a 72 pound flamethrower, a useless walkie-talkie, a mortar and its ammunition, and one of their two bazookas were cast aside.

By amazing good fortune, they made it to the shore without casualties, but at the beach's edge a rifleman was hit in the foot by small arms fire and a few minutes later a BAR man was hit in the shoulder by a shell fragment. The lieutenant was not encouraged to find that he was 1000 yards to the east of his supposed landing place and that men of his company as well as those supposed to be on either side of him were now confused, uncertain of the landmarks, often bunched in areas where they made good targets. His salvation lay in the prompt decision to start off the beaches as soon as possible. Stopped by fire, one of his men with a Bangalore blew a hole large enough for them to pass through. Rushing ahead to a demolished building, they took shelter behind it and a nearby pile of rubble, exchanging fire with enemy snipers, until machine gun fire which dotted the wall behind which they hid accounted for the first man of the section killed on D Day.

Looking back at the sea, the lieutenant sought to locate other sections of his company. Instead, he saw boats in flames. They reminded him of the men he had seen struggling in the water, who had escaped from DD tanks which had sunk on their way in to the shore. At last he saw a tank on the beach about 0730 but even that was not reassuring. "After a couple of looks back," he recalled, "we decided we wouldn't look back anymore."

Meanwhile one of his men had found a small defile several hundred yards away, running towards the top of the hill. The lieutenant called his men to come up on the right and they passed upward in the face of small arms fire which, while heavy, cost few casualties. Worried about a machine gun above him, he forgot to watch the path until his sergeant warned, "Watch out for the damned mines." The place was supposed to be infested with a small box type mine, but no one was hit, although the company which followed them a few hours later suffered several casualties. "The Lord was with us and we had an angel on each shoulder on that trip," the lieutenant later explained.

But the luck did not always hold. Trying to take out the troublesome machine gun above them with a bazooka, one of the sergeants was shot in the arm. A PFC was shot next as he tried to fire. Another sergeant who had picked up an automatic rifle was hit in both legs. But one machine gun could not cover them all and other members of the section, who had moved up, charged the position. The one enemy soldier, who turned out to be a former Polish prisoner, now enlisted in the German static defense force, suddenly surrendered.

By dint of luck and leadership, the lieutenant reached the top of the hill between 0900 and 1000. He believed, and later investigation showed that he was probably correct, that his was one of the first units of the 16th to hit the top. Once they reached it, the men had the advantage over the enemy in bunkers or in individual positions now below them towards the sea. Methodically they began to flush the enemy out of bunkers and communications trenches. Throughout that morning and afternoon the lieutenant was conscious of close-in Navy support that helped to silence enemy fire.

Soon other squads and sections came up

the same or similar paths and he found at last other elements of his company, most of which had suffered heavily. Directed to go inland towards Colleville, he and his men spent the afternoon and early evening guarding approaches to the town, engaging in occasional fire fights, until they were at last given reinforcements. They spent the night watchfully only a few thousand yards inland from the beach. Of the 32 men the lieutenant had brought ashore, two were dead and ten wounded. For their bravery, five received DSCs, awarded personally by General Eisenhower.

This tiny segment of the D Day story is one of many that newsmen and combat historians, like myself, got from others. While we were involved, because we shared some of the discomforts and a few of the dangers (indeed some were killed or wounded), our D Day story is a composite of the experiences of others. Field Marshal Wavell named an anthology of his favorite poems—*Other Men's Flowers*. We who collected interviews might call them *Other Men's Memories*. One man's story can not tell the whole, but it can give a sampling of a battle which many men—airmen, sailors and soldiers helped make.

The story of other units, fighting their way ashore and then inland, show them often to have done much less well than the one I have described. Although by midnight all regiments of the 1st Division, two regiments of the 29th Division, and the 2d and 5th Rangers had been landed on Omaha Beach the position was precarious.

The factors responsible for D Day difficulties are many: the launching of small boats too far from shore, the heavy seas, landings on wrong beaches, concentration of men in front of exits, the foundering of all but five out of 32 DD tanks which were launched towards Omaha Beach from ships five or six miles out, (most of those sent in by ship arrived), the loss by capsizing of nearly all howitzers in one 105 mm. battery, abnormally high casualties among junior officers, delays in opening the beach exits, the tendency of some men in the first waves to crouch behind the first seawall they reached, exposing themselves to artillery fire and the danger of drowning in the incoming tide, the lack of sufficient gaps in underwater and beach obstacles, the late decision to cancel the bombing of beach fortifications, and the unexpected presence of the 352d Division near the beach.

Amidst all the gloomy summaries, there were many bright spots. On the 116th Infantry front, the assistant division commander, Brigadier General Norman D. Cota, and the regimental commander, Col. C. D. W. Canham, had set to work shortly after coming ashore around 0730 to organize the attack. Shortly afterwards Canham was wounded but he returned to the task after receiving first aid. According to the accounts of the soldiers General Cota was everywhere that morning. His activities in rallying the men and working to clear the exits from the beaches made him a legendary figure. On the 16th Infantry's beaches, Colonel George Taylor, the regimental commander, gained immortality by saying to his officers and men: "The only people on the beach are the dead and those who are going to die—now let's get the hell out of here." He and Colonel Canham were promoted to brigadier general for their D Day work and General Cota a few months later received command of the 28th Division.

Both to the east and west of Omaha Beach, the battle had gone better. The British 6th Airborne Division had landed in the early hours of June 6th to seize bridgeheads east of the Orne; along beaches Sword, Juno, and Gold troops of two British and one Canadian division of the 1 and 30 Corps landed with fewer difficulties than their American neighbors and were pushing in by late morning towards Bayeux. They were helped by a shorter trip in, the landing of

most of their tanks, and the effective use of tank flails, armored bulldozers and other mechanical items which the Americans had declined. Their losses, including the airborne, came to some 3600. On Utah Beach, the battle also went well. Confused by the paratroops of the 82d and 101st Airborne that had landed by glider and parachute on a widely scattered front, the enemy in that area seemed unable to organize a defense. Some pressure, therefore, was taken off the 4th Division which, stoutly supported by naval gunfire and aided by being landed by error on fronts more lightly defended than those on which they were expected to put down, moved swiftly inland with only some 200 casualties. The airborne suffered more heavily, sustaining some 2500 casualties in the two divisions.

For all its difficulties the D Day performance had been tremendously impressive. Some 5000 naval ships and landing craft participated, bombers and fighters made 11,000 sorties, dropping 12,000 tons of bombs, and approximately 125,000 men were put ashore. Heavy losses had been inflicted on the enemy units back of the beaches, the surprised enemy was now in confusion, the Luftwaffe's activities had been held to almost nothing, there was a difference in opinion between the Commander-in-Chief West, Field Marshal Gerd von Rundstedt, and his chief subordinate, Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, as to the proper way to meet the invaders, and Hitler and his staff disagreed with the western commanders on future enemy intentions, withholding permission for the commitment of the armored reserves and the use of troops from the Pas de Calais. Much remained to be done before the Allies could establish the lodgment area, and there would follow weeks of frustrating fighting in the hedgerows and in the narrow lanes of Normandy until the way was opened for the breakout toward Paris. But the lodgment had been won and the end seemed nearer at hand.

There were many D Days in World War II, but only one is understood when the term is mentioned. For the Western Powers at least, it represented the final focus of efforts to win a definite victory over the Axis in Europe. It was the decisive coming to grips with Germany to which the Allies had moved since the British withdrawal from the Continent and the fall of France. Concentrated in the mighty assault across the Channel from the ports of the United Kingdom was the power of the United States and the final surge of greatness of the British armed forces. It marked the finest hour of Anglo-American cooperation.

As there is only one D Day which comes to mind when the term is mentioned, there is one name above others that we associate with it. It is especially fitting that we mark the 25th anniversary of the Normandy landings near the home where that leader, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, grew to manhood and closer still to the chapel where he was recently laid to rest, a few weeks short of the anniversary of the Cross-Channel assault whose early plans he sketched and whose armies he directed.

Each man in Western Europe and the United States more than ten years of age in 1944 doubtless will remember where he was when the news first came of the landings, even as he can tell you where he first heard of Pearl Harbor or of the death of John F. Kennedy. (A ghastly coincidence reminds us all of the linking of June 6 with another tragedy). So far as my own memories of D Day are concerned, I can not speak firsthand of the storming of the beaches or the fire and shells and moments of terror because I was off the Isle of Wight in an LST, loaded with a company of the 175th Infantry and elements of combat engineers, scheduled for the afternoon follow-up on Omaha Beach. But the plans were disrupted and we were

told to wait across the Channel until the exits were fully cleared. As a result it was not until evening that we crossed, getting our first sight of the beaches, as the smoke and haze lifted the following morning. The infantry and engineers aboard our ship were taken off near noon, but a small party of us consisting of War Department observers, liaison officers, and the two combat historians covering Omaha Beach actions, Bill Fox and I, heavily laden with map cases, typewriters, and brief cases, armed only with pistols, were told to stay aboard ship until the following day.

My first knowledge of the fighting came, therefore, from interviews with men wounded in the early fighting who had been brought aboard our craft, one of dozens provided with hospital facilities for handling men brought from the beaches. Although my notes recall the words, my memories are stronger of wounded men being brought over the side and taken down to sick bay, some so badly wounded they soon died, one—a British airman—whose foot was badly mangled but who managed, as he clenched his teeth to keep from crying out, to ask that someone more seriously injured be treated first. And of the interviewees, I recall the artillery liaison officer, shot through both hands, now swathed in bandages, cursing himself for making the elementary mistake of climbing up a tree where he was shot down before he had a chance to view the hedgerow country he had come to see. Or the Texas corporal of the combat engineers, suffering from a hole in his side, but somehow cheerful because the wound was bad enough to send him home to rejoin his wife and the baby he had never seen.

Recently in preparation for this address, I thumbed through the few souvenirs I have of D Day. There were my slender notebooks, which I filled in the days after landing, visiting men in underground OPs or in foxholes to get their stories of that first long day, sometimes sitting under a leaky shelter half as I wrote, the water washing out parts of the paragraphs as it spilled down my helmet. There were bits of enemy and American propaganda, dropped from planes that I found in the hedgerows and the orchards, one an American appeal, written in German, asking for an honorable surrender of the enemy; another a fake American one dollar bill which, when opened, contained in French an anti-Semitic attack on Secretary Morgenthau and the merciless Americans who had launched the attack. Elsewhere there is a crumpled and dirty copy of Eisenhower's D Day message which was handed to every man engaged in the landings, and a firing plan, showing ranges at various points on Omaha Beach, which I found southwest of Pointe du Hoc. And there are remnants of a script for a maneuver exercise which I found in a bunker of a unit stationed near Isigny, fishing it out of a pile of papers most gingerly, fearing every moment that it might be wired to explode. It was for a maneuver against an enemy landing in the area of the Port en Bassin. Since the Germans wrote the script it ended happily, the Allied forces being thrown back into the sea after hard fighting.

There are many stories which recall the drama of D Day. But because the day itself has such tremendous interest, we forget all too quickly the long period of preparation which went before and the debt we owe to a number of men whose names are often forgotten when we speak of the great invasion. On this anniversary, we should recall that D Day's achievements were the products of many minds, months of training, massive production of ships and planes and weapons and equipment, skilled planning, the finding of competent leaders, and lessons learned from defeat and blood and death. It was the one moment of the war when the British and American leaders, the soldiers under their

command, the civilians who backed them with their labors and their understanding support came together for a brief period, subordinating personal and national interests and narrow ambitions to one great purpose, finding a unity and a dedication to which we can still turn with pride.

Let us turn our minds back to the day when the last British troops had withdrawn from the Continent, leaving from Brittany and Normandy ports as the government of France went through its final agonies, and to the days when remnants of the defeated French forces rallied to General Charles de Gaulle in London. Despite the desperate situation, there was no doubt that the Allied forces would return. For months, the main energies of Britain would be devoted to defense of her shores and the skies overhead, but there was still a desire to plan. But when and how? An early outline, sketched in this period, started hopefully, "Having gotten ashore."

Those words, almost mocking in their nature, were not facetious but prophetic. They pointed up two problems that the western allies had not met in many years of fighting on the Continent: the lack of a hospitable landing place and the lack of proper landing craft. In the wars of the 18th and 19th centuries, the British had been able to find friendly ports for the entry of their troops, so that ordinary transports were enough for their purposes. Even when the great Napoleon had brought most of Europe under the Continental system, it had been possible to find a place in the Low Countries or in the Iberian Peninsula for a landing place.

With the fall of France and the later extension of German power over the whole of that country, with Spain and Portugal neutral in the struggle with Axis troops in firm control of most of western and central Europe and much of Russia, with German airpower dominating the skies of Europe and raining destruction down on Britain, with German submarines endangering Allied ships in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Channel, it was clear that much must be achieved before the Allies could attain the goal of getting ashore.

Before a realistic plan could be drawn for invasion, an air offensive had to be started which could win the skies over the British Isles and Western Europe, that could cut off the movement of men and supplies to the invasion area, and that could reduce enemy resources to the point that they could be dealt with successfully. There must also be landing craft that could carry ashore men and tanks and artillery. And there must be solid support from the United States.

Not until the end of 1941 was the last condition fulfilled. And the requirements of the Cross-Channel operation had to be measured against those of MacArthur's and Nimitz's first in the Philippines and then in the Southwest, South and Central Pacific, against the appeals of China, and the desperate needs of Russia caught up in a fight to the death on their own soil.

With all that remained ahead, it is interesting to note that early in 1942 the American commanders and planners outlined the Cross-Channel attack that was launched two years later. Brig. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, newly brought to Washington by General George C. Marshall, and more recently made Chief of the War Plans Division, sketched the plan which reflected War Department thinking and won presidential backing for a return to the Continent.

But before the goal could be attained there followed the landings in North Africa, the taking of Sicily, and landings in the south of Italy. Not until December, 1943, when a Supreme Commander was actually selected to head the invasion and an approximate date of May, 1944, given to Marshal Stalin and not until Montgomery was picked by the British

to lead their forces and sent on to the United Kingdom to start final planning did the Cross-Channel attack move from the possible into the likely category. Churchill, to whom the idea of grappling with the enemy on the Continent appealed, still dreaded the possibility of a blood bath comparable to that his generation had suffered in Flanders. "You are fighting the ghosts of the Somme," the Prime Minister's doctor said to Marshall. His dread was such that even into the final months, he seemed to hope for some miracle that would bring German collapse without an invasion. As late as March and April, he continued to say occasionally to American visitors, "I am hardening on this operation," as if even then it might be averted.

And the Americans remained faithful to the concept. Never faltering in their devotion to the Cross-Channel attack were two officials in Washington—Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson and General Marshall. Backing them were the United States Chiefs of Staff and, for the most part, the President. Abroad, General Eisenhower, busy in North Africa and then in the Mediterranean, where he came to favor a later date for Overlord than he had at first suggested, remained loyal to his earlier proposal.

Yet it was Churchill who had helped pave the way for the return to France by his appointment in October, 1941, of Admiral Lord Louis Mountbatten as head of Combined Operations Headquarters. He was told to prepare for raids along the whole of the enemy coastline from North Cape to the Bay of Biscay but his main object was to be the re-invasion of France. He was to develop apparatuses and devices to make the invasion possible, to select and build up bases from which the assault could be made, to create amphibious training centers, and to select the place for attack. Although his attention was to range far from the French coast in the months that followed, Churchill's directive had set into motion a planning group which would lay the groundwork for the later D Day landings—a fact which Churchill and the U.S. and British Chiefs of Staff recognized when they visited the Normandy beaches six days after the landing when they sent a message to Mountbatten, then in the South East Asia Command, that much of the remarkable technique "and therefore the success of this venture had its origin in developments effected by you and your staff of Combined Operations."

Before the United States was brought into the war, representatives of COHQ were discussing with American manufacturers plans for producing landing craft for future operations. After U.S. entry into the war, COHQ poured more proposals into American hands.

Among his duties, Mountbatten acted as adviser to the Combined Commanders in considering a plan for a proposed return to the Continent, drawn up in early 1942. The Commander-in-Chief, Home Forces, General Sir Bernard Paget, the Admiral commanding at Portsmouth and the chiefs of the Fighter and Bomber Commands composed this group.

Paget, an able officer, who would later become commanding general of 21 Army Group, which he relinquished to Montgomery in late December, 1943, had little enthusiasm for the cross-Channel operation with which he was entrusted and was considered to be a defeatist. But he differed especially with Mountbatten and other planners in preferring the Pas de Calais for the landing area. There were paper arguments for his views—from Dover one could see the Calais shore and even shell it, air forces in southeast England could blanket the area, there would be a short turnaround for ships and landing craft, the way to Germany was much shorter than from any beach further to the West. But Mountbatten reasoned differently. There were few ports in the area

nearest the Pas de Calais, troops brought from Wales and Cornwall would have a longer voyage to the attack area and would be subject to greater danger from the enemy. Again, the largest ports of the area, Calais and Boulogne, were not sufficient for developing the later attack. Even more important, the Germans would expect an attack there and be prepared to meet it. An advance in that area would expose its flank to German counterattack. It was in this period that the final attack area, the Baie de la Seine, was finally selected. Shortly afterwards, work began on port facilities from which the troops would sail. It would have been difficult in 1944 to have changed the landing area even if Eisenhower had so desired.

The other important planning group which preceded Eisenhower's Supreme Headquarters was the staff known as COSSAC (Chief of Staff to the Supreme Allied Commander) which was set up early in 1943 to start planning a return to the Continent. The British Lt. Gen. Frederick E. Morgan and his American deputy Major General Ray W. Barker were handicapped by the lack of a commander who could demand all that he needed to make a successful return to the Continent and by a restricted number of divisions on which to base the planning. As a result COSSAC's plan was described by nearly all who saw it as insufficiently strong. Although the invasion front was later widened and a number of changes made in the overall plan, much excellent groundwork was laid by COSSAC which was drawn on by later planners.

The important thing is that when the Supreme Headquarters was finally established, it succeeded to a rich harvest. Underway were experiments with and development of landing craft, artificial harbors, DD tanks, tank flails, Pluto, and the like. Also, in progress was the amassing of intelligence material which would be necessary for final planning.

While the planning was in progress, the commander of 21 Army Group—General Paget—was sending his British troops through realistic training to a degree never before utilized in Britain. For this work, Paget was compared with Sir John Moore who helped prepare Wellington's army for its successes in the Napoleonic war. American units were also undergoing training at centers in the United Kingdom, activities that sharply increased in the late fall of 1943 after General Bradley arrived to take command of First Army and to organize a second headquarters which ultimately was known as 12th Army Group.

Although planning and training went forward, the whole affair was somewhat academic until a commander was selected for the invasion. In his frustration, General Morgan at times suspected that he was serving as a front for something that would not take place. As a result when he was invited to the United States in October 1943 by General Marshall, then regarded as the future Supreme Commander, the British officer asked President Roosevelt for the immediate naming of the commander of the Cross-Channel attack. Feeling that he could not let Marshall go at the moment, Roosevelt still temporized. It was not until December at Cairo after he had been pressed by Stalin for the name of the commander that Roosevelt at last made his decision to name General Eisenhower. Shortly afterwards, on the recommendation of Field Marshal Sir Alan Brooke, the Prime Minister placed General Montgomery at the head of the British invasion forces. In turn, Eisenhower entrusted the British general with control of the Allied forces in the assault phases. Before he left North Africa for a brief trip to the United States, Eisenhower had instructed Montgomery—who shared his views—to proceed to London and begin a fight to enlarge the invasion force.

While Eisenhower was in Washington discussing future plans with General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, General Smith, and General Montgomery outlined plans for strengthening the attack. With the confidence born of victories in North Africa and the Mediterranean, Montgomery stirred the COSSAC planners with calls for more of everything. His recommendations, which his Chief of Staff thought were those "of any trained soldier," included more assault forces, a quicker build-up, a larger airlift, and an expanded invasion front. Realizing that many of the resources would have to come from the United States, the British commander insisted that Eisenhower take personal action, asking, "Will you hurl yourself into the contest and what we want, get for us?"

From the time that Eisenhower arrived in London in mid-January until the eve of D Day, he was involved in getting what was needed for victory. In some cases, it required a long battle to convince the U.S. Chiefs of Staff or the American President, in others the acceptance of political decisions displeasing to the British War Cabinet and the Prime Minister, and in still others the attempts to gain cooperation of General de Gaulle. Only an Allied Commander-in-Chief could have won from various governments what a British or American general could scarcely have asked from his own government. In the major political and military decisions of the period, Eisenhower made his authority felt.

Even before Eisenhower left the United States for London, Montgomery and Bedell Smith had concluded that a landing in southern France (ANVIL) scheduled to coincide with the Cross-Channel attack should be cancelled and the landing craft allocated to it sent to the Normandy area. Aware that the President and the U.S. Chiefs of Staff felt committed to the ANVIL operation, Eisenhower assured Washington that he would save the southern France attack if at all possible.

From the beginning the British sensed that Eisenhower was the key to a shift in strategy. Despite growing doubts in London, General Marshall still believed the operation feasible. But if Eisenhower felt he must sacrifice ANVIL to make certain of Overlord then the U.S. Chief of Staff would listen. He wanted nothing to hamper the Supreme Commander's success. For the moment, the decision waited while resources and allotments were reassessed. By early March, Eisenhower recognized that he would have to have the ANVIL landing craft for Overlord. But he waited until the decision was certain. On March 21, he informed the Chief of Staff that "ANVIL as we originally visualized it is no longer a possibility . . ." The U.S. Chiefs of Staff assented provided the British would agree to an ANVIL operation later in the summer. After prolonged debates, the Combined Chiefs of Staff on April 18th accepted a compromise arrangement which left open the final decision on a delayed ANVIL operation.

The other decision required by the broadening of the invasion front was on the proposal that two airborne divisions be dropped in the Cotentin Peninsula to help secure the new beach being added to the west. At once the commanding general of the Tactical Air Expeditionary Force, Air Chief Marshal Sir Trafford Leigh-Mallory, objected that he lacked the requisite airlift for the additional divisions and that he feared heavy losses to glider forces because of unsatisfactory landing fields and possible heavy antiaircraft fire. In view of pressure by Generals Montgomery and Bradley for the airborne drop, Eisenhower continued his advocacy of the plan, a view that Leigh-Mallory persistently opposed until near the time for landing. At length, he declared that it was probable that "at the most 30 per cent of the glider loads will become effective for use against the enemy." Six days before the landings, the Supreme

Command shut off the debate with a reminder that the airborne operation was essential to the success of the plan and "must go on." As a result, he added, "there is nothing for it but for you, the Army Commander and the Troop Carrier Commander to work out to the last detail every single thing that may diminish these hazards." A week later when it was clear that the landings had been achieved with much smaller losses than he had predicted, Leigh-Mallory conceded that the Supreme Commander had been right.

In the control and use of bombers before D Day and in the early phases of the battle for Normandy, General Eisenhower showed himself in his most positive mood. Let no one claim, said Air Chief Marshal Portal later, that anyone pushed Eisenhower around. He had in mind the heated debate over the Supreme Commander's control over strategic air forces in the early phases of operations and the equally sharp arguments over the transportation bombing plan. In both these controversies, Eisenhower had the strong support of General Marshall and of the Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, Air Chief Marshal Tedder, but his own decision and arguments were emphasized.

The command dispute arose from the fear of the bomber chiefs that the long-range bombing program, known as Operation Pointblank, which had been decided on at Casablanca and was yielding excellent returns, would be upset by a diversion to targets dictated by the interests of ground commanders. There was also the belief in some quarters that the bombers could decide the issue itself if the battle could be temporarily postponed.

Eisenhower had discussed the matter of control of strategic air forces with Marshall in late December, pointing out the need of having men in command who were aware of the problems involved in air support of ground troops. "Otherwise," he declared, "a commander is forever fighting with those airmen who, regardless of the ground situation, want to send big bombers on missions that have nothing to do with the critical effort." He brought up the matter personally a few days later with the Chief of Staff in Washington. Marshall needed no convincing. It was his initial view that Allied air superiority would make possible the invasion of northern France without overwhelming ground superiority and that had prompted him to back the Cross-Channel operation so strongly. Naturally, he was in favor of the maximum use of the bomber force to aid Eisenhower forces to get ashore and to stay there. As a result, he indicated that if he had been named as Supreme Commander and had been denied what he required, he would have resigned the command.

Strongly backed by Marshall, Eisenhower insisted that he be given control over those bombing efforts essential to his cross-Channel battle, adding at last that if the British were for anything less than all-out effort for the Cross-Channel attack he would "simply have to go home." To remove British doubts about SHAEF's possible misuse of the bombers, he declared at the end of February that he would exercise such control through Air Chief Marshal Tedder. Impressed by the strong stand on principle being made by Marshall and Eisenhower, the British Chief of Air Staff, Air Chief Marshal Portal, decided that some compromise formula must be devised.

His proposed formula indicated that when the Supreme Commander's plan for the air program in support of the Cross-Channel assault had been approved by Eisenhower and by Portal, "the responsibility for supervision of air operations of England of all the forces engaged in the program, including the United States Strategic Air Force and the British Bomber Command, together with any other air forces that might be made available, should pass to the Supreme Commander." The strategic air forces not used in support of Operation Overlord would be com-

mitted in accordance with arrangements made by the Supreme Commander and the Chief of the Air Staff.

This arrangement at once threatened to become unstuck when the U.S. Chiefs of Staff protested that it did not give Eisenhower "command" of the strategic air forces. The Supreme Commander, who had been inclined to accept the formula when first presented, now declared that in view of the question which had been raised, he must insist that there be no doubt over his authority and responsibility for controlling air operations of the bomber and tactical forces "during the critical period of Overlord." This point was settled on April 7th when the Combined Chiefs of Staff declared that the U.S. Strategic Air Force and British Bomber Command would "operate under the direction of the Supreme Commander, in conformity with agreements between him and the Chief of the Air Staff as approved by the Combined Chief of Staff."

Equally stormy and drawn out was the debate over the transportation plan set forth by Leigh-Mallory's staff at the beginning of 1944. In an effort to reduce supplies carried by railroad into the invasion area, the planners proposed bombing of railway marshalling yards and repair facilities in key railway centers in Germany, Belgium, and France. The bomber chiefs objected at once to targets in Germany, saying that other targets—such as oil or airplane plants were more remunerative. In addition, there was a strong political objection raised by Churchill, Eden, and other members of the Government. After the war it was noted, the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Balkans would look towards Russia; Great Britain would have to depend for friendship on countries in the West. And there was the danger that heavy casualties inflicted on the civilian population in the attacks on railway centers would alienate them from the countries responsible for the losses—especially Britain.

Convinced that the plan was sound and necessary to success of the invasion, Eisenhower gave it his strongest backing. Leaving to Tedder the task of fighting for the concept in meetings with the bomber chiefs, he worked on the Prime Minister and members of the War Cabinet. As the commander responsible for the assault, Eisenhower was impressed by the arguments of the transportation plan proponents. He agreed fully with Tedder's suggestion in late April that although first priority should be given pointblank attacks deep into Germany which would weaken the German Air Force, the remaining air effort should be used to delay and disorganize ground movement during and after the landings "so as to help the army get ashore and stay ashore." Since the first five or six weeks of Overlord were likely to be the most critical, the Supreme Commander argued, it was essential to insure that the assault forces landed and held their ground. He insisted that it was "only necessary to show that there would be some reduction of German transportation, however small, to justify adopting this plan, provided there was no alternative available."

When the Prime Minister continued to stress political objections, Eisenhower stood firm, saying "I have stuck by my guns because there is no other way in which this tremendous air force can help us, during the preparatory period, to get ashore and stay there." At last Mr. Churchill gave way, but he demanded that casualties be held below 10,000. He kept careful watch on reports of civilian losses in France, saying to Tedder, "I am afraid you are piling up an awful load of hate." He was mollified to an extent by General Smith's report that General Pierre Koenig, head of the French forces in the United Kingdom, had said "We would take twice the anticipated loss to be rid of the Germans."

The necessity of weighing preparations for D Day against political considerations dis-

turbing to Great Britain was particularly marked in Eisenhower's efforts to insure the security of his assault planning. Only a determined officer, able to gain the ear of the Prime Minister, could have turned the trick. This fact was illustrated in three episodes in the spring of 1944.

Reminded by members of his staff that visitors to beach areas and harbors were likely to imperil the secrecy of his operations, Eisenhower asked for an outright ban of civilians from restricted coastal areas in the critical days of final preparations. When the civil ministries objected, General Morgan, now deputy Chief of Staff under Eisenhower, retorted, "If we fail, there won't be any more politics—and certainly no more Lend-Lease." But no final action was taken until the Supreme Commander warned the members of the War Cabinet that it would go hard with their consciences "if we were to feel, in later years, that by neglecting any security precaution we have compromised the success of these vital operations or needlessly squandered men's lives." Four days later the required ban was imposed.

This was followed by censorship of outgoing mail and a ban on leave for members of the armed forces outside the country. A more difficult step was the proposed censorship of diplomatic correspondence. The Foreign Office and War Cabinet were extremely dubious about the proposal. Again the Supreme Commander spoke of what might happen. This source of leakage represented "the gravest risk to the security of our operations and to the lives of our sailors, soldiers, and airmen," he declared on April 9th. Eight days later the War Cabinet announced that foreign diplomatic representatives henceforth would not be permitted to receive or send uncensored communications and their couriers not allowed to leave the United Kingdom. Only the United States and the USSR were exempt from this British decree.

From Algiers, a furious de Gaulle ordered his representative in London, Koenig, to break off discussions then in progress with members of the SHAEF staff on questions relating to D Day. Fortunately, the tempest soon subsided when de Gaulle, who believed that matters would go well between Koenig and Eisenhower because of the latter's "friendly disposition toward France," permitted an arrangement to be worked out. An agreement was reached by which British and U.S. authorities examined French messages before they were dispatched from London and then permitted them to be sent in code on Koenig's assurance that the original texts would not be changed.

The uproar over the diplomatic messages was but a foretaste of the protests that could be expected from de Gaulle in Algiers. Believing that the open support of the French National Committee for the invasion was of great importance to General Eisenhower, he was determined to gain recognition for his Committee as the government of France. This was an old and tiresome question which had long troubled Eisenhower but which he had been unable to solve. In Britain, the Foreign Office at least was favorable to recognizing de Gaulle, but Roosevelt, never friendly to the French general, firmly reminded Eisenhower that he could recognize no government of France until the people of that country had an opportunity to make a choice. He was willing for Eisenhower to discuss matters with the French Committee on a military level, but resolutely opposed to any action politically.

The situation, as Eisenhower reminded the Combined Chiefs of Staff near mid-May, was embarrassing and "potentially dangerous." He suggested a way out of their difficulty by inviting General de Gaulle to London where he could be briefed on the coming operation. Roosevelt agreed if de Gaulle did not return to Algiers until the attack had been launched.

As final plans were being made for the assault, Eisenhower and members of his staff concluded that it was essential to have de Gaulle issue an appeal to the French people to support Allied forces under the Supreme Commander. At a very late hour, little more than 48 hours before the attack, the French General was flown to the United Kingdom and informed of the coming assault. Piqued by the lateness of his briefing, the irate leader reacted strongly when handed a statement which the SHAEF Psychological Warfare Division had prepared for him to read in support of Supreme Headquarters. He flatly refused to cooperate on the ground that nothing was said of the French National Committee.

Through much of the night of June 5th a series of conferences were held involving Foreign Secretary Eden, Sir Robert Bruce Lockhart of the Political Warfare Executive, General R. A. McClure, SHAEF Psychological Warfare head, and de Gaulle. Bedell Smith was inclined to be blunt with him and threaten to cut off grants of aid. Lockhart and McClure took the more diplomatic approach, and reminding de Gaulle that his standing in France would be damaged if it were known that he was in London and did not add his voice to the representatives of other occupied countries. At last in the early morning of June 6th he agreed to make an appeal. But he made it on his own terms.

He did not speak when other representatives of occupied countries made their appeals. He did not call on Frenchmen to put themselves under Eisenhower's orders as the prepared speech had done. Instead he told them to follow the orders of the government of France (his committee) and its chiefs. And he got revenge on Roosevelt by pointedly omitting any mention of American efforts while graciously praising old England's contribution as the last bastion in the west.

His eloquent speech touched the Prime Minister. Churchill, who was easily moved to tears, wept at the tribute. To disguise his feelings, he picked on one of his favorite targets, General Ismay, who was standing nearby, unmoved by the eloquence. Caustically, the Prime Minister demanded, "You great lump of lard have you no finer feelings."

Many of these developments were not then known to me and the other combat historians who were preparing for their own role in the D Day invasion. Several of us had been briefed in Washington that spring and then flown to London in April in time to learn something of the invasion plans before the launching of the June 6th attack.

Various signs signalled the approach of the assault. Nearly every day regular traffic would be stopped in parts of London while great convoys of men and equipment moved eastward and to the south. The British were headed towards the old cities of Dover and Rye, while the Americans moved towards the fields and ports of Devon and of Cornwall. At other times we talked to a pilot or a gunner. Tired, weary, but avid for a change from the excitement they had been experiencing, they would describe the work being done in preparation for the attack. Six missions in a row over Flak Corner on the "Milk Run" was the story of one gunner, who spelled out tales of recklessness, heroism, fatigue and fear. He was sure that things were about to pop because the intensity of the attacks could not be maintained. As yet unbriefed as to the real area of the invasion, we tried to make deductions from the pattern of attacks and troop movements, only to make the same mistake the Germans did.

We learned much about the Allied forces in the briefings in London, the nature of the command organization, the logistical preparations, organization of various combat units, tables of organization and the like, but we still did not know the area of attack

or the precise development of the battle. Perhaps the most memorable thing that came from the session was the statement of the Navy officer who summed up the report that we could write in advance on D Day, "confusion reigned on the beaches," a prophecy which proved exact.

Not until we had made a brief visit to General Bradley's headquarters at Bristol—where our historical teams were split up for assignment—and Lt. William J. Fox and I settled down at V Corps Headquarters at Norton Manor near Taunton in Somerset did we finally see the detailed plans. After being bigoted we were shown into a small room filled with paint buckets and brushes used to stencil boxes. In one corner was a wooden cabinet and in it were the broad outlines of the high level plan, sketches of 21 Army Group and First U.S. Army plans, the complete Navy plan, and the detailed V Corps plan and annexes for Omaha Beach.

Feverishly we digested the material. We already knew that under General Eisenhower was General Bernard L. Montgomery's 21 Army Group with general direction of the Allied ground forces for the assault period and that under him Lt. General Omar N. Bradley's First U.S. Army commanded the American effort in the fight. Now we learned of the dispositions on the respective beaches.

The area chosen looked unpromising on the map. From the detailed, yard by yard descriptions, the beaches—once attractive to tourists—seemed unlikely places on which to land, particularly in the V Corps area. The beaches, backed by cliffs, were rimmed by ledges from which antitank guns, mortars, and automatic weapons could bring murderous fire on the attackers. Reports from the French underground, from air photos, and from special landing parties, which had been set ashore to conduct reconnaissance, virtually pin-pointed the defenses, the paths, the winding roads, the stone walls, the length of the beach, the height of shingle. Most important, they listed the location of almost every machine gun, the direction of fire, the rifle pits, the strands of wire, the communications trenches between bunkers, the tank ditches which cut off access to the exits from the beaches, and the awful photographs of underwater barriers. Gate-like "Element C," standing nine feet high, with slanting steel supports, topped by tellermines; hedgehogs, ugly affairs made of crisscrossed steel beams from 5-7 feet in height; log ramps and posts with ragged edges on which other mines were placed to rip and explode the small landing craft as they came in with troops protected the beaches from assault. This devilish collection of pitfalls, which the enemy under Field Marshal Erwin Rommel's stern direction had been installing at a rapid rate in recent weeks, seemed to grow more deadly each day. Because of the obstructions, it was necessary for the planners to arrange for the assault at low tide, so that the first waves could go in while the barriers were exposed, thus avoiding the underwater terror and bringing in demolition teams to clear them away before the later waves of craft and troops came in.

Naturally, the plans were extensive. Besides such matters as naval and air support, supply, operational details, the massive appendices extended to civil government, supply, medical questions, and the like. One list detailed the amounts of cocoa, wheat, meat, and vegetables to be distributed to towns needing food. The quartermaster was given estimates of uniforms, bandages, Purple Hearts, and even Bronze Stars he would be expected to provide. The Medical Section reassured us that there were no poisonous serpents in the area, but failed to note that in a local apple brandy called Calvados, the region had a potent antidote against snakebite. We were even told where the Germans had their chief administrative offices, which

local officials had been unduly friendly to the enemy, the location of possible pigeon lofts, and names of prostitutes in some localities who might be able to supply information about the Germans.

On Tuesday, May 23d V Corps began its move from Norton Manor to the marshalling area in Cornwall. Our group was bound for Redruth, not far from Penzance near the southwestward tip of England. The morning was cold when we started, but slowly the chill was dispersed by the sun, and the day at last became one which made us happy to be in England now that spring was here. I remember the peaceful hills and valleys, and the occasional breathless moment when we sat on a hilltop and saw a dozen roads through the valleys below thousands of vehicles, jammed with men and equipment, moving towards the south. I was reminded of a chapter in Conan Doyle's *Sir Nigel* when he spoke of a much earlier setting forth of men for battle in a chapter "How the Comrades Journeyed Down the Old, Old Road." In his case, the men-at-arms travelled towards Dover rather than westward, but he had caught the picture of a crowded highway as he described "the throng which set the old road smoking in a haze of white dust from Winchester to the narrow sea."

The little towns, still filled with century old quaintness, looked out of place as troops streamed through in flood tide to the channel. There were half-concealed airfields, meadows which hid tanks and jeeps, and hedges filled with piles of shells. But we forgot the war momentarily when we passed a simple country house with a scrawled sign, proclaiming "Tea for Sale." The pleasant old lady poured tea in her parlor, where our fighting gear seemed somewhat out of place until we saw on the walls the photographs of her daughter, a WAAF in London, and a son, now a lance corporal in India.

After a half hour stop, we continued on our way, reaching at last the concentration area where our small party of liaison officers and historians were to be attached for rations and quarters to a company of the 175th Infantry of the 29th Division. Our camp was in a number of fields, along a country lane, placed between small hills which hid us from the sea.

At this isolated camp, we felt for the first time the imminence of the invasion. Since we were to be briefed on the time and place of the attack, we were forbidden to leave the area without permission. Guards stood at regular intervals along the road to enforce that regulation, acting also as airplane watchers and carrying specially treated arm-bands which would indicate the presence of gas.

On Friday the soldiers were briefed. It was fascinating to watch the reactions of the various groups as they were shown silhouettes of the coasts showing how the beaches looked at one half mile, two miles, and five miles out. In other cases, the men gathered around card tables or maps spread on the ground. They listened closely as the story of D Day was unfolded, still not clear as to the overall plan. They were told that under the full support of naval and air bombardment they would go in on beaches cleared of opposition. As the officers and men learned their specific missions, their faces showed the growing grins that one notes when a listener anticipates the ending of a well known joke. "Jesus," one of them remarked, "now we can get started on the way home."

An outsider would not understand the enthusiasm of soldiers facing a deadly assault, but these men had participated in repeated exercises in the U.S., marched up and down England, practiced in assault training centers until it seemed that they would never strike at the target which must be seized before they could turn back to the United States. So without worry about the fact that

the first day of battle might be the last of life, they hailed the announcement that they were going to Normandy.

There was little talk of the enemy; I saw no sign of hatred there. We spoke of this strange attitude, but no one worried. The soldiers were sure that when the shooting started and friends were killed, they would hate the enemy enough. "After all," said one artilleryman, "we don't see the men we kill anyway." There was not even great anxiety about the chance of getting hit. In an effort to keep down fears on this score, the Stars and Stripes, in issues carefully distributed to the troops, explained how shock kept the wounded from feeling much pain and that there were few cases where the hurt persisted long before unconsciousness of morphia gave relief. General Bradley, who proved to be an accurate prophet, struck out against wild estimates of casualties, based on Tarawa percentages, which predicted losses of 50,000 in the first few hours.

The weather on our final Sunday in camp was extremely beautiful. The day was much like any other, until someone announced that there would be services in the mess hall. I half persuaded another chap to go but he said that he would feel like a hypocrite by waiting until this late hour to go to church. Some twenty of us met in the tent, sitting on the rude benches at the wooden mess tables, while a young red-haired chaplain from Virginia led us in a group of songs from which "Onward Christian Soldiers" and "The Son of God Goes Forth to War" were carefully omitted. He preached simply on the text, "Suffer Little Children to Come Unto Me." There was no threat of death nor talk of hate nor smell of battle in that tent, although his helmet, set before him on a table, served as a pulpit and we held our weapons close at hand while we prayed.

We were awakened at the usual time—0700—on June 2d and told to don our gas impregnated clothing. Two hours later, after breakfasting, we started to a rendezvous point where we met a convoy. At noon we were fed at an improvised mess hall along the way. Two hours later we stopped and were fed again as jokesters spoke of the condemned man eating a hearty meal. Occasionally we passed English homes and the dwellers would come out to look curiously at the quiet groups of silent men—going down to the sea. Now and then a mother would hold up her child to see the passing troops, as if she wanted him to be able to say when he was old that he had seen the soldiers march off to attack the distant shore.

Land's end for us was the edge of a small cove near Helston—such an inlet as pirates or smugglers might have used or a place where the Phoenicians might have anchored when they came two thousand years ago to seek Cornish tin. The British had realized that it was such a place as enemy intruders might seek out for entry and they had built machine gun nests and barricades on the hills around. Now at last they could hope that these defenses would soon be no longer needed.

By early evening our party—a company of the 175th Infantry, attached engineer units, and our small party of "parasites"—had been loaded on our LST. Some two hours later we left the cove. As we sailed for Falmouth, we met some of the crew. It added nothing to our sense of well-being to find that most of them, like the LST, were on their first voyage. Many of them had been drafted only six months before. A few had been in Italy, but most of them were still so new that the skipper, normally after giving a nautical command, would immediately translate into the layman's language.

On Sunday, June 4th the weather was foul. Sometime during the day we learned that Eisenhower had postponed the invasion one day and there was griping by the men who feared they would have to go back to port. The plan had indicated that only June

5, 6, and 7 in the first half of June were satisfactory for the assault.

Next morning at 9, we started from Falmouth Harbor, sailing slowly eastwards. By 3 P.M., there were 28 LSTs in sight—at this time in three parallel lanes, later expanding to five or more, while out on the horizon could be seen three or four destroyers, shedding confidence on us as they circled and turned to stay between us and unknown perils. Above were plane escorts and we could see hundreds of planes or hear their motors as bombers flew to targets near the beaches. Two barrage balloons which floated above each LST gave a holiday appearance to the occasion. Behind us we towed a curious raft known as a Rhino ferry. Other vessels pulled along strange contraptions of concrete and steel that were to make up part of an artificial port. Everything was relatively quiet on shipboard. The sky was somewhat overcast, but the sea relatively calm, and the sun came through now and then. "Abandon ship" drill was perfunctory, despite the sobering statement that the next alert we heard would be the real thing.

At noon with our lunch, each man received General Eisenhower's Order of the Day, dated June 6th. It was now certain that D Day was on. Later we were to learn of the dramatic meeting at which the decision was finally given.

Through five months Eisenhower had used a mixture of diplomacy, stubbornness, gentle words and firm persuasion to gain the unity and support he needed for the disparate elements which would make up the Allied team for D Day. In all these he had the backing of one or more strong political or military leaders. But it was on June 5th when he met for a second time with his chief advisers at Southwick House near Portsmouth to decide whether the invasion must again be postponed that he faced one of his most crucial decisions of the war. Writing of it later, Eisenhower's Chief of Staff was struck by "the loneliness and isolation at a time when such a momentous decision was to be taken by him, with full knowledge that success or failure rests on his individual decision."

At 9:30 on the evening of June 4th, General Eisenhower discussed with his advisers whether weather conditions, which had forced him to consent to a one day postponement, earlier that day, now showed sufficient improvement to authorize the assault for the 6th. Much depended on the observations of the weather officer, Captain J. M. Stagg, of the SHAEF staff. One observer was later convinced that the Supreme Commander's decision was aided in the final analysis by the fact that in the days preceding the D Day verdict, he had discussed the factors involved in weather predictions so that he not only had confidence in his meteorological adviser but understood the elements to be considered.

The alternatives were not pleasant ones. Stagg reported that a new weather front gave some hope for improvement throughout June 5th and until the morning of the 6th. The skies were expected to clear sufficiently during the evening of the 5th for heavy bombers to operate during the night and in the early morning at H hour, but it was not certain if favorable conditions would prevail during the assault stages.

Thus there was some hope, but if the weather grew worse after the first wave had landed, what then? Caution favored delay. On the other hand a second delay meant that ships must return to port and the men unloaded. The possibility that the enemy might spot the preparations would be increased. A second postponement might find even worse weather in prospect for the 7th and the need for postponement for two weeks. These delays reduced the period of good weather for fighting and increased the possibility that the V weapons, now known to be readied for attack on British cities and

harbors, might be in use (as indeed they were by that time). Worse still, a further wait would hurt troop morale. The men had been brought to a state of readiness. Another delay would make it hard to reach that pitch again.

All these points were in Eisenhower's mind when he pondered his decision. Looking around the room, he polled his advisers. Leigh-Mallory believed that from an air standpoint the attack would be chancey and Tedder agreed. General Montgomery, sticking to his view of the previous day, voted "Go." The decision was now entirely in the Supreme Commander's hands. He pondered it briefly, dropped his head for a moment's thought and decided, "We go."

A final review was slated for the early morning of June 5th. Despite the rain and wind that greeted the Supreme Commander at his final conference, the weather forecasters now thought there might be a break of thirty-six hours. On the basis of this advice, Eisenhower held to earlier decision, informing Washington that "Halcyon plus 5 (June 6) finally and definitely confirmed."

In fact no other decision was possible but it was important for the future of operations in Europe. One of Montgomery's aides said long afterwards the fact that Eisenhower took the responsibility and said "let's go" was a prodigious contribution psychologically in that it took off others the weight of decision. The fact that he had accepted full weight of any reverses that might come was indicated by the Supreme Commander in a memorandum he wrote the day before the landings. Several days later when the success of the assault was complete, he showed it to Commander Butcher. The key sentence read: "The troops, the air and the Navy did all that bravery and devotion to duty could do. If any blame or fault attaches to the attempt it is mine alone." Those words alone make it peculiarly fitting that we associate this Anglo-American action of D Day forever with the name of Ike.

And it is important in this period of strained alliances, of misunderstandings, of loosening ties which once bound us tightly to friends of Western Europe that we recall the day twenty-five years ago when a common effort and a common belief in the things we held most dear produced the D Day miracle. For it was with that rare unity forged in the years of peril and of fear and of defeat that victory was at last attained.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS ON PAY TELEVISION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the mounting interest and serious concern in many circles as to the future impact of subscription or pay television compels me to bring to the attention of my colleagues further developments of paramount importance.

For example, perhaps you missed the brief, but rather potent, article which appeared June 13, 1969—a Friday, incidentally—in the Washington Post. It will follow this statement. Let me quote one paragraph from the story which was entitled "Sports Ready To Collect on Pay-TV." The quote from Dick Bailey, Sr., president of the Hughes Sports Network, sums up the future quite well as far as pay television operators are concerned. Mr. Bailey is quoted as saying:

There is a new era coming and a lot of people will be scrambling to get into it. Free TV will have to worry about losing sports to pay TV.

The article is wrong in one respect. The closing paragraph of the story leaves the impression that it will be 2 years before pay television will be a threat. This is not true.

The Federal Communications Commission has announced its intention to begin licensing pay TV operations 60 days after the disposition of a pending court case. The FCC now is accepting applications from prospective pay television operators.

For over 2 years I have advocated that the question of pay television is a congressional issue and one that Congress should decide—not the FCC. This Congress should determine the role of pay television. For example, it now is being stated that if pay television takes hold in the United States, Americans in the lower income groups will lose free television. They would not be able to watch pay television.

I further understand that the FCC has stated that at least one-third of the families with television sets will not be able to afford pay television.

Another development concerning pay television is covered in an article by Jack Gould, which appeared last Friday, June 20, 1969, in the New York Times. I am also including that article at the end of this statement, as it clearly shows the possible future relationship between pay television and community antenna television—CATV.

In addition, I want to include for the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of Lester W. Lindow, executive director of the Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., Washington, D.C., before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce back on October 13, 1967. His comments some 21 months ago remain valid and current on today's pay television developments.

The newspaper articles and Mr. Lindow's statement follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 13, 1969]

SPORTS READY TO COLLECT ON PAY-TV

The prospect of a bountiful new source of revenue for sports came closer to realization following the Federal Communications Commission order yesterday permitting the start of pay television.

There are legal, technical and other obstacles to be overcome before the householder will be asked to pay for his television fare, but Dick Bailey Sr., president of the Hughes Sports Network, said, "It is coming, there is no use fighting it."

Art Modell, president of the National Football League, said, "I believe it is 'way, way off for pro football. We're married to free TV, except for a special game or two. I could understand pay TV in an area which has been blacked out of free TV during postseason games."

Harry Markson, director of boxing for Madison Square Garden, said, "We will be most interested in the developments of pay TV."

The Garden recently contracted to show 125 sports events on community antenna television over a one-year period, including all the games of the New York Knickerbockers and New York Rangers.

Baseball Commissioner Bowis Kuhn could not be reached for comment.

Pro football already has made provisions for pay TV in the merger agreement between the two leagues, which takes full effect in 1970.

With most stadiums already playing to capacity crowds and negotiations for regular Sunday game telecasts reaching the choking price, pro football recently went to prime-time Monday night telecasts for 1970 to raise an extra \$8 million in revenue.

At the time of the merger between the American and National football leagues, in 1966, owner Ralph Wilson of the Buffalo Bills estimated that pay television of the Super Bowl could mean \$25 million to \$30 million in revenue for a game that now brings in \$2.5 million from free TV.

"Wilson is probably right," president Bailey of the Hughes Sports Network said yesterday. "If I had not sold this network to Howard Hughes. I know I would be going into pay TV now instead of bucking the three conventional networks."

"Only Mr. Hughes can say what we will do now. He makes the decisions."

Bailey revealed that the Hughes network bid on the 13 Monday night telecasts for 1970, which went to the American Broadcasting Co.

"We did not bid lower than ABC," Bailey said "There were other circumstances."

Bailey added, "There is a new era coming and a lot of people will be scrambling to get into it. Free TV will have to worry about losing sports to pay TV."

But not for two years because sports events regularly shown on free TV cannot make the switch to pay TV until that much time has elapsed under the projected regulations.

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1969]
CABLE TV COMPANY TO PROVIDE EXTRA SERVICES AT MONTHLY FEE

(By Jack Gould)

A cable television company operating outside New York City plans to make separate charges for four TV program services, including motion pictures. Cable TV subscribers already pay an average of \$5 a month for the relaying over wires of programs televised by regular stations.

Alfred R. Stern, president of the Television Communications Corporation of 630 Fifth Avenue, disclosed yesterday that he had entered negotiations with the major film producers for the showing of films on a cable "theater channel." A charge of \$5 a month would be made for the showing of three pictures a week.

The plan, scheduled to be introduced in Winter Haven, Fla., calls for the film producers to receive 40 per cent of the proceeds; the cable system, 50 per cent, and the corporation, 10 per cent.

SCHEDULING OF FILMS

To allay the fears of theater owners over competition from pay TV, Mr. Stern said, no film will be shown until after it has completed its engagements in first-run and neighborhood houses.

Mr. Stern's announcement is expected to add to the general controversy over cable TV because many on-the-air broadcasters and theater owners have regarded cable video as an opening wedge to pay-you-see TV.

In New York City, the Manhattan Cable TV Services and the Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corporation have carried supplementary services such as athletic and musical events and documentary films. These companies have not made extra charges because of a city ban on any form of pay TV over franchised cable facilities.

SEEN AS MORE POPULAR

Mr. Stern, whose company owns cable systems in smaller communities in 10 states, said he thought the lump monthly fee for

motion picture service would be more popular and efficient than trying to charge an individual price for different films.

Another advantage, he said, was that the consumer would have the option of deciding whether he wanted to pay for extra programs without increasing the cost of regular cable relay of presentations on the air.

In addition to the theater channel, which would have no advertising, Mr. Stern's corporation is proposing an informational channel, for films of general interest to youngsters and adults; an instructional channel, for foreign-language courses and other vocational guidance, and a professional channel, for providing up-to-date medical data to registered physicians.

The additional channels would cost \$2.50 each, bringing the total for all four channels to \$12.50 monthly.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF LESTER W. LINDOW

There has been considerable discussion this week about the proposed FCC rules for pay TV as they would affect sports events. Quite understandably, there has been a certain amount of confusion. Let me say, first of all, that the proposed rules regarding sports are quite complex. It is certainly understandable that confusion has been created. I do not blame you one bit for having problems with these things.

However, the proposed FCC Fourth Report and Order does set forth the proposed rules although, as I say, they are somewhat complicated. First of all, it is important to understand that there are two kinds of sports events established by the proposed rules. The first type is what are called specific sports events. These include such features as the World Series, the All Star Game, the various Bowl games, League Championships, and, of course, they extend not only to baseball but other kinds of sports, as well.

The second type is what is described as non-specific sports events. Generally speaking, these include those games played as a part of a regular season, in other words, all the regular games of the Washington Redskins or the Washington Senators.

Within the non-specific type there is a further breakdown of categories, again applying to all types of sports having a regular season. It includes home games, games away from home, pre-season games or exhibition games, or the so-called Games of the Week. These matters are set forth in detail on page 91, paragraph 261 of the proposed FCC Report as well as in paragraph 262 which immediately follows that.

Let us refer back to the type described as specific sports events; the World Series, the All Star Game. The proposed Commission rules would provide that if such an event had been broadcast on free television for two consecutive years in the community, and I emphasize "in the community", where the pay television station is located, not nationwide but in the community, pay television cannot broadcast it. I refer now to page 92 of the proposed Report at paragraph 264.

Let us take the World Series as an example. If the Series were on free TV in that community in October 1965 as well as in October 1966, both years, pay television could not show it in October 1967 on the pay TV station licensed to that community. Here I quote from the Report, "If the Series were on free TV in that community in either October 1965 or 1966 but not in both years it would be viewed as not having been regularly televised there and an STV station could show the Series in October 1967."

This is the rule. Would it prevent siphoning? I don't think that it would. Let us see how this could conceivably work. It could work in several ways. Assume that the Series was broadcast on free television in 1966 and again this year, in 1967. The pay television station operator in Washington, D.C. could

go to the baseball people, offer them a sufficient amount of money if they would refuse to sell the World Series rights for Washington for free television in 1968—they only have to do it in Washington—and agree to make up the difference in income. The following year it could be placed on pay TV and every year thereafter.

Another method to get around this might well be to keep it off free television in 1968 but, through mutually agreeable arrangements, put the Series in 1968 into theater pay television in Washington, in near-by Maryland, Virginia, all through our whole area, with the idea of bringing it on pay TV the following year. Under this method, the baseball people would not stand to lose any revenue and the public could see the Series provided they were able to go to the theater and pay for it for one year.

Now, we do not say that this would necessarily happen on a national basis overnight but it could happen on a selected basis in Market A and B this year, in C and D next year, and, incidentally, Zenith said that they did not expect to go into operation all over the country; they are just talking about a couple of markets at a time; Mr. Wright made that point the other day—they could do this progressively and so on until in a relatively short time, for all practical purposes, the World Series would be taken out of the realm of free television and into a completely pay TV setup.

Certainly there would be outcries from the public. There were outcries from the public when Championship fights were put into the theaters on a pay basis and taken off free television. You have reminded us on several occasions, again this week, that there were very serious outcries from Arizona this spring on this very matter, in the case of the Clay-Foley Championship fight. But the situation still exists. That is part of what we are up here talking about today.

Now let us turn to the second type of sports event set up by the proposed Commission rules, that of the non-specific sports event; the game which is played as a part of a regular season. The proposed Commission rules cover this as well. I refer you now to paragraphs 266 and 267, commencing at the bottom of page 92 of the proposed FCC Report.

If a substantial number of non-specific events, such as home games or away from home games, or the so-called Games of the Week, were televised over free television in the pay TV community and were, and I quote from the proposed FCC Report, "within each of the two years preceding the proposed STV broadcasting thereof," then no games in that category may be presented by pay television in that community.

As the proposed FCC Report states, the standard is to be applied on a category by category basis, and, here I quote again from the Report, "If during one but not both of the two years preceding proposed STV broadcast, a substantial number of events in a category were not televised in a community, the category will be considered not to have been regularly televised therein and STV may show the contests in that category." That means all such contests.

Now, that is the rule that is proposed. Does it prevent siphoning? A pay TV promoter could use his economic leverage to purchase the games in a category of non-specific sport events such as regular season home baseball games, which may not have been broadcast in the community over free television, and present them without any delay. For example, assume that a baseball team plays 80 home games and no games in this category are broadcast on free television in the home community. Pay TV could purchase the television rights to all of the home games in this category the very next season, while the away from home games previously broadcast by television could be withdrawn from

free television by the ball club during that season so that they, too, could be made available to pay TV the following year. The same situation could exist if some but not all of the home games were broadcast on free television.

Now, I hope this may help clear up the so-called two-year provision which I think is a snare and a delusion.

TACOMA CELEBRATES ITS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Tacoma, which I have the honor to represent, is currently celebrating the 100th anniversary of its birth. Located on beautiful Commencement Bay at the mouth of the Puyallup River in the shadow of Mount Rainier, Tacoma has grown from a family homestead to the third largest city in the State of Washington.

The history of the continuous settlement of the area began when Job Carr selected a piece of land along the shore of the bay in December 1864 in an area called Chebaulip by the Indians, and shortly thereafter constructed a log cabin as a home for his family. The family arrived from Indiana in 1865.

The patented land, about one-quarter of a section, possessed rich soil and excellent location. It was its location, in fact, that made the claim so appealing to Gen. Morton M. McCarver, who arrived in 1868 as the representative of Portland financial interests. McCarver and his associates had concluded that the area round Commencement Bay was a natural location for the western terminus of a transcontinental railroad. The town which served as that terminus would necessarily prosper.

Upon his arrival, McCarver immediately sought out Job Carr and offered to buy his claim. Carr agreed to sell all with the exception of a 5-acre plot on which he continued to reside. Buying additional land in the area, McCarver began to create his new city. Other settlers arrived as a consequence of McCarver's promotion and soon discussion centered around a permanent name for the new community, which tentatively was being referred to as Commencement City. Selection of the name Tacoma was promoted by an eastern Washington resident, Philip Ritz of Ritzville, who arrived in the fall. Ritz had recently read a book about Puget Sound country written several years before by Theodore Winthrop, who had visited the region in 1853. The book, entitled "The Canoe and Saddle," among other things dealt with the original names of mountains now bearing incongruous European names. Mount Rainier, Winthrop claimed, was known to the Indians as Tacoma.

Both the McCarver and Carr families were visited by Ritz, who encouraged adoption of the mountain's Indian name as the name of the city. McCarver was persuaded and when he and his partners

completed the temporary plat of the new town, the name Commencement City was stricken and that of Tacoma entered.

During the following year, 1869, many lots in the fledgling community were sold, a number of houses built, and several businesses begun. Population increased to the point that in May the county commissioners created Tacoma precinct and appointed the necessary election officials. It was now time for the formal platting of the townsite.

The plat was completed in August and filed at Olympia, the State capital, in December. It is the anniversary of this formal beginning of Tacoma which is now being celebrated.

Tacoma grew steadily during its first several years but it was the announcement in July 1873 of its selection as the western terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad which provided the needed basis for expansion. As envisaged by McCarver, hundreds of individuals rushed to Tacoma to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the new railroad.

Then came the closure of J. Cooke & Co., principal financiers of the road; the railroad was nevertheless completed before the end of the year, 1873. But Tacoma, like the rest of the Nation, felt the depression severely. When it finally lifted and especially in the 1880's with the construction of a direct railroad to the east, the city began to flourish.

The population, which was 1,098 in 1880, swelled to over 36,000 in 1890. Again, depression struck the Nation, causing the city to record only a slight population increase during the 1890's. But with the new century the future of the city, as measured by its current growth, was assured.

During the first decade alone, the population substantially more than doubled. The vision of its founders had become reality.

Tacoma is now the State's third largest city with a population in excess of 150,000 and serves a metropolitan area with a population more than double that figure. It possesses in Commencement Bay one of the finest natural harbors in the world, and one of the fastest developing ports in the country.

The value of imports in 1968 was three times that handled in the previous year. Imports in 1967 totaled \$37 million, and in 1968 they were \$108 million.

With plentiful and inexpensive water and electricity and excellent transportation facilities, including in addition to the port, the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, the new Tacoma Industrial Airport, and serviced by four major railroads, the city is one of the State's leading industrial areas.

Its broad industrial base includes wood products and metallurgy. The Tacoma smelter is the largest combined copper smelter and refinery in the Nation and refines about 10 percent of the country's copper. The city is one of the leading producers of a number of forest products. The 1968 estimated industrial payroll of \$390 million was nearly 20-percent larger than that for 1967.

The Tacoma metropolitan area also includes two large defense establishments, Fort Lewis and McChord Air

Force Base, and is only 25 miles from the Bremerton Naval Shipyard to the west and the Boeing Co., to the north. The area has two fine private universities and two community colleges.

Possessed of one of the most equable climates in the world and located in one of the most beautiful and naturally bounteous sections of the Nation, Tacoma is the gateway to the Northwest playground.

The grandeur and beauty of the area are more than adequately symbolized by Mount Rainier. The Tacomans are indeed proud of their centennial city and equally proud of the area which it serves.

And I, Mr. Speaker, am most proud to take part in the centennial celebration during the Fourth of July congressional recess, and invite any of my colleagues who may be in the area to join me during that time.

THE ESTABLISHMENT—HOW ONE WORKS

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, my good friend and member of the board of regents of the Mercersburg Academy, Mr. Austin V. McClain, spoke to the student body at our alma mater on the functions and responsibilities of a board of regents.

His talk was a good exposition of how one attempts to bridge the "generation gap" of which we hear so much these days. The purpose of his talk was to explain how the Mercersburg board operates, but more important, how any group of dedicated men and women must operate to provide for an educational institution. In common usage, such an institution is part of "the establishment" and as such, in some schools throughout the country, comes under heavy fire from those who know little and apparently care less whether or not their particular educational institution is to be a viable one.

Mr. McClain pointed out that by-and-large a board of trustees or regents is largely made up of graduates of the school which they serve; that most of such graduates had the same goals and aspirations as students, as the students presently in attendance; that they serve their alma mater with devotion, with personal sacrifice, and with only the best interests of the institution as their goal.

To hear some of the campus radicals today, one would think that the governing bodies of educational institutions were jailers or worse. What these people do not understand and fail to try to understand is that the governing body of any educational institution exists for only one reason, and that is to provide for the continuation of a place for others to receive an education. The role of the governing body is critical to this process and that role should be understood by all—students, faculty, alumni, and the pub-

lic. Mr. McClain has made a good start toward making some aware of the role of a board of regents, and I hope that with wider circulation, the understanding will grow. To that end, I am inserting this statement to the student body of the Mercersburg Academy at this point in the RECORD.

THE FUNCTION OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS (By Austin V. McClain)

It has been suggested that we talk together about the way this and other schools and colleges are organized. What I am about to say of the origin and organization of this School applies almost exactly to other educational institutions.

It may not be exciting, but it may help a little in both your understanding and mine. The discussion is particularly pertinent in these times when so many boards are under attack by student groups who I am sure do not really understand the organizational structure.

I wish I could call on your imagination and ask you to think of me as a Mercersburg student. This may be very difficult, because I am two generations beyond you. But I am asking you to imagine a group of 500 students gathered as you are today, and that I am one of them. I ask you to do this because younger people often do not realize we were young and at your age had many of the same thoughts, complaints, worry over examinations and guard that you have. We complained about compulsory rules. And when we got together for bull sessions we talked about the girls and hell raising in general, just as you do.

Our School itself was started by a young man of only 28, and when he was at Exeter I haven't the slightest doubt that he had the same problems. Most of all I emphasize he was a very young man, under 30, to have this dream. On May 1st I had a letter concerning a gift an alumnus has been thinking about. He entered in 1905 and has been one of our most loyal alumni. Quite by coincidence in his letter he had this sentence:

"I led the infamous strike in 1910 and did many other things I've always regretted and was a bad student to boot."

So while there may be a generation gap, we were Mercersburg students and contrary to what you may think, we have not forgotten. Far from forgetting, there is scarcely a day in my life that I do not use some of the information and principles that were taught me here . . . things that at the time did not seem relevant at all.

I will take a moment to tell you how most schools started. The earliest settlers, though they were not themselves educated, wanted their offspring to have an education, so they founded schools almost as soon as they cleared the land. They knew that an educated citizenry could not be subjugated, and their whole purpose in coming here was freedom from unjust governments. The word freedom is most often misused. The constitution guarantees us certain freedoms with respect to the government. It does not intend the word to mean that we have freedom to do anything we want. We are not free to drive any way we wish, nor to hit our neighbor over the head, nor to say just anything that comes into our mind under any and all circumstances.

At any rate, the Pilgrims got here in 1619, and Harvard was started in 1636. As the people went west they continued to found colleges and schools. Yale was founded when a group in New Haven got together and gave \$7,000 to get started. Mercersburg was founded as a college when the people of this small village gave \$10,000. Woodberry Forest started when Robert Walker in 1889 began teaching his own youngsters in his home. The neighbors asked if their children could attend, and shortly they were raising the

funds from gifts of thinking citizens so they could educate more students. My first point is: schools did not just happen. They were founded by generous and thinking people for the education of their families, and others. The most important point is that in no case did those who gave the money expect to get anything out of it. What they did was for the benefit of others.

When a group of people want to work together in any sort of project involving property the procedure is to go to the legislature and ask for a charter. If granted, the charter sets forth the rights, responsibilities and limitations of the group. Our charter granted in 1965 tells how the Board was to be organized, and then grants the Board the right to accept gifts, hold land, build buildings, invest funds, etc.

In another part it gives the Board the right and obligations to name a head of the School, plus a faculty, and specially sets forth that they can be removed for misconduct, etc.

In our system of law, where any property is involved it is given over to the care of Trustees. This is the most common name, but titles such as regents, governors, directors are also used. But "Trustee" describes the group best since the property is in truth entrusted to them, including all the funds, current and endowment. And the Trustees are required to protect and preserve these assets, and they are responsible. If they do not protect and preserve them, they can be sued.

There are Trustee functions running all through our system. When a man dies he can turn his money over to Trustees who must manage the "trust" in accordance with the terms of the will. A group of people may form a corporation, and the stockholders turn the corporation over to a board which is similar in its function to Trustees.

My second point is that any organization has to have a board of management. You have this in the officers of your organizations here in the School. Some person or group has to give leadership and take responsibility.

In all cases if the boards do not do their duty and handle the property correctly, they can be challenged in the courts and penalized financially if they have done anything that is improper.

Under all these charters the Board then adopts by-laws which in the main describe the organization, what officers there will be, what their duties are, etc.

And in all instances that I know of, the boards then name a manager, or a president, or headmaster to have full-time operation of the institution. Board members of educational institutions are almost never full-time employees, so they have to engage full-time people to manage the School. So a man is named president, principal, or headmaster, and he in turn engages a staff to do the teaching. In practice, he recommends to the Board that a certain individual be named to teach mathematics, etc., and the Board elects, but also in practice the Board would rarely interfere.

After the faculty has been named, the Board then looks to the headmaster and faculty to work out the curriculum and rules for operating the institution. The headmaster and faculty in turn make recommendations to the Board, and nearly always the Board approves their recommendations on the basis that they are closer to the situation, and are in a position to know best.

The school then is made up of four parts:

1. The Student body, which is the whole purpose for the existence of the School.
2. The Headmaster and faculty, who in later life are revered by their students, but are not always appreciated during the school years.
3. The alumni body, 12,000 former students, who all complained while they were here, including me, but who after graduation

give the funds to provide better facilities for the students.

4. The Board of Regents, whose job it is to serve these three groups, and to do the best they can to make it an outstanding institution.

As the School ages, and the young men who have been graduated develop into leaders in their fields, the Board is likely to be made up largely of alumni. So a typical Board is made up of people who themselves have studied at the particular school, and who have reached maturity. They refer to it as "Alma Mater"—beloved mother.

The typical Board is made up of people who care greatly. They have attended the school; their own children have attended the school; and they have attained a modicum of success in their chosen field.

On the Board of Mercersburg we have 30 individuals, plus five honorary members. On the active Board 24 of the 30 are alumni; the others are devoted friends. There are two physicians, four bankers, four accountants, four educators, two clergymen, six attorneys, two legislators and twenty-one corporation executives, i.e., businessmen. There is some duplication, since one attorney is a banker, several accountants are heads of companies, etc. There is very little that can come up in a Board meeting where we do not have someone competent to advise us, though what we usually do is to weigh this advice, and then hire outside experts if this seems indicated.

Now what does the Board do?

This can best be introduced by describing the various committees of the Board. Each of us serves on one or more committees. Listen carefully to the title of each: finance committee, buildings and grounds committee, nominating committee, development committee—that means fund-raising. The heads of each of these committees serve on the executive committee.

The committees describe the work we do. It is mostly business matters. Nowhere have I mentioned a committee on curriculum, athletics, discipline, or student affairs, for these are the responsibility of the Headmaster and faculty.

I have gone back over the minutes of the Board for the past year, and can find our main work was concerned with investments, how we can raise more money to improve the buildings, what the tuition must be to approach a balanced budget, etc.

One of our major jobs is the balancing of the budget. At no school do the students pay the whole cost. I have put in your places a restructured budget for this year. It shows that all fees provide \$1,521,000 out of total expense of \$1,905,000. Then we list gifts of \$349,000 to make up some of the difference, which this year means we will end up about \$34,000 in the red. Note that we have to make up \$349,000. Divided among 500 students this would require \$770 more in tuition than is now charged, but we supply this money rather than charge the higher rate.

We do not ignore the main purpose of the Academy, which is to educate. But our Board, like most boards, cannot become involved with day-to-day class work. So from the beginning the Board has searched for an individual with educational experience, and a faculty to have charge of the day-to-day operations. They decide on the curriculum, discipline, athletic policies, and all the things that touch you directly. When there is to be any change in these areas, Mr. Fowle comes to the Board and says: "The Faculty and I recommend that such and such be done." Since we are not competent to decide whether Latin or some other course should be taught, we normally accept the recommendations. I cannot remember a time when we did not. In fact, we may not always entirely agree. But it is essential to good management to cooperate with the operating

head of an organization and let him manage it. If he does well, all right. If he doesn't you get a new manager, but he has to be let alone. I must say that I do not know of any case where there has been a difference of opinion that there has been anything but the best of feelings. You can disagree with your best friend and not be nasty about it. I wish there was more of this sort of feeling abroad on college campuses. Nothing is settled by violence. Violence is infantile. Children throw tantrums when they do not get what they want. Mature people do not act that way.

Now let me say several things about this Board that some people overlook.

1. No one on the Board is paid anything for his service. In fact, it costs him and his company a lot of money for him to serve.

2. Individual members of the Board do not do business with the School, i.e., they do not profit from School business.

3. They do not exert pressure to secure the admission of a prospective student. In fact, on several occasions sons of members have not been able to make it.

4. They travel to four to six meetings a year at their own expense.

5. Since most of the men are in active business, the time taken from that business is costly. I estimate that the per diem cost to our firms for a Board meeting is \$12,000 to \$15,000 per meeting.

I mentioned that one of our committees is finance and another development. Well in the development field we have in the past ten years raised \$7,000,000 in one way or another. Our most recent campaign was to raise \$1.5 million to match a challenge gift of \$1.5 million. The challenge gift was made by a foundation of which a Board member is president. The way we started out to raise the money was to go first to the Board, and of that \$1.5 million the Board gave 41 per cent. Thirty people gave over \$600,000, but you could well say that with the challenge gift, the Board gave \$2.1 million of the more than \$3 million raised.

What happened was that the Headmaster told us one day the students of this School needed a better library and a better gymnasium. We accepted his recommendation, and set about raising the money, spending our time going out to see others to ask for gifts.

The Board is the business and giving arm of the School. In my judgment, this function can best be carried out by a diversified group such as we have. Maybe we could have a better Board, but in general the decisions coming from it would be no better and possibly worse. If you know of anyone who has particular experience in budget-balancing, investments, building construction, and education, and who is also willing to give generously, I urge you to give me his name for a place on the Board of this Academy. But please don't give me any name unless he has already proved he has been successful in managing his own affairs.

What does the Board get out of all of this? What have we gained from making a gift every year, balancing the budget, building buildings? The same satisfaction the pioneers got when they started their schools . . . hopefully better education for their descendants.

Critics of boards all seem to forget that they invest their time, money, and experience, and get absolutely no tangible return.

They do have the satisfaction of having invested in the future of the youth of America. They do it because they have come to appreciate the value of their experience here, and because they want to pass it on to others.

Wrong we may often be, but our every decision has the highest motivation.

SST NEXT LOGICAL STEP IN AIR TRANSPORT GROWTH

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 months ago I conveyed to the President my strong support of continued progress in the U.S. supersonic transport program. It is my understanding that the SST program is still under review by the administration, and in recent weeks consideration has been given to alternate plans of financing prototype construction.

I take this opportunity of calling to the attention of Members of the House a recent statement which appeared in Boeing Planetalk, an employee publication, outlining the importance of the United States proceeding with the next phase of the SST program.

According to the article, it will take until the late 1970's before the American SST will be ready for service and the early 1980's before substantial numbers will be in operation. The British-French SST already has been flight tested and made its first public appearance at the recent international air show in Paris.

We are talking about a \$20 billion production program, and a program in which the Federal Government's SST investment will be returned by the 300th airplane sale.

Having received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article on the SST from Boeing Planetalk:

SST NEXT LOGICAL STEP IN AIR TRANSPORT GROWTH

The impressive growth of world air transportation, together with the advance of technology, make the supersonic transport a logical next major step for the air transport industry. It must be kept in mind that the time required to construct and test prototypes and enter production will make it late in the 1970s before the American SST will be ready for service and early in the '80s before appreciable numbers will be in operation. Market forecasters generally agree that air traffic will continue to grow at a rate averaging at least 8½ percent per year through the 1970s and '80s, as compared with a 15 percent average annual increase during the past 20 years. This growth will result in six times the present passenger-mile volume by 1990.

In the total route pattern, the long intercontinental routes are particularly suited to the SST, because trip times would be shortened dramatically by the 1,800-mile-an-hour speed. These overwater routes also avoid the problem of possible objections to sonic boom effects over populated areas. The SST's share of the traffic on these routes in 1985 will equal today's total free world traffic. The market so described will absorb an estimated 500 American-built SST's by 1990—a \$20 billion production program.

Latest studies show the U.S. SST to be highly competitive in the 1980s from an operational economics standpoint. In its early years following introduction, when the demand will be high and SST equipment will still be scarce, high load factors or percentage of seats occupied can be expected to result in high revenue yield, as was the case when

the jet transport was first introduced. Thereafter the SST will gradually gain an advantage over present jet transports in total operating costs as a direct result of its speed, since wage and salary costs that are applicable on an hourly basis will produce three times as many miles of transportation per hour. As these hourly costs continue to increase, the SST will continue to gain in relative operating economy, until in the latter 1980s its total operating cost per seat mile will tend to approximate that of the newest large-body economy jets. Travel at three times the present speed can be accomplished at relatively the same cost per seat mile as for the subsonic equipment. The result will be advantageous economically to the airlines and a considerable boon to the air traveler. Europe will be as close to the East coast by SST as Minneapolis is to New York by subsonic jet.

The program will also be advantageous from the standpoint of the nation's economy as a whole. The U.S. aircraft industry has long held the position of leading supplier of air transport equipment to the airlines of the world and hence has been a leading contributor to our balance of payments. But that position is threatened by the entry of Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union into the SST field. The American SST program will have an estimated \$16 billion favorable balance of trade effect, as compared with an opposite situation wherein U.S. airlines would be obliged to buy the equipment from European sources.

A production SST program will provide an estimated 50,000 direct jobs in the plants of prime contractors and principal subcontractors at peak. More than 50 percent of the work will be subcontracted, covering almost all of the 50 states. Considerable national benefit will also accrue from broader application of various technological developments employed in the SST, as well as from secondary employment in support of the SST program itself.

From the first the program has been designed to be self-liquidating. Royalties on production sales will return the government's full prototype investment by the 300th airplane sale and \$1 billion in interest by the 500th sale—the present market estimate. In addition, personal and corporate income tax payments by participants in the production program will return an amount to the U.S. Treasury estimated at twice the prototype expenditure.

Delivery positions for a total of 122 SSTs have been reserved by 12 U.S. and 14 non-U.S. airlines. United States airlines have invested \$59.5 million in the prototype development program. The Boeing Company estimates its total commitment through completion of prototype construction (including research and development, facilities and other non-reimbursable expenditures) to be approximately \$200 million.

The total cost of the prototype program to the government is estimated at \$1.2 billion if the program goes forward as originally planned. In recent weeks consideration has been given by the Administration to alternate plans of financing the prototypes such as through the use of government-guaranteed bonds, but as of this writing no determination has been made on such plans.

Research and development work on the SST have now been going on for more than ten years. The program has reached the point where appropriate designs exist. A full range of design alternatives has been wind tunnel tested, resulting in an airplane superior to the present European SSTs in speed (by 400 miles per hour), in combined range and payload, in passenger accommodations and in operating economics. The next step required is the construction of prototypes for actual flight proving and refinement prior to production.

Delay in proceeding with the program

could result in European model advances toward the performance capabilities that are counted on to give the U.S. product its market superiority. It would permit the foreign competition to book more orders and thus narrow the remaining SST market.

The management of The Boeing Company feels that the SST program is one highly appropriate to United States capabilities, capitalizing on the technology that has been built up in this country. It fits the requirements of growth in world air transportation, bringing the advantage of increased productivity by providing substantially more seat-miles per hour than present jet equipment. It will bring the air traveler the advantage of significantly greater speed and convenience, which has been the basis of air transportation's growth.

FALSE ECONOMY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, while Newark Bay marine terminal development is best known for its containership and general cargo facilities, channel improvements in the bay and the Hackensack River to the north of Port Newark, must not be overlooked. As part of the overall Newark Bay-Hackensack River improvement project, Congress and the President in 1968 also authorized a deepening of the north reach of Newark Bay channel from its present 32 feet to a new depth of 35 feet, the provision of a maneuvering area 1,300 feet long and 900 feet wide just below the Passaic and Hackensack Rivers, and a deepening of the Hackensack from 30 to 32 feet for about 4 miles, thence from 12 to 15 feet up to about the city of Hackensack.

Located along the northern shore of the bay and lower reaches of the river are industrial terminals which handle waterborne movements of sulfur, chemicals, coal, asphalt and petroleum. Some of the larger industrial-type tonnages handled on Newark Bay in 1966 are as follows—in short tons:

Aluminum ores and concentrates...	17,330
Chrome ores and concentrates....	57,858
Crude petroleum.....	49,728
Salt.....	70,945
Basic chemicals and plastics.....	366,146
Soap.....	73,796
Gasoline.....	1,330,232
Jet fuel.....	1,143,651
Kerosene.....	499,509
Fuel oils.....	1,914,687
Naphtha.....	73,296
Iron and steel products.....	366,768
Copper alloys.....	171,294
Iron and steel scrap.....	706,210

Mr. Speaker, from these figures, it must be obvious that water commerce on Newark Bay plays a key role in New Jersey's leadership in industry and industrial employment.

Of particular interest is the importance of petroleum, and the fact that in 1966, 410 ocean tanker movements, that is, vessels drawing more than 19 feet of water, handled petroleum products on Newark Bay. Of this, 176 ships upon arrival in Newark Bay drew 29 or more feet of water, which means that these vessels could have navigated the present

32-foot deep north reach only at high tide.

I think it must be clear that the deepening of this reach will prevent costly delays to such vessels awaiting high tide. Accordingly, along with the widening of the lower reaches of Newark Bay, I strongly support the deepening of the northern reaches and the provision of the turning basin recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against economy, but economy in the above areas would not only be false, but in some instances, dangerous as well. I urge the present administration not to discriminate against the New York-New Jersey ports.

ECONOMICS OF OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS OFFSHORE UNITED STATES

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. C. McCurdy, president of Shell Oil Co., examined the economic factors in offshore oil and gas operations in a recent presentation to a technology conference in Houston. His paper considered the high costs of offshore work and the need for a reasonable expectation of return so the industry can attract the necessary investor capital.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Mr. McCurdy's remarks for inclusion in the RECORD. His remarks have particular significance at this time when efforts are being made to open our borders to a vast flow of foreign oil. His paper examines the enormous return to the public that is generated from offshore activity in the form of bonuses, rentals, production taxes, and royalties to the Federal and State Governments. A valid comparison between the cost of domestic offshore oil and foreign imports cannot be made unless this considerable benefit is made a part of the evaluation.

Mr. Speaker, figures 1 and 2 referred to by Mr. McCurdy are tables and are included in the RECORD. Figures 3 through 7 are charts which present a problem in printing and are therefore not included but will be readily made available to anyone interested.

The material follows:

ECONOMICS OF OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS OFFSHORE, UNITED STATES

(By R. C. McCurdy, Shell Oil Co.)

INTRODUCTION

Offshore oil and gas operations are the first major industrial endeavor to exploit the mineral resources under the oceans. Over a span of 20 years these operations have grown to a position of prominence in the oil industry. In 1968 they accounted for 14 percent of this nation's crude oil and condensate production and about 40 percent of the industry's total domestic exploration and production investment. This growth has dictated the development of a new technology which today permits us to produce in 350 feet of water and drill in water depths in excess of 1,300 feet. These capabilities undoubtedly can be extended several fold.

The potential of the explored areas of the continental shelf is well established. The vast unexplored areas of the shelf and slope offer added potential. However, the ultimate role of the offshore in satisfying future national energy requirements depends on the application of continuing technological advancements within an accepted economic framework.

WHY THE MIGRATION OFFSHORE

The underlying reason for the oil industry's activity in the ocean is this nation's growing demand for hydrocarbons. In the past 20 years domestic consumption of liquid hydrocarbons has more than doubled. Demand is expected to nearly double again in the next two decades. Growth in demand for natural gas has been even more spectacular, increasing fourfold since 1948.

Based on data in a recent U.S. Geological Survey publication there may remain as much as 900 billion barrels¹ of crude oil undiscovered within the terrestrial boundaries of the United States.² At present recovery efficiency levels this would represent about 300 billion barrels of recoverable reserves or about 100 times domestic crude production in 1968 and 10 times present proved reserves. In addition an estimated 2,100 billion barrels³ potentially is available in the form of oil-shale and coal.⁴ Why then has the industry ventured into the perilous offshore environment when these vast untapped supplies reportedly exist onshore? The answer is simply that the costs of finding, developing and producing hydrocarbons in water depths of present operations are competitive with the current combined costs of these activities onshore and with current estimates of the costs of manufacturing unconventional supplies as evidenced by the industry's apparent low level of enthusiasm for such ventures.

The movement offshore has not been a headlong plunge. The marine environment was poorly understood, and the industry had—and still has—much to learn about the many factors and risks unique to the seas. Offshore oil operations began in shallow water, near shore in a physical and cost environment not unlike that encountered in adjacent inland waters. However, as the frontiers of ocean technology were pushed forward and operations were gradually extended seaward, the oil industry found itself in a world where the operating and economic rules-of-thumb constantly change. The costs of implementing this technology increase steadily with water depth, and the economic merit of the offshore relative to alternate supply sources is ever narrowing.

The industry has a responsibility to supply energy at minimum cost. It also has a responsibility to provide a fair return on the funds which investors make available for our business. With each step into deeper water industry must weigh these increasing costs against the alternatives available if it is to fulfill these responsibilities.

HOW HAVE INVESTOR AND THE NATION FARED IN THE OFFSHORE TO DATE?⁵

How well has the offshore served the investor and the nation in the competition to

¹ The basic data in this publication have been modified to exclude the offshore.

² Hendricks, T. A.: "Resources of Oil, Gas, and Natural Gas Liquids in the U.S. and the World", U.S. Geological Survey, (1965).

³ Based on estimated oil shale resources yielding 25 gallons or more per ton in beds over 10 feet thick, and the use of the coal conversion method developed in "Project Gasoline".

⁴ "United States Petroleum through 1980", U.S. Department of the Interior, (July 1968).

⁵ For purposes of this discussion offshore is defined as the area lying seaward of the Chapman Line in Louisiana and seaward of the Coastline in Texas. Both State and Fed-

supply energy requirements? The answers to these questions should provide a framework of reference for estimating the future role of the offshore in the national energy picture.

Let us begin by reviewing the results of these operations from the point of view of the investor who thru the end of 1968 had made available about \$12.9 billion for these operations. These expenditures which are shown in the following table, fall into two major categories.

FIGURE 1.—DOMESTIC OFFSHORE EXPENDITURES

	Cumulative through 1968		
	Investment	Expense	Total
Operational:			
Exploration.....	\$1.5		
Drilling and development.....	7.3		
Production expense and overhead.....		\$1.7	
Subtotal.....	8.8	1.7	\$10.5
Leasehold:			
Bonus and rental.....	4.1		
Royalty and production taxes.....		1.7	
Subtotal.....	4.1	1.7	5.8
Total.....	12.9	3.4	16.3

The first category consists of those costs directly related to finding, developing and producing hydrocarbons. These costs are largely controlled by the physical environment—the sea and the geology.

The second category includes those costs that are subject to the direct control of the industry and/or the various governmental bodies that administer these public resources. These costs include lease bonus, rentals, royalties and production taxes.

About two-thirds of the total \$16.3 billion expenditure falls into the first category. The major item is the expenditure for drilling, platforms and facilities, which totals \$7.3 billion. Exploration costs, including exploration overhead, amount to \$1.5 billion, and production expense has been \$1.7 billion.

In the second category, bonus is the dominant cost item. Bonus accounts for \$3.9 billion out of the total of \$4.1 billion for bonus and rental, as compared to \$1.7 billion for royalties and production taxes.

The total investment to find and establish production amounts to \$12.9 billion. It includes the costs of exploration, bonus, and drilling and facilities. Expenses, which are recovered out of income as they are incurred during the course of production, total \$3.4 billion. These include royalties, production expense and overhead.

The rewards of these enormous expenditures are listed below:

FIGURE 2.—DEVELOPED RESERVES (JAN. 1, 1969)

	Oil and condensate (billion barrels)	Natural gas (trillion cubic feet)	Total oil equivalent ¹ (billion barrels)
Remaining reserves....	4.5	35.5	6.3
Cumulative production.....	2.2	10.5	2.7
Ultimate recovery.....	6.7	46.0	9.0

¹ Natural gas converted to oil equivalent on the basis of 20,000 cubic feet per barrel.

eral waters are included. On the Pacific Coast the definition follows that of the Conservation Committee of California Oil Producers except that portions of certain fields, which were developed from land locations, have been excluded. Most important of these are portions of the Wilmington and Huntington Beach Fields. The THUMS portion of the Wilmington Field is included.

The hydrocarbon volumes developed thru the end of 1968 amounted to an estimated 6.7 billion barrels of crude and condensate and 46 trillion cubic feet of gas. Converting the gas to an equivalent volume of oil on the basis of 20,000 cubic feet per barrel gives a total of 9.0 billion equivalent barrels of hydrocarbons. Of this amount 2.7 billion equivalent barrels have been produced to date and 6.3 billion barrels exist as underground reserves.

Figure 1 shows production growth over the years. Liquid production began to accelerate in the mid-1950's and in 1968 reached a level of about 450 million barrels. The extraordinary rate of increase since 1965 is in part due to the crisis in the Middle East and rising allowables in Louisiana. The offshore was probably the most responsive of any area in the country to this emergency.

The growth rate of gas production in recent years has even outpaced that of petroleum liquids. Gas production has increased three fold since 1964, and in 1968 reached an annual level of 2.4 trillion cubic feet.

These production volumes have been translated into dollars on Figure 2. Also shown are cumulative expenditures and net cash flow. The latter represents the difference between expenditures and revenues. Federal income tax is not considered. Gross revenue at the end of 1968 totaled \$8.8 billion. Deduction of royalty, production and overhead expenses gives a cumulative cash income of \$5.4 billion. As evidenced by the negative slope of the cash flow curve annual expenditures have continually exceeded revenues. At the end of 1968 the oil industry was \$7.5 in the hole. However, you will recall that there are developed reserves of 6.3 billion equivalent barrels of hydrocarbons remaining to be produced. After royalty and operating costs, the value of these reserves is estimated to be about \$1.75 per barrel for a total of \$11.0 billion. This is \$3.5 billion dollars in excess of the present deficit. So, there is every indication that the industry will get its money back.

Payout is several years in the future, and based on these data alone anyone familiar with the time value of money recognizes that the overall rate of return will be quite low. However, the cost data are a composite of many different plays at various stages in the exploration, development, and production cycle and many of these have yet to bear fruit. Reserves and production attributable to these exploration expenditures are likely to grow. The ultimate economic outcome depends both on the extent to which this occurs and on the amount of additional capital required to develop and produce these added reserves.

There can be no doubt about the economic outcome from the point of view of the public. They definitely will profit from the venture. It will be recalled that one third of the total expenditure in the offshore has been paid to State and Federal governments in the form of royalty, production taxes, bonus and rentals for the right to exploit these public resources. When future royalties and production taxes on the remaining reserves are included, the total of these payments should grow to about \$10.0 billion or \$1.10 for each barrel of hydrocarbons developed in the offshore to date. It is recognized that the present bonus expenditures may represent payments for volumes that are as yet undiscovered and yet undeveloped. However, if the ultimate volume related to these expenditures were to increase as much as 50 percent the amount that the industry would return to the public would still approximate \$1.00 per barrel. Either way, it is apparent that the net price the consumer public pays for offshore oil is competitive with the price of oil delivered in this country from almost anywhere in the free world.

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

With the investor economics of past operations still in doubt what are the prospects

for the future? Results to date are heavily weighted by operation in relatively shallow water, and as these opportunities diminish operations must move into deeper water if this quest in the ocean is to continue. This movement must take place as it has in the past by careful step-by-step progression lest industry get in over its head.

Much of the technology to permit this movement is already available, and that which isn't can be developed. Industry presently has the capability of exploring in water depths several times as deep as the present maximum water depth of a producing operation. The water-depth capability of seismic operations to locate structural anomalies is virtually unlimited. Conventional evaluative drilling operations have been successfully carried out in 1,300 feet of water.

The primary challenge to our scientists and engineers is in the extractive phase of the business. So far the fixed platform has provided the physical base for development and producing activities, but operations are fast approaching water depths where platforms will no longer be economically practical. Several imaginative floating and underwater systems are now under development, and one or more of these may be needed within a few years.

The key to the future of the offshore is one of cost. The extent to which the volume potential offered by the offshore is translated into developed reserves depends on our ability to implement this technology at costs that are competitive with alternative sources. The cost of exploration are relatively insensitive to water depth. However, this is not true of the costs related to the extractive phase.

Figure 3 (not printed) shows how the cost of a fixed platform increases with water depth in the Gulf of Mexico. The wide cost spread is due to differences in the configuration and size of the structure, number of conductors driven, the time of year it is installed, and soil and current conditions at the location. Looking at the base of this spread note that the minimum cost of a platform in 350 feet of water, which is presently the maximum depth of a producing operation, is about \$3.5 million. This is about double the cost in 200 feet of water and the cost is increasing exponentially. Platform costs are substantially higher off the coasts of California and Alaska. The costs of complex underwater or floating systems which must eventually replace the fixed platform will also be high, although they may not be as sensitive to water depth. While some reductions will be achieved as the tools of the trade are improved and experience is assimilated, there is nothing on the horizon that would materially change this capital cost prognosis, reduce operating costs or mitigate environmental hazards.

The only soft spot in the cost picture is the second category of costs—leasehold. If industry is conducting its business in a rational manner, the expenditures for bonus, rental and royalties should be no greater than the difference between the market value of the resource and the costs of physically doing business in the offshore. In the latter we must also include a fair return to the investor on his investment, including leasehold costs, if he is to continue to make funds available for this endeavor. Leasehold costs should thus shrink as other costs increase. It will be recalled that payments for bonus, rentals, production taxes, and royalties constitute about one-third of the total expenditures to date and eventually should amount to something on the order of \$1.00 per barrel. Thus the costs of physically doing business in the offshore could increase substantially if the cost for bonus, rentals and royalties are permitted to approach zero. This, of course, assumes that the industry has properly done its arithmetic in the past and that the sum of all costs, including all the money spent on leases which proved to be barren,

plus a fair return for the investor actually add up to no more than the market value of the resource. Although at this stage we cannot be certain this is the case, it is apparent that the physical costs of the average offshore operation have not yet reached a level which places them on the threshold of economic extinction. These activities can be expected to continue to expand for some time to come.

None of this is meant to infer an immediate need for the government to take steps to reduce or eliminate these payments. These are public resources and the public's right to fair market value is not questioned. However, as the severity of the environment increases, their value in the undeveloped state will decrease and the bonus an investor can afford to pay is bound to shrink accordingly. Eventually a point may be reached where royalty and rental requirements will also have to be reduced if the maximum volume potential of the offshore is to be realized.

Within the framework of this cost outlook, how much of the potential offered by the offshore will fall within economic reach? The answer to this question depends to a great extent on the distribution of the hydrocarbons. A platform or, in the future, an underwater or floating facility, is required for even the most modest producing operation. Its cost, which in deeper water amounts to several million dollars, dominates the expenditure picture. The economic outcome depends on the hydrocarbon volume that falls within the drainage area of this fixed facility. Despite the advances in directional drilling techniques of recent years, the geographic area that can be reached by directional drilling from a platform still is limited to a few thousand acres, and there is little prospect that this capability will be greatly increased. The area that can be exploited by a platform, floating or underwater facility can be greatly extended by using mobile equipment to drill wells at outlying locations, and then connecting them to the facility with flowlines. However, the capital and operating costs of these wells and the necessary ocean floor completion equipment are much higher than those of a platform well, and the hydrocarbon volume within the drainage area of an individual well, which because of geologic consideration seldom exceeds 100 acres, becomes the overriding constraint.

Figure 4 (not printed) is based on a statistical study of 690 fields in South Louisiana and the adjacent coastal waters. Because of differences in geologic conditions from province to province, these data are not directly applicable to the total offshore or even the remaining unexplored areas in the Louisiana offshore. However, they do serve to illustrate the general pattern of hydrocarbon distribution that has been observed in mature producing provinces. It is not unreasonable to assume that the distribution in the offshore could follow a similar pattern. The ordinate on this chart gives the fraction of the total 690 fields which individually contain a recoverable volume less than the value shown on the abscissa. You will note that half of the fields included in the study contained less than 4.0 million equivalent barrels. In 400 feet of water a single platform may cost more than \$5 million. Burdened with this heavy initial expenditure the median size venture would not have a happy economic outcome. This would be true if the entire volume falls within reach of a single platform which will not always be the case in oil fields and is less likely in gas fields. Based on FPC dictated gas prices and assuming a constant reservoir thickness, a gas field will yield about one fourth the gross revenue of an oil field covering an equal area. The number of accumulations that meet the criteria for development in deep water is thus drastically reduced, particularly in the case of gas fields. It is apparent that the offshore will never be exploited as intensively as the terrestrial environments.

However, the volume that the offshore ultimately yields will not necessarily be reduced proportionately because the major portion of the total reserve in a province is usually found in a few larger fields.

Figure 5 (not printed) is based on this same statistical study. The ordinate gives the fraction of the total volume in all 690 fields that is contained in fields which individually contain a volume larger than the value shown on the abscissa. This chart shows that more than 50 percent of the total reserve in all of the fields was in fields which individually contained 75 million barrels or more. Approximately 80 percent was in fields larger than 25 million barrels. Volumes of this magnitude are capable of supporting a substantial expenditure to establish a base for producing operations, and depending on the distribution of the hydrocarbons within the field, much of this potential may be within economic reach.

CONCLUSIONS

The offshore has served the energy market well in the past and will play an important role in the future in satisfying this nation's insatiable thirst for energy. It is also apparent that the oil industry, in the intense competition for new reserves, is playing the offshore game as vigorously as its investors will allow. To successfully play the game at these levels, the competitor must thoroughly understand the game and its rules. Nearly all of the stake is put up many years before the value of the pot is fully known, and success depends on the ability to forecast in advance what this value will be. This is the challenge that our technologists and economists face, and it is indeed a formidable one. The estimation of volume, on which the value of the reward is so heavily dependent, is a hazardous undertaking under the most favorable conditions. Now in the offshore the explorer must also predict its distribution. The engineers must then forecast the costs to develop and produce. These operations often require the use of untried tools or even technology that is yet to be developed.

These risks are an inherent part of the game, and the industry can live with them as long as it can predict the rules of the game that will prevail over the lives of these ventures. This can be accomplished only in an atmosphere of political and economic stability. It is within such an atmosphere that the offshore has grown to its present stature in the energy business, and only within such an atmosphere can it continue to grow.

THE FLAG

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this is the season for commencement addresses and I have noticed a number of very fine ones in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Recently, I attended the high school exercises in my hometown of Sylacauga, Ala., and the address was given by Dr. William C. Berryman, director of curriculum and instruction for the Sylacauga Board of Education.

I was most impressed by Dr. Berryman's address which accents the positive things about our great country. Most of these commencement addresses, which receive publicity, are those which downgrade America and the system we live under.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Berryman's address in the RECORD at this point:

Rather than speaking to the Graduating Class tonight, I wish to speak for them. These Graduating Seniors of Sylacauga High School are different from some of the students that we read about today. These students love their country and are proud of it. They are determined to work hard and contribute to its greatness.

At an assembly at Sylacauga High earlier this year we examined together the meaning of an activity—Pledging Allegiance to the Flag—an activity in which these graduates have engaged at the beginning of each assembly program. I know that the words and feelings which follow are their words and feelings. I know because they have told me so—in both words and in their actions.

I therefore am proud to speak for these Graduating Seniors.

They say—

I Pledge Allegiance: I promise loyalty to my country. Surely, if we live in a country whose protection and privileges we enjoy, it is basic that we recognize the benefits we receive by being true to its government and ideals—I promise loyalty.

To the Flag: Our flag means a great many things to us—whether it is being displayed in a building such as our school or being raised on Iwo Jima as is shown in the U.S. Marine Memorial it represents home, justice, honor, safety, greatness, liberty, freedom.

Of the United States of America: The words of the Americans Creed express it so well: "I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed."

And to the Republic for which it stands: "a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states," the republic—where I count—where my voice may be heard—where I may participate in decision making.

One nation: "a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

Under God indivisible: Recognition of, and love for a supreme being—God is at the heart of what America means—we are free to worship God in any way we choose—this recognition of our universal dependence upon God, combined with our freedom to worship him as we choose, is the source of our nation's strength.

With liberty: Liberty exists for each citizen. The law enforces certain rules that protect the basic rights of individuals to life, liberty, and property. It sees that the will of the majority is carried out when that will does not violate the rights of any citizen. Therefore, liberty, which exists under the law, does not mean that everyone is free to "do as he pleases." Even so, we are much freer than those citizens of other nations who were not as fortunate as we were—to be born in the United States of America.

And justice for all: Our governmental system rests upon two mighty pillars: the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America. This nation was born with the bold words of the Declaration. It's very heart is in these hallowed lines: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

The Union was created by the lofty phrases of the Constitution. It's very first words are

among the most important in all of the document:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish the Constitution of the United States of America."

These two passages are brief, yes—and their words are simple. Yet they are of deep and lasting significance. In them is to be found the fundamental expression of the American heritage—a deep and abiding faith in individualism—in freedom—and in equality.

It is this faith that has made us the greatest of nations the world has ever known. Look about you. The things that show our greatness can be seen on every hand. There are huge cities, bustling towns, fertile farms, thriving stores and busy factories. Our roads and highways teem with traffic; railroads and airlines span the continent. There are millions of telephones, radios, and television sets, clothes dryers, dishwashers and many other conveniences. We have harnessed mighty rivers, split the atom and viewed the other side of the moon. The list is well-nigh endless.

But these things are only the *material evidence* of our greatness. They may show that we are a great nation; but in themselves they do not make us great. We are a great nation and a mighty people because we were born with, and we strive to live by, the faith that is our American Heritage. What is the stuff of which our nation is made? It has been said that our democracy is based on two concepts—Competence and Compassion—competence is necessary in a free enterprise system—the ability to do—to accomplish—to create—to use wisely—to understand—

However, even a casual study of history shows us that competence is not enough—The good citizen has feeling as well as skill—The educated person understands the humanness of human beings. A feeling for people—the ability to interpose evidence, reason, and judgment between impulse and action. A feeling for people as individuals and as nations.

How do we feel about our nation?

A clipping which has been in my files for several years expresses it so well:

"My love for my country affects me in many ways.

"Sometimes it's an emotional thrill when I see our flag used in ceremony or flying from a flagpole in our school yards.

"Sometimes it's a feeling of reverence when I view the majesty of the things that make up this nation—our mountains and plains and lakes and cities.

"Sometimes it's a feeling of pride in our people when they determine to share their bounty with others.

"And sometimes, because love and pride are so great, it's a feeling of disappointment when we fail to live up to our commitment to the worth and dignity of the individual.

"Patriotism is a word with high emotional impact. I don't think one should suppress feelings in the presence of our nation's symbols, but patriotism is more than flag-waving.

"Patriotism needs an intellectual base in the history of this nation's victories over forces which degrade the human spirit.

"Patriotism needs an intellectual base in order to honestly recognize failure and to resolve to correct it."

Perhaps love of country can be compared to my love for my children. I love them now in spite of their faults, but I love them even more for what I dream that they can become and I want to help that dream become reality.

Will America remain a great nation? Will

it continue to become, as it has throughout its history, an even greater one? It will if we—you and I—believe in and live by our heritage. The future of the nation rests with us. That future is secure if we, you and I, dedicate ourselves to the high purpose of carrying that great heritage forward.

These Seniors Pledge Their Allegiance.

SCHOOLS WITHOUT LIBRARIES

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about proposed cuts in the funding of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I insert an editorial of June 14, 1969, from the magazine *America*. I think that it states excellently the need for adequate funding of this useful and important program. The article follows:

SCHOOLS WITHOUT LIBRARIES

Until early June it seemed to some that Marshall McLuhan and the Administration in Washington were of one mind in believing that you can run a school without a library. Dr. McLuhan lately clarified his position, however, in an address to the American Booksellers Assn.'s 69th annual convention. Arguing that "anything which undermines the alphabet undermines the progress of civilization," he insisted that the book is "unique and it will persist." That seems to leave the Administration without an ally in its decision to assign low priorities to books and libraries. Up to this point librarians, educators, editors and publishers had speculated that Washington may have been relying on the McLuhan gospel that the printed word was on its way out.

All of this may be a bit unfair to both Dr. McLuhan and the Administration. The fact remains that the Administration in its budgetary requests for the fiscal year 1970 has evidenced a willingness to cut back on Federal expenditures for school libraries and other educational tools almost to the vanishing point. In some instances, in fact, if Congress goes along with the White House budget recommendations, the result is bound to be annihilation.

Title II of the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, for example, authorized making grants available to the States to acquire school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials for the use of teachers and pupils in public and private schools.

Originally, \$200 million had been authorized for fiscal 1970. President Johnson's recommendations to Congress in January of this year reduced that sum to \$42 million. The Nixon budget recommendations of April 16, however, have cut even that truncated item back to absolute zero.

No one can deny the danger posed by inflation. The Administration is quite correct in directing serious efforts to curbing its threat. The fact remains that a danger at least equally grave can result from a fiscal approach that fails to take account of the importance of quality education—translate that into schools, books, libraries and other essential ingredients—for the war against racism and poverty. The cutback on ESEA's Title II is particularly regrettable because one can be certain that its impact will be greatest on those inner city schools, public and private alike, presently serving their youngest victims of our gravest national blights.

MUSICAL COMEDY: "1776"

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the Wilson Library bulletin contains an article describing how the award-winning musical comedy "1776" was written in the public library in Morristown, N.J., in my congressional district.

As a former trustee of the Morristown Library, I am, naturally pleased at the appearance of this article, and feel it will do a great deal to point up the varied and extensive services offered by our libraries.

I should like at this time to insert the article from the library bulletin in the RECORD:

"1776": CREATING THE BEST OF BROADWAY IN A SMALL-TOWN PUBLIC LIBRARY

When the Broadway show "1776" won a Tony this Spring for best musical comedy, it was a triumph not only for originator-composer-lyricist Sherman Edwards, but for: the small-town (17,700) public library in Morristown, New Jersey, that provided him with resources and research headquarters for three years; for Library Director Marian R. Gerhart and her staff, who helped guide Mr. Edwards to his pot of gold during their long working relationship with him; and for the concept of the library network, in which a small library can tie in to the resources of larger institutions and, with or without computers, bring the world of knowledge to the reader's desk.

The musical comedy, which has delighted audiences and critics in Washington, D.C., and currently at the 46th Street Theatre in New York, is a portrayal of men, human, afraid, absurd, and noble, who happened to be gathered at the Continental Congress in 1776 to decide upon a document of rebellion. The feeling it imparts that this must be the real story behind the Declaration of Independence can perhaps be attributed to Mr. Edwards' fidelity to the spirit of history after an heroic plunge into the facts of same, and to author Peter Stone's talented re-writing of the book.

Mr. Edwards, a songwriter and former history teacher who has just turned fifty, first appeared at the Joint Free Public Library of Morristown and Morris Township in 1962, when he began working on the idea for his first show. He came from his home in nearby Boonton in the historic Morristown area and soon discovered that this local library had a fair collection in American history and an especially helpful reference librarian in Mrs. Gerhart.

As a reference patron, Sherman Edwards was a librarian's dream. He could not have been more motivated, since he was taking off a couple of years from other work at the risk of going broke, and he knew how to use a library. He quickly became inspired by some of the primary sources on hand, and he requested specific authors, titles, and bibliographic aid. He also asked for sophisticated leads for further research, but never considered the library a "take-and-run" operation, where books and short answers are dumped in the arms, and then, good day.

From 1962-65, Mr. Edwards averaged about a full day a week in the Morristown library. He was a tireless reader and a quiet, modest man until he got on the trail of something exciting; then he would become animated and demanding (in the positive sense) of the library staff. He paid little attention to minor library rules and to occasional fines, but, because no two days of reference service to

him were the same, he was a pleasure to assist.

The many circumstances that come together to create an eminent success cannot always be isolated, but certainly it was no obstacle to Mr. Edwards' good fortune that he worked with a modern librarian in a modern-run library. Mrs. Gerhart, B. S. and M. A., also earned a library degree at Columbia University and worked as a college and school librarian before she taught in the Library Education Department of the Pennsylvania State Teachers College in Millersville. Director of the Morristown library since 1967, she came to the library in 1961 and soon after was assisting Mr. Edwards among her duties as reference librarian.

There has been a library of one sort or another in Morristown for more than 200 years, and the beautiful gothic building that houses the present library and its 100,000 volumes is a result of a relatively public and private patronage in the town and township.

"The personal touch is still very important in this library," said Mrs. Gerhart. "That is the chief distinction between our service and that of a larger library. We know our collections, and we're more in tune with our surroundings."

"We're a big little library," she further noted. "We're big enough not to be bashful about approaching other sources, as are some smaller libraries. We don't mind picking up the phone."

As a result, some one-third of Mr. Edwards' sources were borrowed through interlibrary loan from other libraries, especially in New Jersey, where the network concept has been well developed. The libraries of Princeton, Rutgers, Drew, University of Pennsylvania, Fairleigh Dickinson, and Franklin and Marshall were all especially helpful, as was the Library of Congress.

Mr. Edwards is now working at the Morristown library on his next show, which will also have an historical theme, but not the revolutionary period. For this work, the library has already borrowed a dissertation from Harvard and items from as far as Colorado. More information here, of course, might give the whole idea away—which ought not to be done even in the name of modern library service.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR A TOP BROADWAY HIT

NOTE.—Highlights of the research materials relating to 1776 in the Morristown library were compiled for WLB by Mrs. Gerhart to reflect the nature of the research done by Mr. Edwards for his musical—and as a guide for other minstrels of American history.

PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIALS

The Adams Papers. Edited by Lyman Henry Butterfield and others. Series I, 1961. *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*. 4v. Series II, 1963. *Adams Family Correspondence*. 2v. Harvard University Press.

Adams-Jefferson Letters: The Complete Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams. Edited by Lester J. Cappon. University of North Carolina Press, 1959. 2v.

Familiar Letters of John Adams and his wife Abigail Adams . . . with a Memoir of Mrs. Adams. By Charles Francis Adams. N. Y. Hurd and Houghton, 1876.

Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789. Edited from the original records in the Library of Congress by Worthington Chauncey Ford. Government Printing Office, 1906. 22v.

Letters of members of the Continental Congress. Edited by Edmund C. Burnett. Washington, D.C. Carnegie Institution, 1921. 7v.

Letters of Mrs. Adams, The Wife of John Adams, with an Introductory Memoir by her Grandson, Charles Francis Adams. 2d ed. Little and Brown, 1840. 2v.

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Edited by Julian P. Boyd and others. Princeton University Press, 1950. 12v.

Selected Writings of John and John Quincy Adams. Edited by Adrienne Koch and William Peden. Knopf, 1946.

"Speech of John Dickinson opposing the Declaration of Independence, 1 July 1776." *Pennsylvania Magazine* 65:458-481, October 1941.

Thacher, James. *A Military Journal during the American Revolutionary War, from 1775 to 1783; Describing Interesting events and Transactions of this Period*. . . 2d ed. Boston, Cottone and Barnard, 1827.

Works by John Adams; with a life of the author, notes and illustrations by his grandson, Charles Francis Adams. Boston, Little, 1856. 10v.

The Works of Benjamin Franklin. . . Edited by Jared Sparks. Boston, Hilliard Gray and Company, 1840. 10v.

GENERAL HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Becker, Carl L. *The Declaration of Independence; A Study in the History of Political Ideas*. Knopf, 1956.

Bobbe, D. D. *Abigail Adams. The Second First Lady*. N.Y. Minton, 1929.

Bowen, Catherine Drinker. *John Adams and the American Revolution*. Little, 1950.

Bowers, Claude G. *The Young Jefferson*. Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1945.

Chidsey, Donald B. *July 4, 1776; The Dramatic Story of the First Four Days of July 1776*. Crown, 1958.

Crane, Verner W. *Benjamin Franklin and a Rising People*. Edited by Oscar Hanlin. Little, Brown and Company, 1954.

Goodrich, Charles A. *Lives of the Signers to the Declaration of Independence*. Philadelphia, DeSilver, 1831.

Handler, Edward. *America and Europe in the Political Thought of John Adams*. Harvard University Press, 1964.

Haraszti, Zoltan. *John Adams and the Prophets of Progress*. Harvard University Press, 1952.

Hawke, David. *A Transaction of Free Men; The Birth and Course of the Declaration of Independence*. Scribner, 1964.

Hendrick, Burton J. *The Lees of Virginia, Biography of a Family*. Little, Brown, 1935.

Lengyel, Cornel A. *Four Days in July; The Story behind the Declaration of Independence*. Doubleday, 1958.

Malone, Dumas. *The Story of the Declaration of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 1964.

Miller, John C. *Origins of the American Revolution*. Little, Brown, 1943.

Miller, John C. *Triumph of Freedom, 1775-1783*. Little, Brown, 1948.

Richards, Laura E. *Abigail Adams and her Times*. D. Appleton & Company, 1917.

Smith, Page. *John Adams*. Doubleplay, 1962. 2v.

Van Doren, Carl. *Benjamin Franklin*. Viking Press, 1938.

Whitney, Janet (Payne) *Abigail Adams*. Little, Brown, 1947.

PAUL E. NEVILLE, EDITOR IN BUFFALO, DIES AT 50

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, my home community of Buffalo, N.Y., was shocked and saddened this past weekend by the fatal illness of the editor of one of our two daily newspapers, Paul E. Neville, 50, executive editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. Neville was stricken at his desk last Friday as he worked to put out another day's editions of the News. He died on Sunday.

Although he had been in Buffalo for only a dozen years, called to take a top executive position in the News' editorial department, he had assembled a wide circle of friends and was highly respected both locally and nationally in his profession.

The News family has lost one of its own, our community has lost one of its leaders, the journalistic profession has lost one of its ablest technicians, and I have lost a friend.

Mr. Speaker, the News tells the story of Paul Neville in its editorial which appeared in its June 23 edition as follows:

PAUL E. NEVILLE

Suddenly and tragically, in the prime of his career and at the moment of his greatest sense of civic pride and satisfaction, the executive editor of The Buffalo Evening News, Paul E. Neville, was seized with a massive stroke at his desk Friday and today he is dead.

Throughout the entire News family, the loss has caused a numbing shock made worse by its abruptness and by the special sadness of a life of tremendous potential snuffed out long before its appointed time.

Paul Neville had just observed his 50th birthday; he had just rounded out his third year as executive editor; he had completed a tour as president of the New York State Society of Newspaper Editors and had been elected by his fellow editors to the board of directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

He was just coming into nationally recognized full flower, in short, as one of the leading metropolitan newspaper editors and executives in America. Through Friday's first editions, he was eagerly on the job, still feeling the glow of civic satisfaction at seeing a campaign on which he had personally worked harder than any other at The News, the struggle to assure construction of a multi-sports domed stadium, brought to fruition. But today he is gone, a brilliant career, a dynamic personality, a perceptive and witty mind suddenly all blanked out.

A thorough professional with a newsman's instincts through and through, Mr. Neville loved nothing more than to be in the middle of a big story. His wide-ranging curiosity and gregarious concept of his editorship caused him to spend as much of his time out in the community as inside the office. A Buffalonian by adoption rather than birth, he undoubtedly had a wider local acquaintance in his 12 years here than most newsmen acquire in a lifetime. Generous with his time, talent and energy, he spent himself all too freely, as his untimely death attests.

Forceful and quick in his news and policy judgments, he worked easily and well with people, respected "no-men" as much as "yes-men," valued suggestions, delegated authority well, and nourished a team approach to doing any civic or journalistic job. To most of the staff, he was just Paul or known by the familiar initialed signature of his many memos, "pen." While personally imaginative and receptive to new ideas, one of his greatest if less obvious strengths was a deep regard for continuity and proper form and style—for "doing it right," thinking and acting "first class."

It was this balanced sense of continuity and innovation that particularly marked his three-year editorship at The News, as he introduced many small and gradual changes but shunned large and splashy ones. Yet perhaps his greatest contribution in his whole 12 years as a News executive has been his sharp alertness to and awareness of underlying community trends—this in a time of

social and generational upheaval where alertness to swiftly changing undercurrents is indispensable to a successful news-media operation.

Of all the qualities he brought to The News, it could be this instinctive feel for the developing trend beneath the news that will be missed the most. For today, though, it is a sudden absence of the sheer vitality, the brisk plain-talking personality, the down-to-earth good humor of an editor who should still have a whole brilliant career before him that fills The News with a sense of loss and sadness—and of deepest sympathy for Mrs. Paul E. Neville and the five children in whom their father took such pride.

THE NATIONAL KIDNEY DISEASE ACT OF 1969

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to join several colleagues today in cosponsoring the National Kidney Disease Act of 1969.

For many years, an urgent need has existed for a comprehensive program to combat kidney disease. In my congressional district alone, I personally knew five young persons who died of kidney disease in the past few years. Every one of them found it very hard to receive dialysis—blood-cleansing—treatments, because of insufficient facilities and inadequate technicians to operate the equipment.

I was not only shocked to discover this, I just could not believe it. I still do not believe that in the United States of America—with all our great wealth and deep compassion—young people who had everything to live for, had to die because we do not have the facilities or technicians to help them. I am not only angry about this tragedy; I am ashamed, not because I did not try to help them—God knows I did everything I could—but simply because this happened in America.

I fervently hope that the bill several Members are cosponsoring today will be passed by this Congress in 1969. The longer enactment is delayed, the more people will die—an estimated 5,000 a year, most of them young.

The next time I receive a heartbreaking letter, telegram, or telephone call from a person suffering from chronic kidney disease, I do not want to tell them that there are only a few hospitals in New Jersey that have dialysis equipment and technicians—that they have to die.

I want to be able to tell them that there are facilities and trained technicians who will treat them and that they will live. That is what should be done and I hope will be done this year, not only to help save the 5,000 sufferers of kidney disease, but to enable us to live with a clear conscience.

Mr. Speaker, more research is needed into the nature of diseases of the kidneys and the problems of kidney transplantation; in developing mass testing procedures for the early detection of kidney disease; and for the development of more

effective and economical devices for blood purification.

I also want to point out that recently, Gov. Richard J. Hughes, of New Jersey, signed a bill that will provide \$250,000 to aid kidney disease patients and to help expand dialysis programs. This assistance will not enable a massive attack against kidney disease, but will provide some help and great hope.

ONLY 30 YEARS TO MATCH
348½ YEARS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech, Daniel M. Fitz-Gerald, the Wickes Corp. board chairman, brought forth an interesting observation that bears repeating at this time. Mr. Fitz-Gerald, a nationally known business leader, told an Austin, Tex., audience, that since December 11, 1620, when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, 142 million houses have been built in the United States to this date. Yet, in the next 30 years—just 30 years—it now is estimated that we must build 142 million more. We must double in 30 years what it took us to do in 348½ years to meet housing demands, according to Mr. Fitz-Gerald.

The Wickes Corp. headquartered in Saginaw, Mich., is in the forefront in developing and adopting new building techniques, new materials, and new designs. I would like to include an article from the June 11, 1969, edition of the Saginaw News on Mr. Fitz-Gerald's remarks. The article follows:

FITZ-GERALD TERMS U.S. HOUSING PROBLEM CRITICAL

The Federal Government may well have misread the size, power and scope of what we face in housing, observed Wickes Corp. Board Chairman Daniel M. Fitz-Gerald in a speech today at Austin, Tex.

Fitz-Gerald is in Austin for the dedication of the 200th Wickes Lumber & Building Supply Center.

Suggesting the housing industry would be replaced by the shelter industry, Fitz-Gerald called it America's number one problem and said "the inventory of completed but unoccupied homes has dropped to almost World War II levels... Back then we only had 34 million families to shelter. Today we have 51 million and the number is growing."

Calling on the government to reassess its anti-inflation programs and to consider immediate steps to ease the borrowing rate for mortgages, he predicted the shelter industry could explode to \$100-billion volume by 1975. He noted it is now running \$63 billion.

"Time has run out," said Fitz-Gerald. "It is urgent that the administration's fiscal, economic and credit planners reassess the government's anti-inflation program and consider immediate steps to ease present credit restrictions on home mortgages. The shelter demands have reached the explosive stage."

"To illustrate the magnitude of the problem," he said, "let me cite these figures. It was 348½ years ago—to the day—on Dec. 11, 1620, that the pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. Between that date and today about 142 million houses have been built. In the next 30 years, we estimate we will have to build another 142 million. Now we're faced with the

problem of doing a 348½-year job in 30 years. Is it any wonder we are calling for action?

"With the exception of Vietnam," he said, "no other issue before Washington or the nation is more critical. The administration must widen its perspectives and consider the total problem."

He said the shelter problem is not the exclusive domain of the inner cities. "There are those," he said, "who live in Appalachia, those with moderate incomes and even the so-called affluent. They all have shelter problems. They want places to live or better places to live, but, for various and diverse reasons, cannot find them."

Fitz-Gerald also pointed out that the problems the nation faces in the area of manufactured homes are legion. "Just because there is a need, homes will not automatically be built. Mortgage money will not magically become available simply because of demand. Restrictive building and zoning regulations present other difficulties."

"In the traditional area of private home building, there must be new techniques, new materials and new designs. To help builders meet the accelerated demand, there will be greater use of pre-built components and manufactured sections," he said.

Noting that shelter includes conventional homes, mobile homes and offices, mobile schools, travel trailers, camper units and industrial, commercial and agricultural structures, he said, "Wickes has recently become involved in all of these areas."

Fitz-Gerald said the Wickes Corp. last year had sales of \$375 million. He said, "The analysts tell us that by 1975 our sales could be well into the \$1-billion column. We fully expect to be half-way there by the end of this year."

He concluded, "This 200th center is another milestone in our growth. We have grown 100-fold in the last 27 years."

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, he is a kind man. He is a great man. These are some of the words used during his lifetime in describing BILL BATES. I have never known a finer, more gracious, more dedicated person.

Early in my congressional career, one of the Members that really went out of his way to be helpful and real nice to me was BILL. I am sure that the words that I am here expressing echo the thoughts of others when we remember this fine man.

BILL BATES was meant in his lifetime to be a servant of the people. In 1950, thrust onto the national scene when his father suffered a tragic death, he was ready to be an outstanding Member of Congress. He had completed his college career and had achieved a master's degree in business administration. He had been a brilliant member of the U.S. Navy participating in naval assaults in Iwo Jima and the Japanese mainland, and had been promoted to the rank of lieutenant commander.

He was a happily married man and the father of a daughter.

He was a patriotic, loyal American and knew the problems facing our great Nation, and as a member of the Armed

Services Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee gave those two committees the benefit of his training, experience, and wisdom. He was one of the most able Members of Congress, and now as we say farewell to our dear friend and colleague, we extend to his family our deepest sympathy, and to his district and Nation the reminder that we have lost a distinguished and capable Representative.

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE RESOLUTION ON INTEREST RATES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the cost of borrowing money in this country is now at an alltime high. The prime interest rate is 8½ percent and there is no indication that it will be lowered in the near future. In fact, the latest increase from 7½ to 8½ percent shocks many Americans because this jump was unusually large.

Mr. President, this extremely high interest rate is causing economic hardship to millions of Americans. While we all recognize the necessity of curbing inflation and that monetary restraint is one method of accomplishing that, it is still regrettable that the burden of coping with the inflationary spiral is falling so heavily on those who need to borrow money to finance housing and other major purchases.

The House of Representatives of South Carolina recently passed a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to investigate this recent increase and to enact suitable legislation to control the interest rate.

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

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

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Memorializing Congress to investigate the recent increase in the prime interest rate and to enact suitable legislation to control such interest rate

Whereas, the cost of borrowing money soared to a new high Monday, June 9, 1969, when major banks across the country increased their prime lending rate to eight and one-half per cent; and

Whereas, an increase from the previous seven and one-half per cent high has been expected by some in the banking community but the size of increase surprised and dismayed many; and

Whereas, this increase may possibly cause chaos through the economy of this country; and

Whereas, this increase will probably greatly curtail the building industry as well as many other facets of our economy. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That Congress be memorialized to investigate the recent increase in the prime interest rate and to enact suitable legislation to control such interest rate.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Sen-

ator from South Carolina, each member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Clerk of the Senate of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, S.C., June 10th, 1969.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution passed in the House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

REMARKS AND BENEDICTION AT MARION RESERVOIR DEDICATION BY REV. MARVIN HEIN

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it recently was my privilege to speak at the dedication of the Marion Dam and Reservoir which is in my congressional district in Kansas. Rev. Marvin Hein, pastor, Hillsboro Mennonite Brethren Church, gave the closing benediction which was prefaced by very appropriate remarks. Reverend Hein's remarks were significant to all Americans who are interested in the conservation and development of our water resources. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks and benediction by Reverend Hein:

REMARKS AND BENEDICTION AT MARION RESERVOIR DEDICATION BY REV. MARVIN HEIN

Several sentences I read just yesterday almost startled me. This is what they said: "The total amount of moisture on the surface of the earth is fixed, just as are the weight and the chemical composition of the globe. There never will be any more water than there is at this moment, for no water reaches the earth from outer space and no chemical process is in operation which changes elements into water."

If that is true, then the body of water that lies before us becomes an intensely spiritual treasure to be guarded zealously. In the past some of us have looked upon the land that lies underneath these waters as a trust from God; even so the gathering of these waters becomes a spiritual responsibility.

This is not just water. This is not just a reservoir created by government engineers with monies provided by taxpayers. This is a part of the wonderful resources of a God who expects us to exercise good stewardship in using everything He has placed in our care. This is a natural, yet divine, resource for which you and I become responsible. We dare not treat it lightly.

Let us pray: Almighty God, Thou who has gathered the waters of the sea together as a heap, we praise Thee today for Thy unending care over Thy creation. We acknowledge Thee as Lord of all. Give us today and through the years a keen sense of our stewardship of all that has been placed in our care.

When the land below this reservoir is spared from floodwaters, remind us, O God, that the earth is, indeed, the Lord's, and we are caretakers.

When the fish and game are retrieved from this area, remind us that these, too, are provisions of a wonderful God, who asks us to use them with discretion.

As men and women, boys and girls spend their leisure hours and days at this place, remind us that time itself is a gift of God, for which we are accountable.

We dedicate not only this reservoir today, but ourselves as well, as keepers of the earth, both land and water, sea and sky, to the glory of God and our Savior, Jesus Christ, in whose name we pray. Amen!

ANATOMY OF LOYALTY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very stimulating and thought-provoking article entitled "Anatomy of Loyalty," written by my good friend, Dr. Stanley W. Niehaus, dean of students at Illinois Central College in East Peoria, Ill.

The article appeared in the January 1969, issue of the Clearing House, a journal for modern junior and senior high schools.

Dr. Niehaus discusses loyalty from a developmental and historical viewpoint and I am sure his words will be of interest to my colleagues and all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

ANATOMY OF LOYALTY

(By Stanley W. Niehaus)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In these turbulent times we often are prone to question the seemingly abandonment of some of our most basic beliefs. For example, we become disturbed when loyalty to our country and institutions is flauntingly violated. What has caused this to happen? To seek an answer to this dilemma, the author discusses loyalty from a developmental and historical viewpoint. He is Dean of Student Personnel at Illinois Central College in East Peoria.)

One of the pressing problems of our time is that there is an abundance of many things—many things, that is, but loyalty. In these times of affluence—affluent economy, affluent education, affluent technology, affluent innovation—it would seem that there should be an abundance of basic down-to-earth loyalty.

There are at present more automobiles per capita than ever in the history of this country. Parking lots, not only of colleges but of high schools as well, are so crowded that there is not enough space to fulfill the need. Today's workman, who with an income that is considered to be minimal, has a standard of living that was undreamed of a half century ago.

It is not difficult for many people to recall the period just after World War II when thousands of veterans were being discharged from service. Many of these young people had come onto the occupational market about the time when they went into service. The older ones were referred to as the "depression babies."

They were the ones who completed high school in the depths of the depression. They didn't have the financial substance to pursue further education even if they could have profited from it. Others in this group could not secure jobs for love nor money. Many of them walked the streets until the New Deal era of Franklin Roosevelt and the CCC Camps which saved many of the youth at that time from sociological and economic disaster.

Other youth, through the insight of parents and other dedicated and caring adults, were able to use the facilities available to them through the public domain. There is one man who told of how he came out of high school at an early age (he was a brilliant student) in the depths of the depression. He didn't have money for college. He couldn't get a job; yet, he made the telling statement—"I had a good mother, she set up a study program for me. I spent a year reading in the public library." What came of this ultimately was that the young man eventually secured a toe-hold; the economy began to improve, and through his scholastic ability, he received a college scholarship and completed his education. He eventually completed his doctor's degree.

There was another group at this time which was ultra-conservative, later to be referred to as the "square" generation. Some of this group were crippled by the depression. They emerged from World War II into an economy which, at that time, was just beginning to get off the ground. They were afraid to strike forth and take any kind of chance or to make any kind of forward move. This type of conservatism, resulting from personal insecurity, had a way of limiting these people in their occupational and educational outlook. They had loyalty, but it was a loyalty born or fear. That kind of loyalty is neither rewarding nor productive.

Many of the younger group, those without prior occupational or educational experience, didn't have much idea of economic loyalty; rather, they had the idea that the world was their oyster and that they were something quite exceptional in the occupational market—a market which existed for them, for their convenience, and for their affluence. Unlike their conservative counterparts, they looked upon work as an obligation rather than as a challenge.

It is not unrealistic to suspect that some seeds of disloyalty—perhaps the term "un-loyalty" is more appropriate—were sown at this time. This is not a simple concept. The matter of loyalty runs all along the continuum of society—loyalty on the part of parents, children, educators, employees and employers. And most encompassing of all, loyalty on the part of citizens, not only to the immediate community but to the national community.

At the end of World War II, there was particular concern about loyalty on the national level. There was a list of all kinds of organizations that were classified as subversive. Many innocent people were caught up in this network wherein they had given their names to some organization or they had joined some group not knowing what it was. When, several years later, their names turned up on the lists of organizations in which they had never participated and which had sounded quite legitimate at the time, their listed names rose up to smite them.

There must be a concern for national loyalty, but loyalty goes much deeper than this—it begins with personal loyalty. A deeply involved person-to-person loyalty to an immediate cause. It is closer than national causes, for national loyalty is borne of personal loyalty. Such loyalty is close to the person and it expands—like a pebble thrown into the water and which casts a ring which expands and expands and expands—reaching out to national loyalty perimeters.

This kind of loyalty, then, moves on a continuum. It begins first in the home—family loyalty. Parents look up in consternation when children sluff off their associations and connections with their family. And, yet, when it is considered in depth, what have many parents done to contribute to the loyalty pattern of their children? Loyalty begins with parents and in the home. Loyalty to the very home concept, loyalty to the children in the home, loyalty of one spouse to another, loyalty to the sen-

ior members of the family—children observe this—they learn it. They learn the loyalty of a church affiliation, of a school and community affiliation. Children acquire their first loyalty patterns from their immediate home situation.

The depressing and bewildering commentary about the "God is Dead" philosophy is very possibly a bitter reflection of frail religious loyalties on the part of parents when their children were young. Children who are dropped off like so many stray kittens for their childhood religious education are more susceptible to a meaningless life philosophy than those children whose parents participate in their children's early religious experiences. Faith begets faith; loyalty begets loyalty.

Unfortunately, some parents are so busy pursuing their own activities that they do not have time for family life. Much of this began during World War II when both parents were so busy earning money (what to them was big money for the first time since the depression) that the family structure began to break down. When family structure breaks down, loyalty has a way of breaking down. Too many children were and are reared in this atmosphere of breakdown in the family, a breakdown of family ties, or a breakdown of immediate group—home loyalty.

In the 1950's during and after the Korean conflict, the national economy was affluent. It was about this time that a depressing and disturbing phenomenon began to be particularly manifest in our society. It probably had been taking shape for quite some time, but it became more apparent then. It was characterized as a generation of people who were afflicted by the cult of self-enhancement, self-indulgence, creature comfort, and probably most disturbing of all, a freedom from involvement.

It was characterized by an avoidance of involvement in anything that could be inconvenient and, by all means, disturbing—the type of involvement which could contribute to betterment of the community and to the betterment of mankind. This period was further characterized by intense competition on many levels of society. (Not that competition isn't healthy if it is used constructively; but if it is used purely for self-acquisition and self-enhancement, then it is harmful.)

This was the time when parents were really competing with each other and probably most disturbing of all, competing with each other through their children. It was the time when parents got into fist fights at Little League games in full view of their children. The children were the hapless pawns in this depressing charade wherein parents used them as status symbols. Unfortunately, this type of child quarterbacking is still indulged in by some status seeking parents who refer to their children with the prim observation, "Jean is our youngest. She is in the gifted program."

Such parents attempted to live vicariously through the accomplishments of their children. They were pushing their children to achieve something that they themselves had not been willing or able to achieve. This in itself is an example of a lack of loyalty.

Parents moved their loyalty from their children as persons to a consuming and self-serving concern for what their children could do. These same parents cried out in anguish not too many years later when their children sluffed off the influence of their parents and went their own way, a way which often disturbed the parents.

On the other hand, a child had an exceptional measure of security when he was reared in a home environment with the kind of parents who took an attitude such as: "We love you, we love you very much, not for what you can do, but for who you are, because you are you. We may not always agree with what your ideas may be but we respect your ideas, and even though

we don't agree, it doesn't necessarily mean that you are wrong. After all, we have not always been right, but we will do our best to give you the benefit of the experiences we have had—the decisions that did not turn out well and also those which did turn out well. When we communicate to you this knowledge, then we look to you to make your own decision. We have confidence that you will make decisions which are appropriate and meaningful."

It is an attitude such as this which sows the seeds for loyalty. There has been much said about sowing seeds for disloyalty. It is about time that comment be made about sowing seeds for loyalty.

Which brings us up to the present time. Even now society is beset by the disturbing spectacle of segments of the population which are alienated from society. A group which is perpetually angry. This is not exclusive with youth. There are segments of all ages of society which are perpetually angry and which have been so throughout their lifetime—those who have not given loyalty to any cause or any thing. They have an abundance of criticism but a poverty of constructive ideas.

There is also the paradoxical and depressing phenomenon of the overindulging parents whose children's problems are referred to in grim humor as problems of the over-privileged child—parents who do not discipline their children. Such children contribute to a climate of parental, family, and societal disloyalty . . . a generation hence.

If parents do not exercise a meaningful, understanding, and emphatic kind of discipline, the children are insecure. It has been said that discipline is the other face of love, and truly it is. The child who receives no type of boundary definitions from parents is an insecure child; he has little way of knowing where he stands. His moorings are not tied securely to his base of operation, which at this time should be the parental influence. As he wavers through childhood and on into adolescence, he searches desperately for something to which he can attach his loyalty.

There is a deeply engraved desire in all human beings which propels them toward giving their loyalty to something. If nothing more than a matter of loyalty to a type of rejection, or anger, or rebellion. This is a type of sick loyalty. Society is sorely troubled at this time, with a bitter crop of people which rejects the standards that democratic society was built upon.

For those who cling to and live by a cultural heritage, this group is an enigma and a source of bewildering frustration.

True, some of them are sick, but it would be naive to say that all are the victims of psychological illness. Rather, they are like plants that don't throw deep roots—roots that have no place to go, since there is not a seedbed of stability from which they have sprung. So instead of moving vertically up and down in a loyalty pattern, they move horizontally and grope about blindly and oftentimes tragically for some cause, for some attitude to which to give their loyalty.

An encouraging aspect of this disturbing situation is that the individuals who are afflicted in this way are as yet not great in number, but they are the ones who attract society's attention. They are the ones who receive the most publicity; who create the most disturbance; who make the most noise.

It is unfair that the majority of young people who do have deep-seated and meaningful loyalties do not receive the recognition and publicity that they deserve. This is a depressing aspect of contemporary society. Several generations ago for those individuals who were disturbed, for those who were afflicted, society had a way of exerting a healing influence, a way of closing in around them. Those who achieved or conducted themselves appropriately received recognition.

What to do about it? It is a matter of getting back to the home. For some parents, it never left the home. These are the kinds of parents who exercise care and understanding in rearing their children. Parents who are imbued with a type of exceptional and blessed sanity; parents whose own loyalty concepts are intact; parents who are loyal to one another; who are loyal to their families, who are loyal and contributing members of society—these are the kinds of parents who communicate to their children the profound idea that everyone owes double duty to make up for the sacrifices which others have made in times past.

What about the educational sphere of reference where children come under the influence of teachers? If teachers are well hinged in their loyalty concepts, loyalty to their profession, their community, it is bound to rub off. It is one thing for a teacher to be a questioning intellectual, and it is quite another for a teacher to be a free-floating, continual, and questioning griper—a complainer without any constructive solutions.

Youth looks to the political climate of the community for concepts of loyalty. Interestingly enough, the realm of politics which has often come under attack has a type of basic loyalty from which society might well take a lesson. Contributing members of contemporary society have a responsibility to give something of value to which others can attach their loyalty.

It is the responsibility of the church to provide this loyalty source; it is the responsibility of the educational system; of the community; of the political system. When there is a credibility gap on any level, whether in the neighborhood, the municipality, or on a national level, loyalty is threatened.

Society desperately needs heroes rather than celebrities for loyalty attachments. It is said of Winston Churchill that he had a way of bringing out the hero in every man.

Some adults contend that they feel sorry for youth because contemporary society is too complex. Today's youth is as or better able to cope with the complexities of present day society as the youth of generations past was able to cope with society at that time. There were problems then, the same as there are problems now. Today's problems are simply of a different kind.

There were threats then, just as there are threats now. Now there is the threat of the atomic bomb and the other afflictions which beset contemporary society. Years back there was the threat of disease for which vaccines had not been discovered. The threat of being stricken by a disease for which there was no antidote was very probably as much a threat to the individual as the threats which confront people at the present time.

It isn't a matter of removing threats and frustrations for youth. It wouldn't be possible if it were tried. Neither would it be constructive if it were possible. Strength of character is not predicated by an absence of frustration; rather, it is based on one's ability to cope with frustrations constructively. To relieve youths of patterns to live by and goals to strive toward would deprive them of their rights as individuals.

Existentialist philosophy can contribute to a meaningful philosophy inasmuch as existentialism is characterized by an awareness of what is occurring here and now. It becomes meaningful if it provides the view and understanding of what people are doing here and now and combines it with an understanding of what has come before, and further provides a constructive look and hope to the future. When this thread of continuity is tied together—the past, the present, and the future—the groundwork for loyalty is then being laid.

Many youth are moving in this pattern in this time. There appears to be a type of healthy contagion that seems to be catching

on. If this encouraging trend continues, it may well be that there is cause to hope that there will be an abundance of many things, particularly loyalty.

ARTICLE BY TOMMY ELEAZER ENTITLED "TRUE AMERICANS WILL MAKE TOMORROW'S HEADLINES"

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many of us are disturbed by the tendency of some of the news media to give undue publicity and attention to the activities of the violence-prone, leftwing student minority. When young people who are patriotic and peaceful attempt to make news in ways which do not violate the law, all too often the public is not aware of it, because it is not considered newsworthy.

A young journalist in South Carolina has written an excellent column on this subject entitled "True Americans Will Make Tomorrow's Headlines." Tommy Eleazer, in my judgment, is representative of the majority of young people in South Carolina and the Nation. I believe he, and others like him, deserve the support of those of us in public life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Tommy Eleazer, which appeared in the May 16 issue of the St. Andrews High School newspaper in Charleston, S.C., be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

TRUE AMERICANS WILL MAKE TOMORROW'S HEADLINES

(By Tommy Eleazer)

The young people of South Carolina have recently been left puzzled and disillusioned by the events which resulted—or rather did not result—from the march on the State House sponsored by the South Carolina Association of Student Councils. The march became what is probably the biggest "non-news" event to happen in our area in some time, for it suffered almost a complete snubbing by the news media of the city and state. The movement was the first of its kind in the entire nation, yet while the regiments of flag-burning, yelling, fighting misfits continued to parade across the television screens and newspaper headlines, the march by patriotic, God-fearing Americans was almost completely ignored.

"What's news about being patriotic?" This is the reply given by a local television station employee when asked about why the news of the march had not been reported. It seems that to hate one's country these days is a much more desirable quality than loving it. Carrying the Communist flag is news, but carrying the American flag is not. Singing protest songs is "in," but singing "God Bless America" is "out." Parading signs saying "Down with the U.S." is something to be proud of, but proclaiming "We Love Our Country" is something that should be shamefully hidden from the public's eyes. Is this a sample of the true America's warped sense of values?

Many people did not like the students' march on the State House. Columbia High and the state of South Carolina now have a

black mark in the books of many Communist-inspired and treasonous organizations. The people who would have supported us, namely the majority of Americans, were kept in the dark about our venture, but the people who want to destroy us know all. And if we, the young people, are to carry on as the leaders of our America, then we cannot, we must not, succumb to the promoters of tyranny and subversion.

The students that marched on the Capitol represent, hopefully, the thoughts and ideals of all of South Carolina's young people. They need, however, not only thought, but unfaltering support from everyone. The marchers were neither afraid, ashamed, nor hesitant to say "I love America." They sang the national anthem with a tear in their eye. They will perhaps never be great for this; they will never achieve the fame of their more illustrious and "colorful" hippie opponents. Yet, with the support of all young people of our school and state, as well as the undying effort of all true Americans, in the end, the patriots, not the traitors, will be the ones that make the headlines of tomorrow.

A NEW PLAN FOR BLACK ECONOMIC EQUALITY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most essential steps to the attainment of full equality by black Americans is the establishment of a sound, black-controlled economic base. Black Americans must no longer be willing to accept the traditional economic role which the broader white society envisions for them. Black people seek to move out of their confinement to the small business area, and envision access to the centers of industrial power which exist within the American corporate structure. Only when this is accomplished will black Americans truly have a meaningful stake in the welfare of this Nation. Mr. Richard F. America in a recent Harvard Business Review article, has proposed a new plan by which blacks would be given access to the industrial community and to the power which might be gained by controlling a substantial share of America's corporate wealth.

Notwithstanding some dangers involved in this plan, I commend Mr. America's article to my colleagues' attention, with the hope that it will help impress upon them the urgent need for the careful consideration of imaginative new ideas and programs in meeting the crisis which is faced by black people in the United States of America.

The article follows:

WHAT DO YOU PEOPLE WANT?

(By Richard F. America, Jr.)

(NOTE.—Housing, health, education, and employment programs are first priorities in our efforts to revitalize our cities, eliminate poverty, and restore social stability. But even when these tasks have been completed, and black per-capita income approaches that of whites, a fundamental cause of social instability will remain, the author says: a lack of institutional power, collective power, in the black community. Black-owned businesses, beginning in their present infant state, probably will not grow fast enough to

provide the necessary power position in one generation. Major U.S. business will still be almost entirely white-controlled and white-managed. To avoid that outcome, and to achieve collective commercial and economic parity, the author proposes a systematic program of transferring a portion of our largest corporations to black ownership and operation.

(Mr. America, who is black, has been associated since 1965 with the Stanford Research Institute, where he is a Development Economist in the Urban and Regional Economics Group specializing in urban systems studies. He has also worked for the Boston Redevelopment Authority, doing housing market analyses and development planning. Mr. America received a bachelor's degree in economics from Pennsylvania State University and is a Harvard Business School graduate.)

In its November 19, 1967 issue *The New York Times* printed an editorial with the title "What Do the Negroes Want?" It said in part:

"Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. . . . refers vaguely to [the Negroes' claim to] 'fulfillment of the rights to share in the ownership of property.' Mr. [James] Farmer declares that the Negro wants not merely jobs but 'jobs that bear his individual stamp and in industries where he commands power and a measure of ownership.' This is a hopelessly utopian claim that the United States has never honored for any other group. Impoverished Negroes, like all other poor Americans, past and present, will have to achieve success on an individual basis and by individual effort.

"American society is likely to accommodate Negro aspirations only as they express themselves in individual terms. It cannot be otherwise in a society that honors personal effort as its highest value and looks toward integration as its goal. Race, unlike poverty or the city, is a cultural or psychological concept, not one that can become a comprehensive basis for law or government policy."

The belief in the myth of rugged individualism; the espousal of black individualism while forgetting the history of public support for whites' special economic interests; the general ignorance of U.S. history—these attitudes, as reflected in the editorial, are widely held by white Americans. Many of them seem to have a weakness for suspending judgment and retreating to such shibboleths when contemplating the changes necessary to sustain the nation's growth and realize its full potential.

What do black people want? Jobs, housing, and education, certainly. But, beyond that, the black community wants a secure economic base. Black people themselves collectively and individually must and can build much of that base, in profit-seeking and non-profit forms.

Contrary to *The New York Times*, I maintain that race can indeed be made a basis for government economic policy explicitly favorable to black people, as it has long been favorable implicitly to whites. The fundamental inequities are collective and not individual, and must be dealt with collectively.

No program conceived to meet major domestic problems has been adequate. This is so because, among other reasons, none, not even the Freedom Budget and Domestic Marshall Plan, has sought to reallocate corporate power. No one has offered a program bold enough (however unsettling) to get at the fundamental inequities which even the most conservative voter and businessman, though he might deny it, must sense lie at the root of the country's present instability and disunity.

PROGRAM RATIONALE

Now, it will be argued in protest that some steps have been taken, and that is quite true.

The movement to eliminate poverty and substandard health, housing, and education for 15 million black Americans seems destined to succeed if legislation already enacted is fully implemented. But the time elapsed between legislation, appropriation, and implementation of programs to full effect can be as long as a decade. If poverty is largely eliminated by, say, 1980, will the principal economic and political causes of urban unrest and racial conflict have been eliminated? Or are there other, currently secondary, considerations that will then assume primary importance?

There are many persons (Floyd McKissick and Senator Eugene McCarthy, for example) who define the black-white problem in the United States as a colonial problem. The colonial analogy is central and illumines a policy question that may prove even more intractable than the poverty question; indeed, in retrospect, by 1980 the latter may even appear relatively simple by contrast.

The colonial analogy permits perception of the black community as a "nation," systematically deprived of an opportunity to save and invest. It therefore can claim control of very little capital wealth. My basic assumption in this article is that, to treat the economics and politics of the race problem properly, this deficiency must be corrected.

The establishment and nurturing of small businesses, now being undertaken on an increasing scale, does not satisfy the need for significant economic independence and self-determination, which all emerging colonies require in order to prosper. Only large enterprises will satisfy that requirement, and they take a long time to develop.

All large businesses in the United States, with two or three exceptions, are owned and operated by whites. If relative economic parity is to be reached in one generation, some of these must be transferred to blacks. There are two additional elements in the rationale for corporate transfer:

1. *Influence in policy making*—It can be expected that black people will increasingly feel that white people, especially white businessmen, have had a disproportionate influence on the domestic and foreign affairs of this country. White businessmen have simply had too much to say about what goes on in this country. Domestic policy—including policy on problems in which the judgment of blacks is increasingly understood to be relevant, if not primary—is directly related to foreign policy. An example is domestic segregation and South Africa. U.S. foreign policy has always been made by the white establishment.

Black people, with certain exceptions like Senator Edward Brooke, have had no direct line of communication with the decision-making echelon. No black leaders of large businesses have such access, since there are virtually no such leaders. And on many of the critical world issues facing this country, new views are badly needed.

One orderly way to change this situation is to accelerate the belated development of comparably powerful groups of black businessmen whose perspectives on foreign and domestic questions would in all likelihood be somewhat different simply because of the racial difference.

It is reasonable to assume that black corporate leaders will introduce new variables and place new weights on old variables in the decision equations of industry and government. That may strike some white businessmen as a terrible prospect, but thoughtful consideration should lead to the conclusion that the introduction of this new element would be in the pluralistic tradition with which many historians credit the relatively consistent stability of the American economic and political experiment.

In short, black corporate leaders may be able to make a valuable contribution to high policy councils in the last quarter of this

turbulent century. The entire nation would benefit from their presence.

2. A 'countervailing' force—The black-white problem in the United States can be framed in terms of John Kenneth Galbraith's concept of countervailing force. It may be necessary and desirable public policy from the white viewpoint, as it is already implicit black "policy," to foster the development of black corporate power as a force against continued mistreatment of blacks by white corporate and labor power, and against the continued political, social, and economic instability which such mistreatment produces.

Massive mutual distrust is a factor between the races. Better economic and social conditions may reduce the level of distrust. But it is dangerous to assume that rising incomes and educational levels alone will be sufficient to dispel historic antipathies. On the contrary, they may just as easily inflame them, for we know that cultural, psychological, and political expectations will rise just as surely as economic expectations. A sense of relative collective political deprivation may persist when individual economic deprivation has been eliminated.

Secure and powerful black economic institutions, rather than simply mass individual affluence, would be the surest safeguard against feelings of collective powerlessness and against manifestations of continued white supremacy. Creating such institutions would be in the public interest.

For these reasons, a workable mechanism is required for the transfer of some major national corporations to black control.

PRECEDENTS FOR THE PROPOSAL

U.S. history does not lack for examples of the use of public resources in support of private activities when the results were expected to be in the public interest. There are ample precedents of public encouragement leading to private wealth.

Construction of the Western railroads, for example, was deemed so important to the development of both the Western region and the nation that private citizens were given extraordinary incentives to build the roads. Land was practically given away.

Examples of the transfer of technology from public to private hands are of course equally common. The development of commercial aviation benefited from publicly sponsored research and development. Currently, the government's aerospace research program is creating products and techniques for private exploitation, and the public is providing a substantial windfall to corporations in the process.

In each of these activities the public treasury has directly supported the development of large private enterprise; and, in the last two cases, the government has removed much of the development risk by turning over to corporations proven products and protected markets. The private benefits accrued after public subsidy of the substantial early costs.

The case of the aluminum industry is also pertinent. After World War II, the federal government concluded that the Aluminum Company of America was too big according to certain objective and subjective criteria. The federal approach, simply stated, was to force Alcoa to divest itself of some of its holdings or face direct competition from a corporation to be founded by the government. Alcoa chose to divest. The important point here is that the government considered the public interest to be sufficiently threatened by the monopolistic situation that it was determined to commit public resources to restore a measure of competition in the industry.

The white monopoly represented by *Fortune's* 500 largest companies might be similarly viewed. The total absence of any large black corporations in the United States is, to some extent, due to a kind of restraint of trade and "collusive" behavior over the years by almost all white institutions, including

the government and the legal system. This has resulted in a situation contrary to the public interest.

Urban renewal: Perhaps the most relevant precedent for a transfer mechanism exists in the federal urban renewal program. The power of eminent domain has been relied on to secure land for restoration of certain areas and for essential public projects. A series of court tests has established that eminent domain may further be used to change a land use while title to the property passes from one private party, through the government, to another. The courts have ruled that such changing uses are sufficiently in the public interest to justify the exercise of eminent domain.

The process normally proceeds after extensive public hearings and with numerous safeguards and checks against abuse, although abuses are not unknown. The mechanism essentially consists of three elements:

1. The owner is compensated at full appraised fair market value for his property. This payment is made from the public treasury.

2. The property thus acquired is prepared for transfer. The preparation in the case of a new use for the land usually consists of clearance of structures, preparation of the ground for new construction, and placement of infrastructure, such as utility lines, street realignments, and curbing.

3. The property is sold to the developer, who ordinarily agrees to certain tenure, use, and design controls which are imposed by the developing authority.

The total cost of acquisition and preparation usually greatly exceeds the final sale price to the developer; indeed, it is not uncommon for property to be disposed of for as little as 5% of that total cost. This price, of course, is an even smaller percentage of what a developer might have had to pay to assemble the parcels in the open market without benefit of the public intermediary, assuming that the assembly could have been accomplished at all. The "net project costs" amount to roughly the difference between total acquisition and the disposition price. The public treasury absorbs the net project cost.

I propose that a variation on the mechanism used in urban renewal be employed to accomplish the transfer of major corporations or portions of them from white to black management and control.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

It might be argued that a better, or at least a somewhat less bureaucratic, approach to developing large black industrial institutions should be developed.

Why not, for example, simply give the full purchase price to a group of black capitalists and let them proceed on their own toward acquisition? The problems of developing safeguards with that approach might be overwhelming. Or why not let the government directly set up large corporations in selected industries and turn them over to a black management group? The problems of altering industry structures and distorting existing competitive situations would be formidable.

While both approaches, or others, might be made operable, my proposed solution appears to be applicable with the least departure from precedent and the minimum disruption of normal financial and production arrangements for all parties directly or indirectly concerned.

It might be argued that black control could be achieved simply by bringing in black managers and accelerating their movement to the top, without disturbing ownership. This approach would probably not work. It is unlikely that the relationship between black management and a board of directors representing white interests would remain as harmonious as that between black management and a black-dominated board. Normal con-

licts between management and the board would over time become exacerbated in the former case, in which racially based conflicts of interest, policy differences, and social objectives would be always potentially present, to the probable eventual detriment of the enterprise.

In transferring ownership of corporations, eminent domain, while not confiscatory, would not be a preferred method even if legal objections could be overcome. The process would require a congenial atmosphere and a high level of cooperation on the part of the original white owners and managers. The potential for obstruction or even sabotage is obvious, so proper incentives, indeed very attractive incentives, must be provided.

A brief aside is in order here. The process of black community development has two facets, one internal and the other external. If the external aspect were completely satisfactory—that is, if the white community moved to reform itself and initiate the needed programs—much of the benefit would be lost unless the black community were unified and able to carry out its part in the process.

For black people, then, the solution of certain internal problems is crucial. One of them is the degree of separatism which they should practice. Few in the black community would dispute that black people—not the white world, governmental or corporate—have the responsibility for internal planning. But the proposal in this article will be viewed as a much too conservative, perhaps even dangerous, step by some significant black analysts and activists who are separatists.

The converse of my statement about internal and external facets is not so. If internal problems are resolved and a high degree of unification is achieved, much white resistance will be effectively countered and eventually overcome. Black progress will not end if my proposal, or even others less far-reaching, is not put into action. Black self-help will accelerate and succeed; it will not be allowed to depend on white approbation.

TRANSFER MECHANISM

The process of corporate transfer should, if possible, be initiated by the candidate. An agency of the federal government created to facilitate such conveyances would issue a standing invitation to divest. Let's call it ACT (Agency for Corporate Transfer). It could be established in the Department of Commerce or the Office of the President.

The program should begin with a trial run, with perhaps three large companies transferred, one a year for three years. After the last transfer, two years of demonstration operations would be undertaken. At the end of the five-year test period it should be clear what program modifications would be required to improve the chances of success with subsequent transfers.

Two assumptions are implicit here: (1) there is a sufficient number of black capitalists with access to \$1 million to \$10 million to accomplish the program; and (2) there is a sufficient quantity of black managerial talent to run the transferred concerns. These assumptions are sound, in my view; the money could be found, and the experience of personnel and management recruiting firms in the past five years suggests the existence of a sizable pool of unrecognized talent, particularly in government, education, and the military.

In each *Fortune* industry category (the 500 largest industrials, plus the 50 largest banks, utilities, and life insurance, merchandising, and transportation companies) might be set an ultimate target of 10% to come under black ownership and control by 1990. Adding 10% to the next 500 largest industrials makes a total of 125 companies to be transferred.

If there were no takers despite very attractive tax and other financial inducements, then, theoretically at least, criteria could be developed for identifying candidates for

acquisition. Conglomerates, for example, might be approached to determine their interest in selling off portions. In the event of such an impasse, the initiative for opening discussions would fall to the government.

A climate in which no corporations would be interested in voluntary divestiture for purposes of simple liquidation or to take advantage of very attractive financial inducements would be a negative climate in any case. With such a total lack of interest prevailing, the necessary legislation for this program obviously never would be enacted in the first place.

So, discussion of a program requiring government initiative leads to a dead end for all practical purposes. Corporate transfer requires that the white business community understand its advantages, accept its premises, and concur in its objective. Otherwise, the program is dead. But in that direction, as I have tried to suggest, lies severe uncertainty and social instability.

CORPORATE CANDIDATES

A difficulty might arise if the only offers of transfer come from marginal corporations or those whose prospects are dimming. It might be very tempting for a community with top management problems, or severe and chronic financial or labor problems, or obsolescent plant and equipment, or grim marketing problems to seize the opportunity to unload, perhaps even at a premium price. If offers from such companies are abundant in the early rounds, negotiations on selling price could be difficult.

Rejection of a few companies because of unsoundness or low potential, however, would cause them considerable embarrassment and would probably discourage offers from seriously troubled companies.

In seeking to develop black industry, the problem of competitiveness will be primary. There is little point in accomplishing the transfer of corporations whose activities are in no-growth or declining areas. On the other hand, companies on the technological frontiers like aerospace, ocean exploitation, and nuclear energy are unlikely to offer themselves. The first rounds of negotiations with manufacturers therefore are likely to involve stable, moderate-growth producers of consumer and industrial goods.

ACT might want to concentrate on industries at both ends of the competitive spectrum. An industry that is relatively "competitive," such as paper products or petroleum, will suffer less dislocation from a transfer of one or two of its major companies. Similarly, utilities and other monopolies should be readily transferable, since they are already heavily regulated and not in such delicate competitive balance as more oligopolistic industries, like autos and aircraft.

The opportunity of acquiring large businesses, incidentally, should certainly be extended to other groups in the United States whose situation vis-à-vis the white business world is similar to that of blacks: Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and, to a lesser extent, Orientals. The government would have to have assurance first that the associates seeking transfer are qualified and would put the corporation to good use. This is the same as my suggested procedure with black groups, which I take up next.

BIDDING PROCEDURE

ACT would acquire a divesting corporation by paying a negotiated price for 51% of the common stock, after acceptance of a tender offer, with monies from the public treasury.

The availability of the corporation would then be made known to all interested parties through public media, and offers would be invited. In the case of a large manufacturer in which controlling interest could be purchased by ACT for \$100 million, an offer of \$1 million to \$5 million should be sufficient to acquire that interest.

The net acquisition cost—the difference between what ACT paid for the 51% interest and the purchasing group's offer—would be absorbed by the government. The portion of the majority interest not held by these entrepreneurs would be assigned by ACT to a nonprofit organization, which I shall describe later.

Initially, the competition from groups of eager entrepreneurs would be keen, but as bidding continued, the field could be expected to dwindle. When a small number of bidders, say three, remained, a set of rigorous criteria would be applied to determine the winner.

The principal criterion would be the ability of the bidding group to produce a management cadre with the potential for successful management of the company. The groups would be required to put together a team of black businessmen with the requisite training, background, general and specialized experience, and potential to fill the key management positions within a reasonable period of time, say 5 to 10 years. This would mean a team of 20 to 100 men with expertise in functional areas including marketing, finance, production, personnel, and so on. A typical team might average 35 years of age, with 10 years of business or noncommercial experience per man.

Objective tests of the team's capacity to enter the divesting company and industry and to learn the business within ten years would be required. Perhaps more difficult, some subjective analysis would be necessary so that the interpersonal dynamics between the divesting management group and the acquiring group's managers could be anticipated.

Obviously, the introduction of a group of black "fair-haired boys," taking over from white managers during a period of years, has the potential for triggering a variety of generally bad vibrations. The organizational behavior specialists would have their work cut out for them. It must be assumed, however, that in this situation—with a willing buyer, a willing seller, and competent managers, both black and white—these problems can be overcome.

Administrative and legal safeguards of a high order of effectiveness would be required because of the very large sums of money involved. Particularly important is a procedure for restraining the level of bidding. It might be tempting for competing bidders to seek outside capital in support of their 1% to 5% bids. In the case of a corporation in which controlling interest can be acquired for \$100 million, white entrepreneurs might find it worthwhile to provide \$50 million, \$75 million, or even more to a black bidding group. In short, the price could be driven up to a level near the market price.

In that event, the black capitalists would become hardly more than a front for the whites, which would defeat the purpose of the program. A technique for certifying the source of all money must be employed, and full disclosure would be essential.

TRANSFER SAFEGUARDS

The mechanism will also have to protect the legitimate interests of minority stockholders who want to dispose of shares. ACT should stand ready to purchase their shares at the market price immediately before the announcement of the sale. On announcement, the stock market would probably discount the company's future earnings to take account of general uncertainty, the incoming and relatively inexperienced management, and similar factors. Small stockholders should not be penalized in this situation.

After the winning bidder has been selected, the stock would be immediately transferred. At this point, or perhaps even earlier, disgruntled minor stockholders might behave in such a way as to upset the management

and the market. The government, through the Securities and Exchange Commission, would have to act to protect the corporation's securities from malevolent operators. Suspension of trading in case of panic selling or other abnormal market activities should be left to the judgment of the boards of the exchanges and the SEC.

The market's reassessment of the company's prospects is to be expected. Within a short time, if earnings hold up and operations continue normally, the market price should reflect the diminished uncertainty, and recovery should be complete.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE BUYERS

The purpose of this program is to contribute to the achievement of economic and political parity, not transform certain black capitalists into instant multimillionaires at public expense. But the purchase of, say, \$100 million in stock for \$1 million to \$5 million would appear to have that effect. So the transfer mechanism must take care of that problem.

The safeguard likely to be most effective would take this form: members of the purchasing group would personally hold only that portion of stock which could have been acquired in the marketplace with the same amount of money as they actually expended. They would receive dividends only on those shares. The balance of the stock purchased by the government would reside in a nonprofit corporation with a community base, similar to the kind envisioned in several recent proposals advanced by black community groups, black spokesmen, and many politicians. It is commonly called a community development corporation (CDC).¹

Dividends, if any, on these shares would be paid to that corporation and could be used to fund a variety of public benefit projects in housing, health, recreation, and so forth—much as The Ford Foundation does with its Ford Motor Company dividends. If, however, in management's judgment the interests of the corporation would be best served by retention of earnings, that judgment should not be subordinated to the CDC's desire for cash; funding local public projects must remain secondary to the goal of sustaining competitive businesses.

The location of these nonprofit corporations and the communities to be benefited would be jointly determined by the new controlling group, by expressions of interest and capacity from local organizations, and by relevant government departments, such as OEO, Commerce, HEW, and HUD. As the controlling group desired, it would be free to purchase stock from the CDC within certain limits designed to prevent abuse or price manipulation.

Some provision would have to be devised either to make this large block of stock nonvoting for a period, to prevent interference from that quarter, or otherwise to restrict direct participation by the CDC in the direction of the company until a transitional period, perhaps two of three years, has been completed.

The entrepreneurial group should be allowed to exercise effective control through its shares at least until the success of the transfer is assured—probably five years in most cases. But the nonprofit corporation should have some representation on the company's board of directors at an early date.

It would be undesirable, however, to protect the directors of the corporation from any of their shareholders for any great length of time. Two or three years of nonvoting status might be suitable; but the CDC should be permitted to express its wishes prudently on some proportionate basis after that tran-

¹ For one view of CDCs, see Frederick D. Sturdivant, "The Limits of Black Capitalism," HBR January-February 1969, p. 122.

sitional period. Mutual respect between company and community corporation should ensure that no harm comes to the company's commercial interests from the CDC's pursuit of its noncommercial objectives. It can be predicted that the community group would not interfere unduly with the company's operations if interference threatened to harm its investment and dividend position.

Members of the acquiring group might be tempted to take advantage of market opportunities and withdraw at an early time. They should be permitted to do so, but since the overriding purpose of the program is social, it seems reasonable to impose some limits on their freedom to trade their shares. Perhaps a moratorium of three years would be sufficient to prevent any manipulations.

OPERATIONAL QUESTIONS

So far as the company's operations are concerned, the period of accomplishing the transfer could run, as suggested earlier, five to ten years. The transition will introduce numerous uncertainty factors for the old management, for original board members who are phasing out, and for minority stockholders. Some means of reducing this uncertainty must be provided.

It will be necessary to allow the company to maintain normal operations while the old management is training the new. So the government should guarantee a minimum rate of return for the corporation and some negotiated level of sales and net income. This can be done through a government offer to purchase some quantity of the company's product (if it is a manufacturer) or through tax concessions.

The former approach is similar in intent to agricultural price supports, which are designed to maintain and protect certain economic activities in the belief that their continuation is in the public interest. Guaranteed markets or returns are also an element in U.S. government attempts to stimulate industrial development or investment in developing countries.

Tax concessions have been suggested recently by almost every nationally prominent politician as a means of inducing the participation of white private corporations in the solution of urban racial problems. Such a policy is undesirable because it would perpetuate the power imbalances that are at the root of these problems. Some kind of tax concessions are probably unavoidable, however, since private industry does have a role to play in treating physical and economic deterioration.

Tax incentives, if used at all, should be applied at least as extensively to the power problem as to the poverty or material deprivation problem. Indeed, the use of tax or other economic incentives to provide only housing, jobs, and so on, without using them to transfer corporate power, rewards white corporations for their past and current economic exploitation.

BLACK AND WHITE MANAGERS

The terms of transfer will provide for the recruitment and employment of a potential senior management cadre of blacks. I do not envision that the important lower- and middle-management levels would be entirely black. Even if that were desirable, it would be virtually impossible in a complex, multi-division corporation. But the recruitment of management trainees and young accountants, engineers, and technicians should focus on black candidates having the potential for quick development. Many will be found in MBA programs at black and white universities.

Young whites should also be recruited. They would, of course, have to be men and women, with special social orientations, but such persons are increasing in number.²

²See Harold J. Leavitt, "The Company President is a Berkeley Student," HBR November-December 1967, p. 152.

They of course would have to understand that, for good reason, the presidency and most other top management jobs would be filled by blacks after five to ten years and for the foreseeable future beyond that. This is not unlike the unspoken understanding that black MBAs and engineers have when entering large white corporations, and with less justification.

The problem with recruiting is not likely to be the absence of good white candidates. On the contrary, the problem is likely to be the attraction of droves of candidates with strong social motivations who anticipate an exciting five or ten years in an unusual, and therefore more interesting, industrial situation before making their normal career moves. Some screening out of young candidates with missionary motives may be necessary. There may be more of a problem with headhunting for white middle managers, because of their perceptions of risk; but, again, at this early conceptual stage we must rely on the organizational behavior specialists to work that problem out.

Since the program is designed to produce large corporations that are black-controlled and led, some whites (perhaps many) will find these circumstances uncongenial and leave. The effort will be better off without them. The policy of the program, however, must be that whites are welcome to participate in the operation of black economic institutions.

SOURCES OF OPPOSITION

Employee relations will obviously be a delicate area, but success here could make the companies models of innovative human relations programs. And, as I mentioned previously, passage of the enabling legislation presupposes a national climate favorable to the transfer program. Resistance in the white business and labor communities would be assumed to be moderate.

Even so, the first corporations transferred are likely to encounter displays of displeasure by employees, by the general public, or in the market. Boycotts, work slowdowns, strikes, even sabotage are possible.

Negotiations with unions and with all employees in candidate companies should precede transfer, and these groups should have a voice in the decision to transfer. The same should be true for other affected parties, such as financial counselors and bankers, manufacturers' representatives, dealers, suppliers, and principal customers. The involvement of all relevant groups would reduce the risk of direct resistance everywhere, except perhaps in the marketplace.

For this reason, it may be prudent to select, as the first companies transferred, manufacturers of producers' goods with relatively few customers and those with heavy government contracts.

After five or six years of experience beyond the demonstration stage, and with 25 or 30 large companies in the transfer pipeline, a manufacturer of cars, soaps and cosmetics, or household appliances might be chosen. When the housewife is ready to choose Brand X (Brand Black or Brand White) on its merits (or for whatever reasons housewives make those decisions), then the entire program may be considered to be a success.

Opposition from organized labor, particularly from craft unions, might pose serious problems if the transfer process were allowed to look like an attempt to break union power. A number of craft unions have been targets recently of black displeasure because of union resistance to entrance and upgrading of blacks. General union reaction would probably depend largely on which industries appeared to offer the earliest opportunities for corporate transfer.

CONCLUSION

After about eight corporations have been transferred to black control each year for

15 years, the procedure would be discontinued, since by then blacks will have achieved economic parity roughly equivalent to their proportion of the population.

At an average purchase price of \$100 million each, the total annual cost of the program, including administration and profit supports, should not run above \$2 billion. In some years, however, it would exceed \$2.5 billion if a giant or two should be transferred. A program with an annual cost of \$2 billion that has the potential to contribute greatly to economic and social equality and stability is an effective program indeed.

Quantifiable benefits would presumably include most of those usually cited in assessing traditional social programs in housing, welfare, transportation, education, employment, and so forth. Such benefits are often realized from savings in public and private expenditures, and such savings might be realized from this program in a variety of ways.

But when the budget analysts have concluded with the cost-benefit arguments, the value of the program should rest on the political judgment that social progress depends on a reallocation of existing institutions—hence a redistribution of power—not merely on reallocation of resources in the form of educational dollars, or guaranteed income checks, or even job opportunities.

Only in this way can anything approaching economic parity be achieved in a satisfactory time—that is, in one generation. All other approaches are based implicitly on a policy of gradualism, which has been rejected by black people. Such a policy includes efforts of private enterprise to stimulate the growth of small, black-owned businesses in the black communities, which President Nixon (it appears at this time of writing) intends to concentrate on.

Would conservative and liberal politicians today support a plan going beyond the limited objectives of legislation promoting self-development, and designed to provide a measure of countervailing power to the black community? The answer is probably no, but in time the wisdom of such a course will, I think, become clear.

Meanwhile, the search for low-cost, supposedly nonthreatening solutions will continue with the implicit hope that somehow white economic supremacy can be maintained and no one will notice that the gross power imbalance remains despite the proliferation of new, small, black-controlled businesses.

A recent report by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan contained the finding (according to a newspaper editorial) that "most black Americans are seeking reform, not revolution," and the "changes they have in mind are essentially conservative in nature." It may be true that the changes most black people seek are conservative in principle.

But from the point of view of apprehensive white taxpayers and business leaders, the changes sought apparently are seen as very radical. Initially, the corporate transfer proposal may also be regarded as too radical by some, but its fundamentally conservative thrust should be obvious in light of the strong precedents.

In the 1930's much of the white business leadership, following the basically conservative direction of Franklin D. Roosevelt, supported stabilizing public and private policies that yielded a measure of power and wealth to labor. Though the circumstances are fundamentally different now (race rather than class being the basis of conflict), with enlightened conservation a measure of institutional power will be yielded in order to secure for the nation the benefits of continuity and stability.

³Palo Alto Times, August 11, 1968.

THE SPACE FRONTIER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Constitution of May 21, 1969, discusses the question of national priorities and the place of our national space program among the pressing requirements of our Nation. This is a question of concern to all of us today. The analysis contained in this editorial is of importance to all Americans and I commend this editorial to my colleagues and to the public:

THE SPACE FRONTIER

Sen. Edward Kennedy has raised a question of national priorities involving our space program. His comment came this week, even as Apollo 10 was on its way to the moon.

The senator suggested that some "substantial" portion of our space budget can be diverted to pressing problems on earth as soon as the current projects for "lunar landing and exploration" are complete. Plans call for Apollo 11 to land on the moon this summer. And, funds have already been allocated for three more manned Apollo flights this year if that landing succeeds.

The moon landing and exploration will complete one major phase of space exploration, so it is appropriate to begin discussing the future of the space program—and the relation of that program to other national needs.

The senator said, in suggesting that space program funds be diverted to problems of poverty and hunger and pollution:

"I am for the space program. But I want to see it in its right priority. One which will let it continue into the future and not have to be cut back or abandoned because the nation that supports it is hobbled by internal disorder."

Kennedy said he favored an "orderly programmed exploration of outer space," but added that in his view we no longer need an "accelerated" program.

We disagree with the good senator.

He raises valid questions of national priorities—and it is clear that this nation must face domestic problems of poverty and hunger and housing and pollution. It must face the question, literally, in order to survive.

But we do not think this necessarily means a pulling back from the space program, a program which today is exploring the frontiers of knowledge for all mankind. Who can predict what mysteries lie just beyond the limits of our present knowledge of the universe?

This summer may see men land on the moon and return. That in itself is a centuries-old dream, considered the stuff of science fiction only a brief time ago. But the moon is only the beginning. We may well see in our lifetime men land on most of the planets in our solar system. Some of us may live to see the first efforts of this earth-based human race to travel to other suns and other planets.

If these things seem incredible, more fiction than fact, they are no more incredible than a prediction in, say, 1949 that 20 years later we would view color pictures of the entire earth being made from a spacecraft traveling at high speed toward the moon.

We have no argument with Sen. Kennedy in his concern for facing up to our problems here on earth. It must be done. As one perceptive social critic noted, history will not deal kindly with a fabulously wealthy nation (and we are) which refuses to tax itself in order to deal with its own internal problems.

But, for one thing, the space program involves only a relatively small percent of the total national budget. Perhaps, in light of domestic concerns, this is not the time to pour new funds into the program. But we do not agree the program should be cut back.

WHERE IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S INDIAN PROGRAM?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is too easy to forget about the American Indians. They are a small group, only 600,000 in all, and many of them live away from our large population centers. Their problems—poverty, disease, despair—are not dramatic and do not make headlines. After centuries of persecution and exploitation, too many of them have inherited only a legacy of hopelessness.

Despite this grim picture, there are hopeful new efforts underway to create a better life for Indians on and off the reservations. Indian groups throughout the country are developing their own housing, education, and job training programs. What is needed to support these local self-help efforts is a new national Indian policy which places primary emphasis on Indian self-determination.

In a speech to the National Congress of American Indians just prior to his election, President Nixon outlined an excellent policy statement that emphasized this need for self-determination. During the first 6 months of the new administration, however, not much progress has been made in implementing the NCAI policy statement. In the following letter to the President, I have indicated my concern about the need for White House initiatives in the area of Indian affairs:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am convinced that the federal government must make a major new commitment to deal with the problems of the American Indian. The deplorable situation facing Indians, both on and off reservations, attests to the fact that our past Indian policies have not been successful. After 150 years of federal efforts intended to aid the Indian people, it is a national disgrace when Indian unemployment rates are still ten times the national average and when school dropout rates among Indian youth are as high as 80%. As you, yourself, so effectively said in a September 1968 speech to the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), "The sad plight of the Indian people is a stain on the honor of the American people."

In view of the need for new and more effective efforts, I am concerned by your administration's slow pace in developing an Indian program. Action in the following areas is particularly important:

1. *Appointment of a Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs:*

The BIA Commissioner is only one of a handful of sub-cabinet positions that has not yet been filled by your administration. Until a Commissioner is selected, there is no spokesman for Indian interests at the executive level government. I understand that

several people are being actively considered for this post, and I hope that there are no further delays in the announcement of an appointment.

2. *Reorganization of federal Indian program:*

In your speech to the NCAI in September, prior to your election, you indicated that your administration would give particular attention to the development of more desirable ways of administering Indian affairs and to the elimination of needless levels of government which insulate decision-making from the Indian people.

You followed up this commitment, after the election, by commissioning a study of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The study, made by Alvin Josephy, was submitted to the White House in February. The Josephy Study outlined several alternative reorganization plans including transferring the BIA from the Interior Department to the Executive Office of the President. As yet, your administration has not commented substantively on the Josephy Study, however, and no plans have been announced for improving the operation of Indian agencies.

3. *Activation of the National Council on Indian Opportunity:*

One of the Johnson Administration's most significant actions in the area of Indian affairs was the creation by Executive Order of the National Council on Indian Opportunity. The Council was charged with the responsibility for coordinating Indian programs in the various federal agencies and with recommending new programs that reflect the needs and desires of the Indian people. One of the Council's early projects was an investigation of the condition of urban Indians, a group whose special needs have been ignored by most government agencies and private organizations.

In your September NCAI speech you said that you would fully support the National Council. However, the Council has not been convened by its chairman, Vice President Agnew, since you took office.

I hope that the lack of progress in these areas during the last six months is not an indication that Indian affairs will be a low priority item for your administration.

Historically, unfair federal policies and demeaning paternalism have reduced the Indian people to powerless wards of the federal government—as you, yourself, have said. But if we are to correct these past mistakes, strong leadership from the White House will be necessary.

I urge you to take the lead in transforming federal policies and programs into an instrument which will effectively aid the Indian people in their efforts to solve their own problems and determine their own destiny.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FRASER.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM BATES,
AN OUTSTANDING STATESMAN

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the tragic passing of our deeply beloved colleague WILLIAM BATES has shocked us all. His life of dedicated service to his country will be an inspiration to generations yet unborn. A statesman of the very highest quality and effectiveness, he was a warm and delightful person, superior in intellect and character, yet humble, understanding and loving in all his associations. Our deepest sympathy goes from each of us to his beloved wife and family.

THE 1968 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker. It has been said by some commentators that the Democratic Party in the 91st Congress has no legislative program. This is not true. Such a program does exist and is embodied in the Democratic platform adopted last year.

The deplorable events surrounding the National Convention in Chicago last year, plus the fact that a large minority of delegates were unhappy about the majority's Vietnam plank, have tended to obscure the fact that a forward-looking platform was drawn up by the resolutions committee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs), and adopted by the convention, under the chairmanship of our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Albert).

Copies of the platform have become hard to obtain. In order that my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD may have ready access to it, I insert it herewith under unanimous consent, together with the minority plank on Vietnam which was supported by 40 percent of the convention delegates:

THE 1968 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

(NOTE.—Following is the complete official text of the 1968 platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention on August 28, 1968. Headings and emphasis are from the original text.)

THE TERMS OF OUR DUTY

America belongs to the people who inhabit it. The source of the nation's strength is the people's freedom to be the source of the laws governing them. To uphold this truth, when Thomas Jefferson and James Madison brought the Democratic party to birth 175 years ago, they bound it to serve the people and their government as a united whole.

Today, in our 175th anniversary year, the Democratic Party in national convention assembled, again renews the covenant of our birth. We reaffirm the binding force of our inherited duty to serve the people and their government. We here, therefore, account for what we have done in the Democratic years since 1961. We here state what we will do when our party is again called to lead the nation.

In America and in the world over, strong forces for change are on the move. Systems of thought have been jarred, ways of life have been uprooted, institutions are under siege. The governed challenge those who govern.

We are summoned, therefore, to a fateful task—to ensure that the turmoil of change will prove to be the turmoil of birth instead of decay. We cannot stand still until we are overtaken by events. We dare not entrust our lives to the blind play of accident and force. By reflection and choice, we must make the impulse for change the agent of orderly progress.

There is no alternative.

In the world around us, people have patiently lived with hopes long deferred, with grievances long endured. They are now impatient with patience. Their demands for change must not only be heard, they must be answered.

This is the reality the world as a whole faces.

In America itself, now, and not later, is the

right time to strengthen the fabric of our society by making justice and equity the cornerstones of order. Now, and not later, is the right time to uphold the rule of law by securing to all the people the natural rights that belong to them by virtue of their being human. Now, and not later, is the right time to unfurl again the flag of human patriotism and rededicate ourselves under it, to the cause of peace among nations. Now, and not later, is the right time to reclaim the strength spent in quarrels over the past and to apply that strength to America's future. Now is the right time to proceed with the work of orderly progress that will make the future become what we want it to be.

It has always been the object of the Democratic Party to march at the head of events instead of waiting for them to happen. It is our resolve to do that in the years ahead—just as we did in the Democratic years since 1961 when the nation was led by two Democratic Presidents and four Democratic Congresses.

THIS WE HAVE DONE

Our pride in the achievements of these Democratic years in no way blinds us to the large unfinished tasks which still lie ahead. Just as we know where we have succeeded, we know where our efforts still fall short of our own and the nation's hopes. And we candidly recognize that the cost of trying the untried of ploughing new ground, is bound to be occasional error. In the future, as in the past, we will confront and correct such errors as we carry our program forward.

In this, we are persuaded that the Almighty judges in a different scale who err in warmly striving to promote the common good, and those who are free from error because they risked nothing at all and were icily indifferent to good and evil alike. We are also persuaded of something else. What we have achieved with the means at hand—the social inventions we have made since 1961 in all areas of our internal life, and the initiatives we have pressed along a broad front in the world arena—gives us a clear title of right to claim that we know how to move the nation forward toward the attainment of its highest goals in a world of change.

THE ECONOMY

In presenting first the record of what we have achieved in the economic life of the American people, we do not view the economy as being just dollar signs divorced from the flesh and blood concerns of the people. Economics, like politics, involves people and it means people. It means for them the difference between what they don't want and what they do want. It means the difference between justice or injustice, health or sickness, better education or ignorance, a good place to live or a rat infested hovel, a good job or corrosive worry.

In the Democratic years since 1961, under the leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, we managed the national economy in ways that kept the best aspirations of people in clear view, and brought them closer to fulfillment.

The case was different in the 1950's when the Republicans held the trust of national leadership. In those years, the American economy creaked and groaned from recurrent recessions. One wasteful recession came in 1954, another in 1958, and a third in 1960. The loss in national production from all three recessions and from a sluggish rate of growth—a loss that can fairly be called the GOP-gap—was a staggering \$175 billion, computed in today's prices.

The Democratic Party, seeing the Republican inertia and the dangers it led to, promised to get America moving again. President Kennedy first made that promise for us, and we kept it. We brought an end to recurring recessions, each one of which had followed closer on the heels of the last. Full cooperation between our government officials and all sectors of American life led to new public policies which unlocked the creative

power of America's free enterprise system. The magnificent response of all the people comprising that system made the world stand in awe of the results.

Since 1961, we have seen:

A 90-month period of recession-free prosperity, the longest and strongest period of sustained economic growth in American history;

A slash in the unemployment rate from 7 to under 4 percent;

An increase of nearly 40 percent in real wages and salaries and nearly one-third in the average person's real income;

And, on the eight year average, a reduction in the rate levels of the individual income tax.

America's private enterprise system flourished as never before in these years of Democratic leadership. Compared with the preceding eight Republican years, private enterprise in the Democratic 1960's grew twice as fast, profits increased twice as rapidly, four times as many jobs were created, and thirteen million Americans—or one-third of those in poverty in 1960—have today escaped its bondage.

Democrats, however, were not satisfied. We saw—and were the first to see—that even sustained prosperity does not eliminate hard-core unemployment. We were the first to see that millions of Americans would never share in America's abundance unless the people as a whole, through their government, acted to supplement what the free enterprise could do.

So, under the leadership of President Johnson, this nation declared war on poverty—a war in which the government is again working in close cooperation with leaders of the free enterprise system.

It would compromise the integrity of words to claim that the war on poverty and for equal opportunity has been won. Democrats are the first to insist that it has only begun—while 82 percent of the House Republicans and 69 percent of the Senate Republicans voted against even beginning it at all. Democrats know that much more remains to be done. What we have done thus far is to test a series of pilot projects before making them bigger, and we have found that they DO work.

Thus:

The new pre-school program known as Head Start has proven its effectiveness in widening the horizons of over two million poor children and their parents.

The new programs known as the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, entailing close cooperation between the government and private enterprise, have helped nearly two million unskilled boys and girls—most of them dropouts from school—get work in the community and in industry.

The new program known as Upward Bound has helped thousands of poor but talented young men and women prepare themselves for college.

The new structure of neighborhood centers brings modern community services directly to the people who need them the most.

THE PEOPLE

We emphasize that the coldly stated statistics of gains made in the war on poverty must be translated to mean people, in all their yearnings for personal fulfillment. That is true as well of all other things in the great outpouring of constructive legislation that surpassed even the landmark years of the early New Deal.

Education is one example. From the beginning of our Party history, Democrats argued that liberty and learning must find in each other the surest ground for mutual support. The inherited convictions provided the motive force behind the educational legislation of the 1960's that we enacted:

Because of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, local education has been enriched to the benefit of over 13 million young Americans;

Because of the Higher Education Act of

1965, new college classrooms, laboratories and libraries have been built to assure that higher education will not be the monopoly of the few but the right of the many;

Because of federal assistance to students, the doors to college have been opened for over a million young men and women coming from families with modest means—so that about one out of every five college students is now pursuing his higher education with some kind of federal help;

Because Democrats are convinced that the best of all investments is in the human resources represented by the youth of America, we brought about a four-fold increase in the federal investment in education since 1960. The level now approaches \$12 billion annually.

As it promoted better education, so did Democratic leadership promote better health for all.

The program of mercy and justice known as health care for the aged, which President Truman originally proposed and Presidents Kennedy and Johnson fought for, finally became law in the summer of 1965. Because of it, more than seven million older citizens each year are now receiving modern medical care in dignity—no longer forced to depend on charity, no longer a burden on relatives, no longer in physical pain because they cannot afford to pay for the healing power of modern medicine. Virtually all older Americans, the well and the sick alike, are now protected, their lives more secure, their afflictions eased.

To deal with other aspects of the nation's health needs, measures were enacted in the Democratic years representing an almost four-fold increase in the government's investment in health. Programs were enacted to cope with the killing diseases of heart, cancer and stroke; to combat mental retardation and mental illness; to increase the manpower supply of trained medical technicians; to speed the construction of new hospitals.

Democrats in the Presidency and in the Congress have led the fight to erase the stain of racial discrimination that tarnished America's proudly announced proposition that all men are created equal.

We knew that racial discrimination was present in every section of the country. We knew that the enforcement of civil rights and general laws are indivisible. In this conviction, Democrats took the initiative to guarantee the rights to safety and security of the person, the right to all privileges of citizenship, the right to equality of opportunity in employment, and the right to public services and accommodations and housing. For example:

Because of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, all men born equal in the eyes of their Creator are by law declared to be equal when they apply for a job, or seek a night's lodging or a good meal;

Because of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the right to the ballot box—the right on which all other rights depend—has been reinforced by law;

Because of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, all families will have an equal right to live where they wish.

THE NATION

The frontier on which most Americans live is the vertical frontier of the city. It is a frontier whose urgent needs hold a place of very high priority on the national agenda—and on the agenda of the Democratic Party.

Democrats recognize that the race to save our cities is a race against the absolute of time itself. The blight that threatens their future takes many forms. It is the physical decay of homes and neighborhoods. It is poverty and unemployment. It is broken homes and social disintegration. It is crime. It is congestion and pollution. The Democratic program attacked all of these forms of blight—and all at once.

Since we know that the cities can be saved only by the people who live there, Democrats have invigorated local effort through federal

leadership and assistance. In almost every city, a community action agency has mounted a many-sided assault on poverty. Through varied neighborhood organizations, the poor themselves are tackling their own problems and devising their own programs of self-help. Under Model Cities legislation, enacted in 1966, seventy-five cities are now launching the most comprehensive programs of economic, physical, and social development ever undertaken—and the number of participating cities will be doubled soon. In this effort, the residents of the areas selected to become the model neighborhoods are participating fully in planning their future and deciding what it will be.

In the series of housing acts beginning in 1961, Democrats have found ways to encourage private enterprise to provide modern, decent housing for low-income and moderate-income families. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is the most far-reaching housing legislation in America's history. Under its terms, the genius of American business will combine with the productivity of American labor to meet a 10-year goal of 26 million new housing units—6 million of them for the poor. The objective is to enable the poor to own their own homes, to rebuild entire neighborhoods, to spur the pace of urban renewal, and to deal more humanely with the problems of displaced people.

To give our cities a spokesman of Cabinet rank, Democrats in 1965 took the lead in creating a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Democratic Presidents and Congresses have moved with equal vigor to help the people of America's vast hinterland outside the metropolitan centers to join the march of economic progress. Of the 101 major areas classified as "depressed areas" when the Democrats assumed office in 1961, 90 have now solved their problems of excessive unemployment and the others are on their way. The Area Redevelopment Act, the expansion of resource development programs, and the massive effort to restore Appalachia and other lagging regions to economic health assisted the people of these areas in their remarkable progress.

In these legislative undertakings of primary concern to people—American people—it is to the credit of some Republicans that they joined the Democratic majority in a common effort. Unfortunately, however, most Republicans sat passively by while Democrats wrote the legislation the nation's needs demanded. Worse, and more often, Republicans did what they could to obstruct and defeat the measures that were approved by Democrats in defiance of hostile Republican votes. Thus:

In the case of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 73 percent of the Republicans in the House voted to kill it.

In the case of medical care for the aged, 93 percent of the Republicans in the House and 64 percent in the Senate voted to kill it.

In the case of the Model Cities program, 88 percent of the Republicans in the House voted to kill it.

In the case of the program to help Appalachia, 81 percent of Republicans in the House and 58 percent of Senate Republicans voted to kill it, and 75 percent of the House Republicans voted to kill corresponding programs of aid for other depressed regions of the country.

The same negative attitude was present among Republicans in the 1950's, and one of the results was a crisis in the farm sector of the economy—which the Democrats inherited in the 1960's. In the late Republican 1950's, the glut of farm surpluses amounted to over \$8 billion, and the taxpayers were forced to pay \$1 billion every year in interest and storage charges alone. Democrats, however, set out resolutely to reverse the picture. Democratic farm programs supported farm income, expanded farm exports and domestic consumption, helped farmers adjust their

production to the size of the expanded markets, and reduce farm surpluses and storage costs to the lowest level since 1952.

Democrats have also acted vigorously to assure that American science and technology shall continue to lead the world.

In atomic energy, in space exploration, in communications, in medicine, in oceanology, in fundamental and applied research in many fields, we have provided leadership and financial aid to the nation's scientists and engineers. Their genius has, in turn, powered our national economic growth.

Other measures affected all Americans everywhere.

Under our constitutional system of federalism, the primary responsibility for law enforcement rests with elected local officials and with governors, but the federal government can and should play a constructive role in support of State and local authorities.

In this conviction, Democratic leadership secured the enactment of a law which extended financial assistance to modernize local police departments, to train law enforcement personnel, and to develop modern police technology. The effect of these provisions is already visible in an improved quality of law enforcement throughout the land.

Under Democratic leadership, furthermore, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act was passed to aid states and communities to plan and carry out comprehensive programs to prevent and combat youth crime. We have added more personnel to strengthen the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the enforcement of narcotics laws, and have intensified the campaign against organized crime. The federal government has come swiftly to the aid of cities needing help to bring major disturbances under control, and Democratic leadership secured the enactment of a new gun control law as a step toward putting the weapons of wanton violence beyond the reach of criminal and irresponsible hands.

To purify the air we breathe and the water we drink, Democrats led the way to the enactment of landmark antipollution legislation.

To bring order into the administration of transportation programs and to coordinate transportation policy, Democrats in 1966 established a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation.

For the consumer, new standards of protection were enacted—truth-in-lending and truth-in-packaging, the Child Safety Act, the Pipeline Safety Act, the Wholesome Meat and Wholesome Poultry Acts.

For America's 100 million automobile drivers, auto and highway safety legislation provided protection not previously known.

For every American family, unparalleled achievements in conservation meant the development of balanced outdoor recreation programs—involving magnificent new national parks, seashores, and lakeshores—all within an afternoon's drive of 110 million Americans. For the first time, we are beating the bulldozer to the nation's remaining open spaces.

For the sake of all living Americans, and for their posterity, the Wilderness Preservation Act of 1964 placed in perpetual trust millions of acres of primitive and wilderness areas.

For America's sons who manned the nation's defenses, a new G.I. bill with greatly enlarged equitable benefits was enacted gratefully and proudly.

America's senior citizens enjoyed the largest increase in social security since the system was inaugurated during the Democratic Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

For the hungry, our food distribution programs were expanded to provide more than \$1 billion worth of food a year for domestic use, giving millions of children, for the first time, enough to eat.

A new minimum wage law raised paychecks and standards of living for millions, while a new network of training programs enabled

more than a million Americans to learn new skills and become productive workers in the labor force.

A new Immigration Act removed the harsh injustice of the national origins quota system and opened our shores without discrimination to those who can contribute to the growth and strength of America.

Many more measures enacted under Democratic leadership could be added to this recital of achievements in our internal life since 1961. But what we could list shares the character of what we have listed. All the measures alike are a witness to our desire to serve the people as a united whole, to chart the way for their orderly progress, to possess their confidence—by striving through our conduct to deserve to possess it.

THE WORLD

The conscience of the entire world has been shocked by the brutal and unprovoked Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia. By this act, Moscow has confessed that it is still the prisoner of its fear of freedom. And the Czechoslovakian people have shown that the love of freedom, in their land and throughout Eastern Europe, can never be crushed.

This severe blow to freedom and self-determination reinforces our commitment to the unending quest for peace and security in the world. These dark days should not obscure the solid achievements of the past eight years. Nuclear war has been avoided. West Berlin and Western Europe are still free.

The blend of American power and restraint, so dramatically demonstrated in the Cuban missile crisis, earned the respect of the world and prepared the way for a series of arms control agreements with the Soviet Union. Long and patient negotiation by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson resulted in the Nuclear Test Ban, Nuclear Non-Proliferation, and Space treaties and the "hot line." These hard-won agreements provide the base for pursuing other measures to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

The unprecedented expansion of the American economy has invigorated the whole free world. Many once skeptical nations, including some communist states, now regard American economic techniques and institutions as a model.

In Asia the tragic Vietnam war has often blinded us to the quiet and constructive developments which affect directly the lives of over a billion people and the prospects for peace everywhere.

An economically strong and democratic Japan has assumed a more active role in the development of the region. Indonesia has a nationalist, non-Communist government seeking to live at peace with its neighbors. Thailand, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Republic of Korea have more stable governments and steadily growing economies. They have been aided by American economic assistance and by the American military presence in the Pacific. They have also been encouraged by a confidence reflecting successive Presidential decisions to assist nations to live in peace and freedom.

Elsewhere in the developing world, there has been hopeful political and economic progress. Though Castro's Cuba is still a source of subversion, the other Latin American states are moving ahead under the Alliance for Progress. In Africa, many of the new states have chosen moderate leaders committed to peaceful nation-building. They are beginning to cooperate with their neighbors in regional agencies of their own design. And like developing countries on other continents, they are for the first time giving serious attention to agricultural development. This new emphasis on food will buy time to launch effective programs of population control.

In all these constructive changes America, under Democratic leadership has played a significant role. But we Democrats do not

believe in resting on past achievements. We view any success as a down payment on the hard tasks that lie ahead. There is still much to be done at home and abroad and we accept with confidence the challenge of the future.

THIS WE WILL DO TOWARD A PEACEFUL WORLD

In the pursuit of our national objectives and in the exercise of American power in the world, we assert that the United States should:

Continue to accept its world responsibilities—not turn inward and isolate ourselves from the cares and aspirations of mankind; Seek a world of diversity and peaceful change, where men can choose their own governments and where each nation can determine its own destiny without external interference;

Resist the temptation to try to mold the world, or any part of it, in our own image, or to become the self-appointed policeman of the world;

Call on other nations, great and small, to contribute a fair share of effort and resources to world peace and development;

Honor our treaty obligations to our allies; Seek always to strengthen and improve the United Nations and other international peacekeeping arrangements and meet breaches or threatened breaches of the peace according to our carefully assessed interests and resources.

In pursuing these objectives, we will insure that our policies will be subject to constant review so they reflect our true national interests in a changing world.

National defense

The tragic events in Czechoslovakia are a shocking reminder that we live in a dangerous and unpredictable world. The Soviet attack on and invasion of a small country that only yesterday was Moscow's peaceful ally, is an ominous reversal of the slow trend toward greater freedom and independence in Eastern Europe. The reimposition of Soviet tyranny raises the spectre of the darkest days of the Stalin era and increases the risk of war in Central Europe, a war that could become a nuclear holocaust.

Against this somber backdrop, whose full portent cannot now be seen, other recent Soviet military moves take on even greater significance. Though we have a significant lead in military strength and in all vital areas of military technology, Moscow has steadily increased its strategic nuclear arsenal, its missile-firing nuclear submarine fleet, and its anti-missile defenses. Communist China is providing political and military support for so-called wars of national liberation. A growing nuclear power, Peking has disdained all arms control efforts.

We must and will maintain a strong and balanced defense establishment adequate to the task of security and peace. There must be no doubt about our strategic nuclear capability, our capacity to meet limited challenges, and our willingness to act when our vital interests are threatened.

To this end, we pledge a vigorous research and development effort. We will also continue to pursue the highly successful efforts initiated by Democratic administrations to save tax dollars by eliminating waste and duplication.

We face difficult and trying times in Asia and in Europe. We have responsibilities and commitments we cannot escape with honor. But we are not alone. We have friends and allies around the world. We will consult with them and ask them to accept a fair share of the burdens of peace and security.

North Atlantic Community

The North Atlantic Community is strong and free. We must further strengthen our ties and be constantly alert to new challenges and opportunities. We support a substantially larger European contribution to NATO.

Soviet troops have never stepped across the border of a NATO country. By harassment

and threat the Kremlin has repeatedly attempted to push the West out of Berlin. But West Berlin is still free. Western Europe is still free. This is a living tribute to the strength and validity of the NATO alliance.

The political differences we have had with some of our allies from time to time should not divert us from our common task of building a secure and prosperous Atlantic community based on the principles: of mutual respect and mutual dependence. The NATO alliance has demonstrated that free nations can build a common shield without sacrificing their identity and independence.

Arms control

We must recognize that vigilance calls for the twin disciplines of defense and arms control. Defense measures and arms control measures must go hand in hand, each serving national security and the larger interests of peace.

We must also recognize that the Soviet Union and the United States still have a common interest in avoiding nuclear war and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. We also share a common interest in reducing the cost of national defense. We must continue to work together. We will press for further arms control agreements, insisting on collective safeguards against violations.

For almost a quarter of a century America's pre-eminent military strength, combined with our political restraint, has deterred nuclear war. This great accomplishment has confounded the prophets of doom.

Eight years ago the Democratic Party pledged new efforts to control nuclear weapons. We have fulfilled that pledge. The new Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has undertaken and coordinated important research. The sustained initiatives of President Kennedy and President Johnson have resulted in the "hot line" between the White House and the Kremlin, the limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the treaty barring the orbiting of weapons of mass destruction.

Even in the present tense atmosphere, we strongly support President Johnson's effort to secure an agreement with the Soviet Union under which both states would refrain from deploying anti-missile systems. Such a treaty would result in the saving of billions of dollars and would create a climate for further arms control measures. We support concurrent efforts to freeze the present level of strategic weapons and delivery systems, and to achieve a balanced and verified reduction of all nuclear and conventional arms.

The Middle East

The Middle East remains a powder keg. We must do all in our power to prevent a recurrence of war in this area. A large Soviet fleet has been deployed to the Mediterranean. Preferring short-term political advantage to long-range stability and peace, the Soviet Union has rushed arms to certain Arab states to replace those lost in the Arab-Israel War of 1967. As long as Israel is threatened by hostile and well-armed neighbors, we will assist her with essential military equipment needed for her defense, including the most advanced types of combat aircraft.

Lasting peace in the Middle East depends upon agreed and secured frontiers, respect for the territorial integrity of all states, the guaranteed right of innocent passage through all international waterways, a humane resettlement of the Arab refugees, and the establishment of a non-provocative military balance. To achieve these objectives, we support negotiations among the concerned parties. We strongly support efforts to achieve an agreement among states in the area and those states supplying arms to limit the flow of military equipment to the Middle East.

We support efforts to raise the living standards throughout the area, including desalination and regional irrigation projects which cut across state frontiers.

Vietnam and Asia

Our most urgent task in Southeast Asia is to end the war in Vietnam by an honorable and lasting settlement which respects the rights of all the people of Vietnam. In our pursuit of peace and stability in the vital area of Southeast Asia we have borne a heavy burden in helping South Vietnam to counter aggression and subversion from the North.

We reject as unacceptable a unilateral withdrawal of our forces which would allow that aggression and subversion to succeed. We have never demanded, and do not now demand, unconditional surrender by the Communists.

We strongly support the Paris talks and applaud the initiative of President Johnson which brought North Vietnam to the peace table. We hope that Hanoi will respond positively to this act of statesmanship.

In the quest for peace no solutions are free of risk. But calculated risks are consistent with the responsibility of a great nation to seek a peace of reconciliation.

Recognizing that events in Vietnam and the negotiations in Paris may affect the timing and the actions we recommend, we would support our Government in the following steps:

Bombing.—Stop all bombing of North Vietnam when this action would not endanger the lives of our troops in the field; this action should take into account the response from Hanoi.

Troop Withdrawal.—Negotiate with Hanoi an immediate end or limitation of hostilities and the withdrawal from South Vietnam of all foreign forces—both United States and allied forces, and forces infiltrated from North Vietnam.

Election of Postwar Government.—Encourage all parties and interests to agree that the choice of the postwar government of South Vietnam should be determined by fair and safeguarded elections, open to all major political factions and parties prepared to accept peaceful political processes. We would favor an effective international presence to facilitate the transition from war to peace and to assure the protection of minorities against reprisal.

Interim Defense and Development Measures.—Until the fighting stops, accelerate our efforts to train and equip the South Vietnamese army so that it can defend its own country and carry out cutbacks of U.S. military involvement as the South Vietnamese forces are able to take over their larger responsibilities. We should simultaneously do all in our power to support and encourage further economic, political and social development and reform in South Vietnam, including an extensive land reform program. We support President Johnson's repeated offer to provide a substantial U.S. contribution to the postwar reconstruction of South Vietnam as well as to the economic development of the entire region, including North Vietnam. Japan and the European industrial states should be urged to join in this postwar effort.

For the future, we will make it clear that U.S. military and economic assistance in Asia will be selective. In addition to considerations of our vital interests and our resources, we will take into account the determination of the nations that request our help to help themselves and their willingness to help each other through regional and multilateral cooperation.

We want no bases in South Vietnam; no continued military presence and no political role in Vietnamese affairs. If and when the Communists understand our basic commitment and limited goals and are willing to take their chances, as we are, on letting the choice of the postwar government of South Vietnam be determined freely and peacefully by all of the South Vietnamese people, then the bloodshed and the tragedy can stop.

Japan, India, Indonesia, and most of the smaller Asian nations are understandably apprehensive about Red China because of its nuclear weapons, its support of subversive efforts abroad, and its militant rhetoric. They have been appalled by the barbaric behavior of the Red Guards toward the Chinese people, their callous disregard for human life and their mistreatment of foreign diplomats.

The immediate prospect that China will emerge from its self-imposed isolation are dim. But both Asians and Americans will have to coexist with the 750 million Chinese on the mainland. We shall continue to make it clear that we are prepared to cooperate with China whenever it is ready to become a responsible member of the international community. We would actively encourage economic, social and cultural exchange with mainland China as a means of freeing that nation and her people from their narrow isolation.

We support continued assistance to help maintain the independence and peaceful development of India and Pakistan.

Recognizing the growing importance of Asia and the Pacific, we will encourage increased cultural and educational efforts, such as those undertaken in multi-racial Hawaii, to facilitate a better understanding of the problems and opportunities of this vast area.

The developing world

The American people share the aspirations for a better life in the developing world. But we are committed to peaceful change. We believe basic political rights in most states can be more effectively achieved and maintained by peaceful action than by violence.

In their struggle for political and economic development, most Asian, African, and Latin American states are confronted by grinding poverty, illiteracy and a stubborn resistance to constructive change. The aspirations and frustrations of the people are frequently exploited by self-serving revolutionaries who employ illegal and violent means.

Since World War II, America's unprecedented program of foreign economic assistance for reconstruction and development has made a profound contribution to peace, security, and a better life for millions of people everywhere. Many nations formerly dependent upon American aid are now viable and stable as a result of this aid.

We support strengthened U.S. and U.N. development aid programs that are responsive to changing circumstances and based on the recognition, as President Johnson put it, that "self-help is the life-blood of economic development." Grant aid and government loans for long-term projects are part of a larger transfer of resources between the developed and under-developed states, which includes international trade and private capital investment as important components.

Like the burden of keeping the peace, the responsibility for assisting the developing world must be shared by Japan and the Western European states, once recipients of U.S. aid and now donor states.

Development aid should be coordinated among both donors and recipients. The World Bank and other international and regional agencies for investment and development should be fully utilized. We should encourage regional cooperation by the recipients for the most efficient use of resources and markets.

We should press for additional international agreements that will stimulate mutually beneficial trade and encourage a growing volume of private investment in the developing states. World-wide commodity agreements that stabilize prices for particular products and other devices to stabilize export earnings will also spur development.

We believe priority attention should be

given to agricultural production and population control. Technical assistance which emphasizes manpower training is also of paramount importance. We support the Peace Corps which has sent thousands of ambassadors of good will to three continents.

Cultural and historic ties and a common quest for peace with freedom and justice have made Latin America an area of special concern and interest to the United States. We support a vigorous Alliance for Progress program based upon the Charter of Punta del Este which affirms that "free men working through the institutions for representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations."

We support the objective of Latin American economic integration endorsed by the presidents of the American Republics in April 1967, and urge further efforts in the areas of tax reform, land reform, educational reform, and economic development to fulfill the promise of Punta del Este.

United Nations

Since the birth of the United Nations, the United States has pursued the quest for peace, security and human dignity through United Nations channels more vigorously than any other member state. Our dedication to its purpose and its work remains undiminished.

The United Nations contributed to dampening the fires of conflict in Kashmir, the Middle East, Cyprus and the Congo. The agencies of the United Nations have made a significant contribution to health, education and economic well-being in Asia, Africa and Latin America. These efforts deserve continued and expanded support. We pledge that support.

Since we recognize that the United Nations can be only as effective as the support of its members, we call upon other states to join with us in a renewed commitment to use its facilities in the great tasks of economic development, the non-military use of atomic energy, arms control and peace-keeping. It is only with member nations working together that the organization can make its full contribution to the growth of a world community of peace under law, rather than by threat or use of military force.

We are profoundly concerned about the continued repression of Jews and other minorities in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, and look forward to the day when the full light of liberty and freedom shall be extended to all countries and all peoples.

Foreign trade and financial policy

World trade is essential to economic stability. The growing interdependence of nations, particularly in economic affairs, is an established fact of contemporary life. It also spells an opportunity for constructive international cooperation that will bring greater well-being for all and improve the prospects for international peace and security.

We shall build upon the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the Kennedy round of trade negotiations, in order to achieve greater trade cooperation and progress toward freer international trade. In future negotiations, which will require careful preparation, we shall: (1) seek continued reciprocal reduction and elimination of tariff barriers, based on the most-favored-nation principle; (2) negotiate the reciprocal removal of non-tariff barriers to international trade on all products, including agriculture; (3) give special attention to the needs of the developing countries for increased export earnings; and (4) develop and improve the rules governing fair international competition affecting both foreign commerce and investment.

To lessen the hardships suffered by industries and workers as the result of trade liberalization, we support improvements in the adjustment assistance provisions of present law. Provision of law to remedy un-

fair and destructive import competition should be reviewed and strengthened, and negotiated international agreements to achieve this purpose should be employed where appropriate.

The United States has experienced balance-of-payments deficits for over a decade, mainly because of our security obligations in the free world. Faced with these deficits, we have behaved responsibly by avoiding both economic deflation at home and severe and unilateral restrictive measures on international transactions, which would have weakened the international economy and international cooperation.

We shall continue to take the path of constructive measures by relying on steps to increase our exports and by the development of further cooperative arrangements with the other countries. We intend, as soon as possible, to dismantle the restrictions placed on foreign investment and finance, so that American free enterprise can play its full part as the agent of economic development. We will continue to encourage persons from other lands to visit America.

Steps of historical importance have already been taken to improve the functioning of the international monetary system, most notably the new special drawing rights under the international monetary fund. We shall continue to work for the further improvement of the international monetary system so as to reduce its vulnerability to monetary crises.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND STABILITY

The Democratic policies that more than doubled the nation's rate of economic expansion in the past eight years can double and redouble our national income by the end of this century. Such a rate of economic growth will enable us to win total victory in our wars on ignorance, poverty, and the misery of the ghettos.

But victory will not come automatically. To realize our full economic potential will require effective, businesslike planning and cooperation between government and all elements of the private economy. The Democratic Party pledges itself to achieve that purpose in many ways.

Fiscal and monetary policy

Taxes were lowered in 1962, 1964, and 1965 to encourage more private spending and reach full employment; they were raised in 1966 and 1968 to help prevent inflation, but with a net reduction in the eight Democratic years. We will continue to use tax policy to maintain steady economic growth by helping through tax reduction to stimulate the economy when it is sluggish and through temporary tax increases to restrain inflation. To promote this objective, methods must be devised to permit prompt, temporary changes in tax rates within prescribed limits with full participation of the Congress in the decisions.

The goals of our national tax policy must be to distribute the burden of government equitably among our citizens and to promote economic efficiency and stability. We have placed major reliance on progressive taxes, which are based on the democratic principle of ability to pay. We pledge ourselves to continue to rely on such taxes, and to continue to improve the way they are levied and collected so that every American contributes to government in proportion to his ability to pay.

A thorough revamping of our federal taxes has been long overdue to make them more equitable as between rich and poor and as among people with the same income and family responsibilities. All corporation and individual preferences that do not serve the national interest should be removed. Tax preferences, like expenditures, must be rigorously evaluated to assure that the benefit to the nation is worth the cost.

We support a proposal for a minimum income tax for persons of high income based

on an individual's total income regardless of source, in order that wealthy persons will be required to make some kind of income tax contribution, no matter how many tax shelters they use to protect their incomes. We also support a reduction of the tax burden on the poor by lowering the income tax rates at the bottom of the tax scale and increasing the minimum standard deduction. No person or family below the poverty level should be required to pay federal income taxes.

Our goal is a balanced budget in a balanced economy. We favor distinguishing current operating expenditures from long-term capital outlays and repayable loans, which should be amortized consistent with sound accounting principles. All government expenditures should be subject to firm tests of efficiency and essentiality.

An effective policy for growth and stability requires careful coordination of fiscal and monetary policies. Changes in taxes, budgets, interest rates, and money supply must be carefully blended and flexibly adjusted to assure:

Adaptation to changing economic conditions;

Adequate supplies of money and credit for the expansion of industry, commerce, and housing;

Maintenance of the lowest possible interest rates;

Avoidance of needless hardships on groups that depend heavily on credit.

Cooperation between fiscal and monetary authorities was greatly strengthened in the past eight years, and we pledge ourselves to continue to perfect this cooperation.

Price stability with growth

Price stability continues to be an essential goal of expansive economic policy. Price inflation hurts most of the weak among us and could interfere with the continued social gains we are determined to achieve in the immediate years ahead.

The answer to rising prices will never be sought, under Democratic administrations, in unemployment and idle plant facilities. We are firmly committed to the twin objectives of full employment and price stability.

To promote price stability in a dynamic and growing economy, we will:

Pursue flexible fiscal and monetary policies designed to keep total private and public demand in line with the economy's rising productive capacity.

Work effectively with business, labor, and the public in formulating principles for price and wage policies that are equitable and sound for consumers as well as for workers and investors.

Strictly enforce antitrust and trade practice laws to combat administered pricing, supply limitations and other restrictive practices.

Strengthen competition by keeping the doors of world trade open and resisting the protectionism of captive markets.

Stimulate plant modernization, upgrade labor skills, and speed technological advance to step up productivity.

Agriculture

Twice in this century the Republican Party has brought disaster to the American farmer—in the thirties and in the fifties. Each time the American farmer was rescued by the Democratic Party, but this prosperity has not yet been fully restored.

Farmers must continue to be heard in the councils of government where decisions affecting agriculture are taken. The productivity of our farmers—already the world's most productive—must continue to rise, making American agriculture more competitive abroad and more prosperous at home.

A strong agriculture requires fair income to farmers for an expanding output. Family farmers must be protected from the squeeze between rising production costs and low prices for their products. Farm income should grow with productivity just as in-

dustrial wages rise with productivity. At the same time, market prices should continue to reflect supply and demand conditions and American farm products must continue to compete effectively in world markets. In this way, markets at home and abroad will continue to expand beyond the record high levels of recent years.

To these ends, we shall:

Take positive action to raise farm income to full parity level in order to preserve the efficient, full-time family farm. This can be done through present farm programs when these programs are properly funded, but these programs will be constantly scrutinized with a view to improvement.

Actively seek out and develop foreign commercial markets, since international trade in agricultural products is a major favorable factor in the nation's balance of payments. In expanding our trade, we shall strive to ensure that farmers get adequate compensation for their production going into export.

Expand our food assistance programs to America's poor and our Food for Peace program to help feed the world's hungry.

Establish a Strategic Food and Feed Reserve Plan whereby essential commodities such as wheat, corn and other feed grains, soybeans, storable meat and other products will be stockpiled as a safeguard against crop failures, to assist our nation and other nations in time of famine or disaster, and to ensure adequate supplies for export markets, as well as to protect our own farm industry. This reserve should be insulated from the market.

Support the right of farmers to bargain collectively in the market place on a commodity-by-commodity basis. Labor and industry have long enjoyed this right to bargain collectively under existing legislation. Protective legislation for bargaining should be extended to agriculture.

Continue to support and encourage agricultural co-operatives by expanded and liberal credit, and to protect them from punitive taxation.

Support private or public credit on reasonable terms to young farmers to enable them to purchase farms on long-term, low-interest loans.

Support the federal crop insurance program.

Reaffirm our support of the rural electrification program, recognizing that rural America cannot be revitalized without adequate low-cost electric power. We pledge continued support of programs to assure supplemental financing to meet the growing generating and distributing power needs of rural areas. We support the rural telephone program.

Support a thorough study of the effect of unlimited payments to farmers. If necessary, we suggest graduated open-end limitations of payments to extremely large corporate farms that participate in government programs.

Take a positive approach to the public interest in the issue of health and tobacco at all levels of the tobacco economy. We recommend a cooperative effort in health and tobacco research by government, industry and qualified scientific bodies, to ascertain relationships between human health and tobacco growth, curing, storage and manufacturing techniques, as well as specific medical aspects of tobacco smoke constituents.

Small business

Small business plays a vital role in a dynamic, competitive economy; it helps maintain a strong social fabric in communities across the land; it builds concerned community leadership deriving from ownership of small enterprises; and it maintains the challenge and competition essential to a free enterprise system.

To assure a continuing healthy environment for small business, the Democratic Party pledges to:

Assure adequate credit at reasonable costs;

Assure small business a fair share of government contracts and procurement;

Encourage investment in research and development of special benefit to small enterprise;

Assist small business in taking advantage of technological innovations;

Provide centers of information on government procurement needs and foreign sales opportunities.

The Democratic Party is pledged to develop programs that will enable members of minority groups to obtain the financing and technical management assistance needed to succeed in launching and operating new enterprises.

Labor-management relations

Private collective bargaining and a strong and independent labor movement are essential to our system of free enterprise and economic democracy. Their development has been fostered under each Democratic administration in this century.

We will thoroughly review and update the National Labor Relations Act to assure an effective opportunity to all workers to exercise the right to organize and to bargain collectively, including such amendments as:

Repeal of the provision permitting states to enact compulsory open shop laws;

Extension of the Act's protection to farm workers, employees of private non-profit organizations, and other employees not now covered;

Removal of unreasonable restrictions upon the right of peaceful picketing, including situs picketing;

Speedier decisions in unfair labor practice cases and representation proceedings;

Greater equality between the remedies available under the Act to labor and those available to management;

Effective opportunities for unions as well as employers to communicate with employees, without coercion by either side or by anyone acting in their behalf.

The Federal Government will continue to set an example as an employer to private business and to state and local governments. The Government will not do business with firms that repeatedly violate Federal statutes prohibiting discrimination against employees who are union members or refuse to bargain with duly authorized union representatives.

By all these means, we will sustain the right of workers to organize in unions of their own choosing and will foster truly effective collective bargaining to provide the maximum opportunity for just and fair agreements between management and labor.

Consumer protection

Rising incomes have brought new vigor to the market place. But the march of technology which has brought unparalleled abundance and opportunity to the consumer has also exposed him to new hazards and new complexities. In providing economic justice for consumers, we shall strengthen business and industry and improve the quality of life for all 200 million Americans.

We commend the Democratic Congress for passing the landmark legislation of the past several years which has ushered in a new era of consumer protection—truth-in-lending, truth-in-packaging, wholesome meat and poultry, auto and highway safety, child safety, and protection against interstate land swindles.

We shall take steps, including necessary legislation, to minimize the likelihood of massive electric power failures, to improve the safety of medical devices and drugs, to penalize deceptive sales practices, and to provide consumer access to product information now being compiled in the Federal Government.

We will help the states to establish consumer fraud and information bureaus, and to update consumer credit laws.

A major objective of all consumer pro-

grams, at all levels, must be the education of the buying public, particularly the poor who are the special targets of unscrupulous and high-pressure salesmanship.

We will make the consumer's voice increasingly heard in the councils of government. We will strengthen consumer education and enforcement programs by consolidation of functions now dispersed among various agencies, through the establishment of an Office of Consumer Affairs to represent consumer interests within the government and before courts and regulatory agencies.

Housing

For the first time in history, a nation is able to rebuild or replace all of its substandard housing, even while providing housing for millions of new families.

This means rebuilding or replacing 4.5 million dwelling units in our urban areas and 3.9 million in rural areas, most in conditions of such dilapidation that they are too often dens of despair for millions of Americans.

Yet this performance is possible in the next decade because of goals and programs fashioned by Democratic Presidents and Democratic Congresses in close partnership with private business.

The goal is clear and pressing—"a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family," as set forth in the 1949 Housing Act by a Democratic Congress and Administration.

To achieve this goal in the next ten years:

We will assist private enterprise to double its volume of homebuilding, to an annual rate of 2.6 million units a year—a ten-year total of 26 million units. This is the specific target of the history-making Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

We will give the highest priority to Federally assisted homebuilding for low-income families, with special attention given to ghetto dwellers, the elderly, the physically handicapped, and families in neglected areas of rural America, Indian reservations, territories of the United States and migratory worker camps. All federal subsidy programs—whether in the form of public housing, interest rates at 1%, rent supplements, or direct loans—will be administered to favor these disadvantaged families, with full participation by the neighborhood residents themselves.

We will cooperate with private home builders to experiment boldly with new production technology, with financial institutions to marshal capital for housing where it is most needed, and with unions to expand the labor force needed for a doubling of production.

Above all, we will work toward the greatest possible freedom of choice—the opportunity for every family, regardless of race, color, religion, or income, to choose home ownership or rental, high-rise or low-rise, cooperatives or condominiums, detached or town house, and city, suburban or country living.

We urge local governments to shape their own zoning laws and building codes to favor consumers and hold down costs.

Rigid enforcement of State and local health and building codes is imperative to alleviate conditions of squalor and despair in deteriorating neighborhoods.

Democrats are proud of their housing record. But we are also painfully aware of how much more needs to be done to reach the final goal of decent shelter for all Americans and we pledge a steadfast pursuit of that goal.

Transportation

America is a nation on the move. To meet the challenge of transportation, we propose a dynamic partnership between industry and government at all levels.

Of utmost urgency is the need to solve congestion in air traffic, especially in airports and between major metropolitan centers. We pledge intensified efforts to devise equitable

methods of financing new and improved airport and airway facilities.

Urban and inter-urban transportation facilities are heavily overburdened. We support expanded programs of assistance to mass transit in order to avoid unnecessary congestion in air traffic, especially at air-link residential and work areas.

Despite the tremendous progress of our interstate highway program, still more super-highways are needed for safe and rapid motor transport. We need to establish local road networks to meet regional requirements.

The efficiency of our railroads has improved greatly but there is need for further strengthening of the nation's railroads so that they can contribute more fully to the nation's transport requirements. In particular, we will press forward with the effort to develop high-speed passenger trains to serve major urban areas.

To assume our proper place as a leading maritime nation, we must launch an aggressive and balanced program to replace and augment our obsolete merchant ships with modern vessels built in American shipyards. We will assist U.S. flag operators to overcome the competitive disparity between American and foreign costs.

We will continue to foster development of harbors, ports, and inland waterways, particularly regional waterways systems, and the St. Lawrence Seaway, to accommodate our expanded water-borne commerce. We support modernization of the Panama Canal.

We pledge a greater investment in transportation research and development to enhance safety and increase speed and economy; to implement the acts that have been passed to control noxious vehicle exhausts; and to reduce aircraft noise.

The expansion of our transportation must not be carried out at the expense of the environment through which it moves. We applaud the leadership provided by the First Lady to enhance the highway environment and initiate a national beautification program.

Communications

America has the most efficient and comprehensive communications system in the world. But a healthy society depends more on the quality of what is communicated than either the volume or form of communication.

Public broadcasting has already proven that it can be a valuable supplement to formal education and a direct medium for non-formal education. We pledge our continuing support for the prompt enactment of a long-range financing plan that will help ensure the vigor and independence of this potentially vital but still underdeveloped new force in American life.

We deplore the all too frequent exploitation of violence as entertainment in all media.

In 1962 the Democratic Party sensed the great potential of space communication and quickly translated this awareness into the Communications Satellite Act. In a creative partnership between government and business, this revolutionary idea soon became a living reality. Six years later we helped establish a consortium of 61 nations devoted to the development of a global satellite network.

We will continue to develop new technology and utilize communications to promote world-wide understanding as an essential pre-condition of world peace. But, in view of rapidly changing technology, the entire federal regulatory system dealing with telecommunication should be thoroughly reappraised.

Science and technology

We lead the world in science and technology. This has produced a dramatic effect on the daily lives of all of us. To maintain our undisputed national leadership in science and further its manifold applications for the betterment of mankind, the Federal

Government has a clear obligation to foster and support creative men and women in the research community, both public and private.

Our pioneering space program has helped mankind on earth in countless ways. The benefits from improved weather forecasting which can soon be available thanks to satellite observations and communications will by themselves make the space efforts worthwhile.

Observation by satellite of crops and other major earth resources will for the first time enable men to see all that is available to him on earth, and therefore to take maximum advantage of it. High-endurance metals developed for spacecraft help make commercial planes safer; similarly, micro-electronics are now found in consumer appliances. Novel space food-preservation techniques are employed in the tropical climates of underdeveloped countries. We will move ahead in aerospace research and development for their unimagined promise for man on earth as well as their vital importance to national defense.

We shall continue to work for our goal of leadership in space. To this end we will maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of our space programs through utilization of the best program, planning and budgeting systems.

To maintain our leadership in the application of energy, we will push forward with research and development to assure a balanced program for the supply of energy for electric power, both public and private. This effort should go hand in hand with the development of "breeder" reactors and large-scale nuclear desalting plants that can provide pure water economically from the sea for domestic use and agricultural and industrial development in arid regions, and with broadened medical and biological applications of atomic energy.

In addition to the physical sciences, the social sciences will be encouraged and assisted to identify and deal with the problem areas of society.

OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

We of the Democratic Party believe that a nation wealthy beyond the dreams of most of mankind—a nation with a twentieth of the world's population, possessing half the world's manufactured goods—has the capacity and the duty to assure to all its citizens the opportunity to enjoy the full measure of the blessings of American life.

For the first time in the history of the world, it is within the power of a nation to eradicate from within its borders the age-old curse of poverty.

Our generation of Americans has now made those commitments. It remains to implement and adequately fund the host of practical measures that demonstrate their effectiveness and to continue to devise new approaches.

We are guided by the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders concerning jobs, housing, urban renewal, and education on a scale commensurate with the needs of the urban ghettos. We are guided by the report of the Commission on Rural Poverty in tackling the equally compelling problems of the rural slums.

Economic growth is our first antipoverty programs. The best avenue to an independent, confident citizenry is a dynamic, full-employment economy. Beyond that lie the measures necessary to assure that every American, of every race, in every region, truly shares in the benefits of economic progress.

Those measures include rehabilitation of the victims of poverty, elimination of the urban and rural slums where poverty is bred, and changes throughout the system of institutions that affect the lives of the poor.

In this endeavor, the resources of private enterprise—not only its economic power but its leadership and ingenuity—must be mo-

bilized. We must marshal the power that comes from people working together in communities—the neighborhood communities of the poor and the larger communities of the city, the town, the village, the region.

We support community action agencies and their programs, such as Head Start, that will prevent the children of the poor from becoming the poor of the next generation. We support the extension of neighborhood centers. We are committed to the principle of meaningful participation of the poor in policy-making and administration of community action and related programs.

Since organizations of many kinds are joined in the war on poverty, problems of coordination inevitably arise. We pledge ourselves to review current antipoverty efforts to assess how responsibility should be distributed among levels of government, among private and public agencies, and between the permanent agencies of the Federal Government and an independent antipoverty agency.

Toward a single society

We acknowledge with concern the findings of the report of the bi-partisan National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and we commit ourselves to implement its recommendations and to wipe out, once and for all, the stain of racial and other discrimination from our national life.

"The major goal," the Commission wrote, "is the creation of a true union—a single society and a single American identity." A single society, however, does not mean social or cultural uniformity. We are a nation of many social, ethnic and national groups. Each has brought richness and strength to America.

The Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, all adopted under the vigorous leadership of President Johnson, are basic to America's long march toward full equality under the law.

We will not permit these great gains to be chipped away by opponents or eroded by administrative neglect. We pledge effective and impartial enforcement of these laws. If they prove inadequate, or if their compliance provisions fail to serve their purposes, we will propose new laws. In particular, the enforcement provisions of the legislation prohibiting discrimination in employment should be strengthened. This will be done as a matter of first priority.

We have also come to recognize that freedom and equality require more than the ending of repression and prejudice. The victims of past discrimination must be encouraged and assisted to take full advantage of opportunities that are now opening to them.

We must recognize that for too long we have neglected the abilities and aspirations of Spanish-speaking Americans to participate fully in American life. We promise to fund and implement the Bilingual Education Act and expand recruitment and training of bilingual federal and state employees.

The American Indian has the oldest claim on our national conscience. We must continue and increase federal help in the Indian's battle against poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, ill health and poor housing. To this end, we pledge a new and equal federal-Indian partnership that will enable Indian communities to provide for themselves many services now furnished by the federal government and federal sponsorship of industrial development programs, owned, managed and run by Indians. We support a quick and fair settlement of land claims of Indians, Eskimo and Aleut-citizens of Alaska.

The inner city

In the decaying slums of our larger cities, where so many of our poor are concentrated, the attack on poverty must embrace many interrelated aspects of development—economic development, the rehabilitation or replacement of dilapidated and unsafe housing, job training and placement, and the improvement of education,

health, recreation, crime control, welfare, and other public services.

As the framework of such an effort, we will continue to support the Model Cities program under which communities themselves are planning and carrying out the most comprehensive plans ever put together for converting their worst slum areas into model neighborhoods—with full participation and leadership by the neighborhood residents themselves. The Model Cities program will be steadily extended to more cities and more neighborhoods and adequately financed.

The resources and leadership of private enterprise must be marshalled in the attack on slums and poverty, and such incentives as may be essential for that purpose we will develop and enact.

Some of the most urgent jobs in the revival of the inner city remain undone because the hazards are too great and the rewards too limited to attract sufficient private capital. To meet this problem, we will charter a new federal banking structure to provide capital and investment guarantees for urban projects planned and implemented through local initiative—neighborhood development corporations, minority programs for self-employment, housing development corporations, and other urban construction and planning operations. We will also enact legislation providing tax incentives for new business and industrial enterprises in the inner city. Our experience with aid to small business demonstrates the importance of increased local ownership of business enterprises in the inner city.

We shall aid the universities to concentrate their resources more fully upon the problems of the cities and facilitate their cooperation with municipal agencies and local organizations in finding solutions to urban problems.

Rural development

Balanced growth is essential for America. To achieve that balanced growth, we must greatly increase the growth of the rural non-farm economy. One-third of our people live in rural areas, but only one rural family in 10 derives its principal income from farming. Almost 30 percent of the Nation's poor are nonfarm people in rural areas.

The problem of rural poverty and the problem of migration of poor people from rural areas to urban ghettos are mainly non-farm problems. The creation of productive jobs in small cities and towns can be the best and least costly solution of these problems.

To revitalize rural and small-town America and assure equal opportunity for all Americans wherever they live, we pledge to:

Create jobs by offering inducements to new enterprises—using tax and other incentives—to locate in small towns and rural areas;

Administer existing Federal programs and design new programs where necessary to overcome the disparity between rural and urban areas in opportunities for education, for health services, for low-income housing, for employment and job training, and for public services of all kinds;

Encourage the development of new towns and new growth centers;

Encourage the creation of comprehensive planning and development agencies to provide additional leadership in nonmetropolitan areas, and assist them financially.

The experience of the Appalachian and other regional commissions indicates that municipalities, counties, and State and Federal agencies can work together in a common development effort.

Jobs and training

Every American in need of work should have opportunity not only for meaningful employment, but also for the education, training, counselling, and other services that enable him to take advantage of available jobs.

To the maximum possible extent, our na-

tional goal of full employment should be realized through creation of jobs in the private economy, where six of every seven Americans now work. We will continue the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) program, which for the first time has mobilized the energies of business and industry on a nationwide scale to provide training and employment to the hardcore unemployed. We will develop whatever additional incentives may be necessary to maximize the opportunities in the private sector for hardcore unemployed.

We will continue also to finance the operation by local communities of a wide range of training programs for youth and retraining for older workers whose skills have become obsolete, coupled with related services necessary to enable people to undertake training and accept jobs—including improved recruitment and placement services, day-care centers, and transportation between work and home.

For those who can work but cannot find jobs, we pledge to expand public job and job-training programs, including the Neighborhood Youth Corps, to provide meaningful employment in state and local government and nonprofit institutions.

For those who cannot obtain other employment, the federal government will be the employer of last resort, either through federal assistance to state and local projects or through federally sponsored projects.

Employment standards

American workers are entitled to more than the right to a job. They have the right to fair and safe working conditions and to adequate protection in periods of unemployment or disability.

In the last 30 years Democratic administrations and Congresses have enacted, extended and improved a series of measures to provide safeguards against exploitation and distress. We pledge to continue these efforts.

The minimum standards covering terms and conditions of employment must be improved—

By increasing the minimum wage guarantee to assure those at the bottom of the economic scale a fairer share in rising living standards;

By extending the minimum wage and overtime provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act to all workers;

By enacting occupational health and safety legislation to assure the material reduction of the present occupational death rate of 14,500 men and women each year, and the disabling accident rate of over 2 million per year;

By assuring that the "green card" worker does not depress wages and conditions of employment for American workers;

By updating of the benefit provisions of the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Act.

The unemployment compensation program should be modernized by national minimum standards for level and duration of benefits, eligibility, and universal coverage.

Older citizens

A lifetime of work and effort deserves a secure and satisfying retirement.

Benefits, especially minimum benefits, under Old Age Survivors, and Disability Insurance, should be raised to overcome present inadequacies and thereafter should be adjusted automatically to reflect increases in living costs.

Medical care for the aged should be expanded to include the costs of prescription drugs.

The minimum age for public assistance should be lowered to correspond to the requirements for social security.

America's self-employed citizens should be encouraged by tax incentive legislation to supplement social security benefits for themselves and their employees to the same extent that employees of corporations are encouraged.

In addition to improving social security, we must develop in each community a wide variety of activities to enrich the lives of our older citizens, to enable them to continue to contribute to our society and to permit them to live in dignity. The aged must have access to better housing and opportunities for regular or part-time employment, community volunteer service, and cultural and recreational activities.

People in need

Every American family whose income is not sufficient to enable its members to live in decency should receive assistance free of the indignities and uncertainties that still too often mar our present programs. To support family incomes of the working poor a number of new program proposals have recently been developed. A thorough evaluation of the relative advantages of such proposals deserves the highest priority attention by the next Administration. This we pledge to do.

Income payments and eligibility standards for the aged, the blind, the disabled and dependent children should be determined and financed on a federal basis—in place of the present inequitable, under-financed hodge-podge state plans. This would, among other things, assure the eligibility in all states of needy children of unemployed parents who are now denied assistance in more than half the states as long as the father remains in the home.

Assistance payments should not only be brought to adequate levels but they should be kept adequate by providing for automatic adjustment to reflect increases in living costs.

Congress has temporarily suspended the restrictive amendment of 1967 that placed an arbitrary limit on the number of dependent children who can be aided in each state. We favor permanent repeal of that restriction and of the provision requiring mothers of young children to work.

The new federal-state program we propose should provide for financial incentives and needed services to enable and encourage adults on welfare to seek employment to the extent they are able to do so.

The time has come when we should make a national commitment that no American should have to go hungry or undernourished. The Democratic Party here and now does make that commitment. We will move rapidly to implement it through continued improvement and expansion of our food programs.

The Democratic Congress this year has already enacted legislation to expand and improve the school lunch and commodity distribution programs, and shortly will complete action on legislation now pending to expand the food stamp program. We will enact further legislation and appropriations to assure on a permanent basis that the school lunch program provides free and reduced-price meals to all needy school children.

Health

The best of modern medical care should be made available to every American. We support efforts to overcome the remaining barriers of distance, poverty, ignorance, and discrimination that separate persons from adequate medical services.

During the last eight years of Democratic administrations, this nation has taken giant steps forward in assuring life and health for its citizens. In the years ahead, we Democrats are determined to take those final steps that are necessary to make certain that every American, regardless of economic status, shall live out his years without fear of the high costs of sickness.

Through a partnership of government and private enterprise we must develop new coordinated approaches to stem the rise in medical and drug costs without lowering the quality or availability of medical care. Out-of-hospital care, comprehensive group practice arrangements, increased availability of neighborhood health centers, and the greater

use of sub-professional aides can all contribute to the lowering of medical costs.

We will raise the level of research in all fields of health, with special programs for development of the artificial heart and the heart transplant technique, development of drugs to treat and prevent the recurrence of heart diseases, expansion of current task forces in cancer research and the creation of new ones including cancer of the lung, determination of the factors in mental retardation and reduction of infant mortality, development of drugs to reduce the incidence of suicide and construction of health research facilities and hospitals.

We must build new medical, dental and medical service schools, and increase the capacity of existing ones, to train more doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians.

Medical care should be extended to disabled beneficiaries under the Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Act to the same extent and under the same system that such care is available to the aged.

Thousands of children die, or are handicapped for life, because their mothers did not receive proper pre-natal medical attention or because the infants were unattended in the critical first days of life. Maternal and child health centers, located and designed to serve the needs of the poor, and voluntary family planning information centers should be established throughout the country. Medicaid programs administered by the state should have uniform standards so that no mother or child is denied necessary health services. Finally, we urge consideration of a program comparable to medicare to finance pre-natal care for mothers and post-natal care for children during the first year of life.

Veterans

American veterans deserve our enduring gratitude for their distinguished service to the nation.

In 1968 some 750,000 returning servicemen will continue their education with increased benefits under the new G.I. Bill passed by an education-minded Democratic Congress. Two million disabled veterans and survivors of those killed in action are receiving larger pensions and higher disability payments.

Guided by the Report of the Veterans Advisory Commission, established by the Democratic Administration, we will:

Continue a strong one-stop agency vested with sole responsibility for all veterans programs;

Sustain and upgrade veteran medical services, expand medical training in VA hospitals;

Maintain compensation for disabled veterans and for widows and dependents of veterans who die of service-connected causes, in line with the rise in earnings and living standards;

Assure every veteran the right of burial in a national cemetery;

Provide incentives for veterans to aid their communities by serving in police, fire departments, educational systems and other public endeavors;

Make veterans and their widows eligible for pension benefits at the same age at which Social Security beneficiaries may receive old age benefits.

We recommend the establishment of a standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in the Senate.

Education

Education is the chief instrument for making good the American promise. It is indispensable to every man's chance to achieve his full potential. We will seek to open education to all Americans.

We will assure equal opportunity to education and equal access to high-quality education. Our aim is to maintain state-local control over the nation's educational system, with federal financial assistance and help in stimulating changes through demonstration and technical assistance. New concepts of

education and training employing new communications technology must be developed to educate children and adults.

Every citizen has a basic right to as much education and training as he desires and can master—from preschool through graduate studies—even if his family cannot pay for this education.

We will marshal our national resources to help develop and finance new and effective methods of dealing with the educationally disadvantaged—including expanded preschool programs to prepare all young children for full participation in formal education, improved teacher recruitment and training programs for inner city and rural schools, the Teacher Corps, assistance to community controlled schools to encourage pursuit of innovative practices, university participation in research and operation of school programs, a vocational education system that will provide imaginative new ties between school and the world of work, and improved and more widespread adult education programs.

We will fully fund Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which provides federal funds for improving education in schools serving large numbers of students from low income families.

The financial burden of education continues to grow as enrollments spiral and costs increase. The home owner's property tax burden must be eased by increased levels of financial aid by both the states and the Federal government.

Our rapidly expanding educational frontiers require a redoubling of efforts to insure the vitality of a diverse higher education system—public and private, large and small, community and junior colleges and great universities. We also pledge support for high quality graduate and medical education.

We will enlarge the federal scholarship program to remove the remaining financial barriers to post-secondary education for low income youths, and increase assistance to students in the form of repayable loans out of future income.

We will encourage support for the arts and the humanities, through the national foundations established by a Democratic Congress to provide incentives for those endowed with extraordinary talent, enhance the quality of our life, and make productive leisure available to all our people.

We recommend greater stress on the arts and humanities in elementary and secondary curricula to ensure a proper educational balance.

Youth

For generations, the Democratic Party has renewed its vitality with young people and new ideas. Today, young people are bringing new vigor and a deep concern for social justice into the political process, yet many feel excluded from full participation.

We of the Democratic Party welcome the bold thinking and exciting ideas of youth. We recognize, with deep satisfaction, that their healthy desire for participation in the democratic system must lead to a series of reforms in the direction of a greater democracy and a more open America.

The Democratic Party takes pride in the fact that so many of today's youth have channeled their interests and energies into our Party. To them, and to all young Americans we pledge the fullest opportunity to participate in the affairs of our Party at the local, state, and national levels. We call for special efforts to recruit young people as candidates for public office.

We will support a constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18.

We favor an increase in youth representation on state delegations in future Democratic conventions.

Steps should be taken to include youth advisors on all government studies, commissions, and hearings which are relevant to

their lives. We will establish a youth commission involving young people between 18 and 26.

Every young person should have an opportunity to contribute to the social health of his community or to humanitarian service abroad. The extraordinary experience of the Teacher Corps, VISTA, and the Peace Corps points the way for broadening the opportunities for such voluntary service. Hundreds of thousands of America's youth have sought to enlist in these programs, but only tens of thousands have been able to serve. We will expand these opportunities.

The lives of millions of young men are deeply affected by the requirement for military service. The present system leaves them in uncertainty through much of their early manhood. Until our manpower needs can be fully met by voluntary enlistment, the Democratic Party will insist upon the most equitable and just selection system that can be devised. We support a random system of selection which will reduce the period of eligibility to one year, guarantee fair selection, and remove uncertainty.

We urge review of draft board memberships to make them more representative of the communities they serve.

ENVIRONMENT, CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

These United States have undergone 200 years of continuous change and dramatic development resulting in the most technologically advanced nation in the World. But with rapid industrialization, the nation's air and water resources have been degraded, the public health and welfare endangered, the landscape scarred and littered, and the very quality of our national life jeopardized.

We must assure the availability of a decent environment for living, working, and relaxation.

To this end, we pledge our efforts:

To accelerate programs for the enhancement of the quality of the nation's waters for the protection of all legitimate water uses, with special emphasis on public water supplies, recreation, fish and wildlife;

To extend the national emission control program to all moving sources of air pollution;

To work for programs for the effective disposal of wastes of our modern industrial society;

To support the efforts on national, state, and local levels to preserve the historic monuments and sites of our heritage;

To assist in planning energy production and transportation to fit into the landscape, to assure safety, and to avoid interference with more desirable uses of land for recreation and other public purposes;

To continue to work toward abating the visual pollution that plagues our land;

To focus on the outdoor recreation needs of those who live in congested metropolitan areas;

To continue to work toward strong measures for the reclamation of mined and depleted lands and the conservation of soil.

Public domain

We pledge continued support of the Public Land Law Review Commission, which is reviewing public land laws and policies to assure maximum opportunity for all beneficial uses of the public lands, including lands under the sea, and to develop a comprehensive land use policy.

We support sustained yield management of our forests, and expanded research for control of forest insects, disease, and fires.

We plan to examine the productivity of the public lands in goods, services, and local community prosperity, with a view to increasing such productivity.

We shall enforce existing federal statutes governing federal timber.

We support the orderly use and development of mineral resources on federal lands.

Recreation

We will continue the vigorous expansion of the public recreational domain to meet tomorrow's increasing needs. We will add national parks, recreation areas and seashores, and create national systems of scenic and wild rivers and of trails and scenic roads. We will support a growing wilderness preservation system, preservation of our redwood forests, and conservation of marshland and estuarine areas.

Recognizing that the bulk of the task of acquisition and development must be accomplished at the state and local levels, we shall foster federal assistance to encourage such action, as well as recreational expansion by the private sector. To this end, we shall build upon the landmark Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which has assured a foundation of a recreational heritage for future generations. We will assist communities to rehabilitate and expand inadequate and deteriorating urban park systems, and develop open space, waterways, and waterfront renovation facilities.

Resources of the oceans

In and beneath the seas are resources of untold dimension for the benefit of mankind. Recognizing and protecting the paramount public interest in the seas, Congress, under democratic leadership, enacted the Sea Grant College Act of 1965 and the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, which established for the first time a comprehensive long-range policy and program for the marine sciences. We pledge to pursue vigorously the goals of that Act. Specifically, we will:

Foster marine application of new technology—spacecraft, buoys, data networks, and advanced navigation systems—and develop an engineering capability to work on and under the sea at any depth;

Encourage development of undersea resources by intensified research and better weather forecasting, with recognition to the coastal, insular and other littoral states of their unique interest and responsibility;

Foster an extensive program of oceanologic research and development, financed by a portion of the mineral-royalty receipts from the outer continental shelf;

Accelerate public and private programs for the development of food and other marine resources to meet world-wide malnutrition, to create new industries, and to utilize underemployed manpower living near the waterfront;

Promote our fisheries by providing incentives for private investment enforcing our 12-mile fishing zone, and discouraging other nations from excessive territorial and fishery claims;

Conclude an appropriate Ocean Space Treaty to secure rules and agreements that will facilitate public and private investment, guarantee security of investment and encourage efficient and orderly development of the seas' resources.

THE GOVERNMENT

In the coming four years, the Democratic President and Democratic Congress will give priority to simplifying and streamlining the processes of government, particularly in the management of the great innovative programs enacted in the 1960's.

The Executive branch of the Federal Government is the largest and most complicated enterprise in the world, with programs distributed among 150 separate departments, agencies, bureaus, and boards. This massive operation contributes to and often results in duplication, administrative confusion, and delay.

We will seek to streamline this machinery by improving coordination and management of federal programs.

We realize that government must develop the capacity to anticipate problems. We support a thorough study of agency operations to determine priorities for governmental action and spending, for examination of the

structure of these agencies, and for establishing more systematic means of attacking our nation's problems.

We recognize that citizen participation in government is most meaningful at the levels of government closest to the people. For that reason, we recognize the necessity of developing a true partnership between state, local, and Federal governments, with each carrying its share of the financial and administrative load. We acknowledge the tremendous strides made by President Johnson in strengthening Federal-State relations through open communication with the governors and local officials, and we pledge to continue and expand on this significant effort.

The complexities of Federal-state-local relationships must be simplified, so that states and local communities receiving federal aid will have maximum freedom to initiate and carry out programs suited to their own particular needs. To give states and communities greater flexibility in their programs, we will combine individual grant programs into broader categories.

As the economy grows, it is the federal revenue system that responds most quickly, yet it may be the states and local governments whose responsibilities mount most rapidly. To help states and cities meet their fiscal challenges, we must seek new methods for states and local governments to share in federal revenues while retaining responsibility for establishing their own priorities and for operating their own programs. To this end, we will seek out new and innovative approaches to government to assure that our Federal system does, in fact, deliver to the people the services for which they are paying.

Public employees

The Democratic administration has moved vigorously in the past eight years—particularly with regard to pay scales—to improve the conditions of public service.

We support:

A federal service that rewards new ideas and leadership;

Continued emphasis on education and training programs for public employees, before and during their service;

Parity of government salaries with private industry;

A proper respect for the privacy and independence of federal employees;

Equal opportunities for career advancement;

Continued application of the principles of collective bargaining to federal employment;

Encouragement to state and local governments to continue to upgrade their personnel systems in terms of pay scales and training;

Interchange of employees between federal and state government.

Elections

We are alarmed at the growing costs of political participation in our country and the consequent reliance of political parties and candidates on large contributors, and we want to assure full public information on campaign expenditures. To encourage citizen participation we urge that limited campaign contributions be made deductible as credit from the federal income tax.

We fully recognize the principle of one man, one vote in all elections. We urge that due consideration be given to the question of Presidential primaries throughout the nation. We urge reform of the electoral college and election procedures to assure that the votes of the people are fully reflected.

We urge all levels of our Party to assume leadership in removing all remaining barriers to voter registration.

We will also seek to eliminate disenfranchisement of voters who change residence during an election year.

The District of Columbia

With the reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia, the nation's capi-

tal has for the first time in nearly a century the strong leadership provided by a mayor-council form of government. This, however, is no substitute for an independent and fiscally autonomous District government. We support a Federally funded Charter Commission—controlled by D.C. residents—to determine the most appropriate form of government for the District, and the prompt implementation of the Commission's recommendation.

The Democratic Party supports full citizenship for residents of the District of Columbia and a Constitutional Amendment to grant such citizenship through voting representation in Congress. Until this can be done we propose non-voting representation.

Puerto Rico

In accordance with the Democratic principle of self-determination, the people of Puerto Rico have expressed their will to continue in permanent union with the U.S. through Commonwealth status. We pledge our continued support to the growth of the Commonwealth status which the people of Puerto Rico overwhelmingly approved last year.

Virgin Islands and Guam

We favor an elected governor and a non-voting delegate in the House of Representatives for the Virgin Islands and Guam, and will consider methods by which American citizens residing in American territories can participate in Presidential elections.

JUSTICE AND LAW

We are firm in our commitment that equal justice under law shall be denied to no one. The duty of government at every level is the safety and security of its people. Yet the fact and fear of crime are uppermost in the minds of Americans today. The entire nation is united in its concern over crime, in all forms and wherever it occurs. America must move aggressively to reduce crime and its causes.

Democratic Presidents, governors and local government officials are dedicated to the principle that equal justice under law shall remain the American creed. Those who take the law into their own hands undermine that creed. Anyone who breaks the law must be held accountable. Organized crime cannot be accepted as a way of life, nor can individual crime or acts of violence be permitted.

As stated in the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the two fundamental questions confronting the American people are:

"How can we as a people end the resort to violence while we build a better society?"

"How can the nation realize the promise of a single society—one nation indivisible—which yet remains unfulfilled?"

This platform commits the Democratic Party to seek resolution of these questions.

We pledge a vigorous and sustained campaign against lawlessness in all its forms—organized crime, white collar crime, rioting, and other violations of the rights and liberties of others. We will further this campaign by attack on the root causes of crime and disorder.

Under the recent enactments of a Democratic Congress we will continue and increase federal financial support and technical assistance to the states and their local governments to:

Increase the numbers, raise the pay, and improve the training of local police officers;

Reduce delays and congestion in our criminal courts;

Rehabilitate and supervise convicted offenders, to return offenders to useful, decent lives, and to protect the public against habitual criminals;

Develop and deploy the most advanced and effective techniques and equipment for the public safety;

Assure the availability in every metropolitan area of quick, balanced, coordinated control forces, with ample manpower, thoroughly

trained and properly equipped to suppress rioting;

Encourage responsible and competent civic associations, and business and labor groups to cooperate with the law enforcement agencies in new efforts to combat organized crime, build community support for police work, and assist in rehabilitating convicted offenders—and for the attainment of these ends, encourage our police to cooperate with any such groups and to establish links of communication with every element of the public they serve, building confidence and respect;

Establish and maintain open and responsive channels of communication between the public and the police through creative police-community relations programs;

Develop innovative programs to reduce the incidence of juvenile delinquency;

Promote the passage and enforcement of effective federal, state and local gun control legislation.

In all these efforts, our aim is to strengthen state and local law enforcement agencies so that they can do their jobs. In addition, the federal government has a clear responsibility for national action. We have accepted that responsibility and will continue to accept it with these specific objectives:

Prompt and effective federal support, upon request of appropriate authorities, to suppress rioting; improvement of the capabilities of all agencies of law enforcement and justice—the police, the military, the courts—to handle more effectively problems attending riots;

A concentrated campaign by the Federal government to wipe out organized crime: by employment of additional Federal investigators and prosecutors, by computerizing the present system of collecting information, by enlarging the program of technical assistance teams to work with the states and local governments that request assistance in this fight, by launching a nationwide program for the country's business and labor leaders to alert them to the problems of organized crime;

Intensified enforcement, research, and education to protect the public from narcotics and other damaging drugs: by review of federal narcotics laws for loopholes and difficulties of enforcement; by increased surveillance of the entire drug traffic; through negotiations with those foreign nations which grow and manufacture the bulk of drug derivatives;

Vigorous federal leadership to assist and coordinate state and local enforcement efforts, and to ensure that all communities benefit from the resources and knowledge essential to the fight on crime;

Further implementation of the recommendations of the President's crime commission.

Creation in the District of Columbia of a model system of criminal justice.

Federal research and development to bring to the problems of law enforcement and the administration of justice the full potential of the scientific revolution.

In fighting crime we must not foster injustice. Lawlessness cannot be ended by curtailing the hard-won liberties of all Americans. The right of privacy must be safeguarded. Court procedures must be expedited. Justice delayed is justice denied.

A respect for civil peace requires also a proper respect for the legitimate means of expressing dissent. A democratic society welcomes criticism within the limits of the law. Freedom of speech, press, assembly and association, together with free exercise of the franchise, are among the legitimate means to achieve change in a democratic society. But when the dissenter resorts to violence, he erodes the institutions and values which are the underpinnings of our democratic society. We must not and will not tolerate violence.

As President Johnson has stated, "Our

test is to rise above the debate between the rights of the individual and the rights of society by securing the rights of both."

We freely admit that the years we live in are years of turbulence. But the wisdom of history has something hopeful to say about times like these. It tells us that the giant American nation, on the move with giant strides, has never moved—and can never move—in silence.

We are an acting, doing, feeling people. We are a people whose deepest emotions are the source of the creative noise we make—precisely because of our ardent desire for unity, our wish for peace, our longing for concord, our demand for justice, our hope for material well being, our impulse to move always toward a more perfect union.

In that never-ending quest, we are all partners together—the industrialist and the banker, the workman and the storekeeper, the farmer and the scientist, the clerk and the engineer, the teacher and the student, the clergyman and the writer, the men of all colors and of all the different generations.

The American dream is not the exclusive property of any political party. But we submit that the Democratic Party has been the chief instrument of orderly progress in our time. As heirs to the longest tradition of any political party on earth, we Democrats have been trained over the generations to be a party of builders. And that experience has taught us that America builds best when it is called upon to build greatly.

We sound that call anew. With the active consent of the American people, we will prove anew that freedom is best secured by a government that is responsive and compassionate and committed to justice and the rule of law.

MINORITY REPORT ON HOW TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Nearly 200,000 American men have been casualties in Vietnam and 25,000 have died. The United States has spent more than one hundred billion dollars. This war has cost us heavily in human life and in all the resources we so badly need to rebuild our cities, improve the quality of life for all Americans and to meet our other obligations around the world. Discarding judgment about the wisdom of the past, we must now act to secure and enrich our own future by bringing the war in Vietnam to a swift conclusion. It is to this cause of early peace that the Democratic Party now commits itself.

Nor can we be content with the vague and ambiguous statements which mark the platform of the Republican Party. For a meaningful pledge of peace also demands the courage to make commitments to those concrete and specific acts most likely to hasten the end of the conflict and destruction. We have taken so many risks for war; we must now take some for peace.

That war must be ended now. It will not be ended by a military victory, surrender, or unilateral withdrawal by either side: it cannot be ended by further U.S. escalation, either increasing our troops, introducing nuclear weapons, or extending the conflict geographically. It must therefore be ended by a fair and realistic compromise settlement.

Although the war in Vietnam is complex, the steps towards peace can be simply stated. First, an unconditional end to all bombing of North Vietnam, while continuing to provide, in the South, all necessary air and other support for American troops.

Second, we will then negotiate a mutual withdrawal of all United States forces and all North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam. This should be a phased withdrawal over a relatively short period of time.

Third, we will encourage our South Vietnamese allies to negotiate a political reconciliation with the National Liberation Front looking toward a government which is broadly representative of these and all elements in South Vietnamese society. The spe-

cial shape of this reconciliation will be a matter for decision by the South Vietnamese, spurred to action by the certain knowledge that the prop of American military support will soon be gone. In addition, the South Vietnamese will assume increasing responsibility for the resolution of the conflict, and full responsibility for determining their own political destiny. We will, of course, extend economic and other assistance to help rebuild in peace the society which has been ravaged by war.

Fourth, to reduce American casualties and the suffering of Vietnamese civilians we will lower the level of violence by reducing offensive operations in the Vietnamese countryside, thus enabling an early withdrawal of a significant number of our troops. We will, of course, at all times continue to provide all necessary military support in the South for American troops confronted by hostile forces.

In this way we can eliminate all foreign forces from South Vietnam. Our troops will leave and those of North Vietnam will also depart. It will be up to the South Vietnamese to achieve a political and social reconciliation among their warring peoples. We will also seek to enlist the participation of international authority to guarantee troop withdrawals and the granting of asylum to political refugees. Thus we can reasonably anticipate that as we leave, the Vietnamese will be well on their way to a solution of their own problems, and a government in which all can have a share of power and responsibility.

We are also resolved to have no more Vietnams. We accept as basic each nation's right to choose its political, economic and social system. Our deep concern for the welfare of human beings everywhere will be expressed through economic and technical assistance, predominately under international auspices. We shall neither assume the role of the world's policeman, nor lend our support to corrupt oppressive regimes unwilling to work for essential reforms and lacking the consent of the governed. Above all, we shall avoid the unilateral use of military means where the issues are political in nature and our national security is not involved.

FINEST GARDENER IN WORLD

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I sent out a newsletter entitled, "Are You Hungry." In it I stated that no one need be hungry this summer or winter. I emphasize the need of planting a garden.

In Japan, I have seen the people gather sand and dirt from the streets and place it in hollow rocks and boxes and have strawberries as large as apples.

I received hundreds of letters requesting agriculture bulletins on growing vegetables and flowers. Several requests came from those living in our larger cities asking about planting small roof gardens. The Agriculture Department does have bulletins on growing vegetables indoors and on rooftops.

The other day a splendid article was called to my attention which appeared in the Charlotte Observer on Monday, June 16th. It deserves the attention of every Member of the Congress and the American people.

The article follows:

FINEST GARDENER IN WORLD

If one wants a garden badly enough, he can beg or borrow enough soil to have one, a retired Charlotte resident says.

"I just couldn't sit down and do nothing for the rest of my life," says S. Edwin Richardson of 1313 Effingham Dr., a former employee of Associated Transport.

"And I didn't have any yard at all for a garden."

He went begging. An alley running behind the south side of Elon Street had a long strip of grass and weeds between it and home fences. A couple of homes had yards in which there were fair-sized plots of brambles and weeds.

He visited each homeowner on that side of Elon and ask if he could plant the areas that weren't being used for grass or other things.

One woman gave him permission to plant an area about 30 feet by 30 feet all the way to the alley ditch behind her home.

A neighbor says, "We think he must be about the finest gardener in the world. He's taken some real eyesore places back there (along the alley) and made them beautiful and productive. All of us on the block think he deserves some recognition."

He has squash, green beans already being picked and eaten, potatoes, butterbeans, half runner beans, beets, onions, carrots, tomatoes, and okra.

He and neighbors have been digging and eating some of the new potatoes.

"My system for planting potatoes is a simple one," says Richardson. "I fertilize the bed, hill it up as I set the seed potatoes, and then cover the entire bed with three or four inches of leaves."

"This mulch holds moisture and keeps down weeds. The potatoes really thrive."

Richardson, whose home is about one and one half blocks from his garden, gives what he grows to his neighbors.

"The object of the garden is to give me food and keep me busy. It isn't to make money with."

Sometimes someone will make a donation. This goes into the fertilizer and spraying fund, he said.

A POLITICIAN'S BEQUEST

HON. MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the following excellent editorial which appeared in the Times Herald Record of Middletown, N.Y., on June 24, 1969, with reference to the remarks made shortly before his death by the former distinguished mayor of Middletown, John N. Botens, on the subject of political activity.

A POLITICIAN'S BEQUEST

The late John N. Botens was a politician, and he gloried in the label.

Just a few weeks before his untimely death, the former mayor of Middletown turned to his colleague in Port Jervis, Jack C. Harford, and urged him to insert a few paragraphs into a speech Mr. Harford was to deliver throughout the area in his capacity of district governor of Kiwanis.

Mr. Harford took down the words Mr. Botens offered, and is fulfilling his promise by including them in the speech he has been giving to local Kiwanis clubs.

We think the Botens credo deserves wider circulation. We offer it as today's editorial thought with respect for the author and in admiration of his philosophy.

"It has become the fashion in too many quarters to consider partisan politics or political activity as degrading. The very word 'politician' is widely used as a derogatory term, connoting a person of little fixed principle, small appetite for hard work, and a basic lack of honesty.

"In my opinion, not only are these views wrong, but their prevalence is desperately dangerous to our democratic process. Democratic government is essentially an articulated consensus of the majority of its citizens.

"Considering all this to be true, it is distressing to contemplate the low estate in which political activity is held by many people. Nor is indifference or apathy any better. It all amounts to an abdication by people of their own rights and also of their own interests.

"Those who do not participate in their own governing affairs have little grounds to complain about the efforts of those who are trying. Those who are trying are aware that the willingness of the people to spend time and exert effort for public purposes determines the success of democracy."

CAUTION REGARDING ANDERSON-COHELAN MIRV RESOLUTIONS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today dispatched to the Members of this body the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1969.

Re Anderson-Cohelan MIRV moratorium resolutions.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: With due respect to the authors of the above captioned resolutions in which you have been asked to join, I wish to caution as follows:

(1) The President has not requested them and already has authority to engage in a moratorium if it would (a) be provident to do so, and (b) expedite negotiations.

(2) Past experience with arms control moratoria has been bad. The extended nuclear test moratorium indulged in during Limited Test Ban Treaty negotiations failed to expedite the talks, succeeded in seriously hampering U.S. weapons progress, and failed to halt Soviet progress. The Soviets used the moratorium as a screen behind which to prepare for extensive testing and renounced it when ready to test.

(3) MIRV is no strange new terror weapon or unbalancing shocker bursting on the scene. Rather, it is an expected and anticipated progression in missilery of surprise to no one familiar with defense of nuclear strategy. Nor is it a first-strike weapon. A first-strike posture is not achievable by any single weapons system. Rather, it is a factor of the overall strategic balance between nations.

(4) Both the U.S. and the USSR have tested MIRV and no one can say without good results. Deployment might be made without further tests. A moratorium on MIRV testing could be futile. A moratorium on MIRV deployment could not be policed because neither side can see inside the other's ICBMs. Under the circumstances about the only moratorium that makes sense would be on further deployment of ICBMs, which, to an extent, is subject to surveillance. Nobody is suggesting the latter. It would be meaningful as to both sides. Therefore, one would not accept it. That is the reason nobody is suggesting it.

Respectfully,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

NEW EMPHASIS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NEEDED FOR TRILLION DOLLAR ECONOMY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to address the New England Distributive Education Conference which was held at the University of Massachusetts.

Miss Jean E. Swantee, of the Wakefield Daily Item, carried an excellent report of this meeting and I call it to the attention of my colleagues today.

Mr. Frank Cyr, coordinator of the distributive education project, deserves the highest tribute for arranging this informative assembly and the University of Massachusetts has performed a notable service by making its facilities available for the conference.

The article follows:

NEW EMPHASIS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NEEDED FOR TRILLION DOLLAR ECONOMY
(By Jean E. Swantee)

"The United States must place a whole new emphasis on vocational education if we are to have the manpower to sustain a trillion-dollar economy by mid-1971," Cong. Roman C. Pucinski of Illinois told educators assembled in Amherst last night.

U.S. Rep. Pucinski, a member of the House of Representatives for nearly 12 years and chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, made this statement in opening his keynote address to the second annual New England Distributive Education Conference being held at the University of Massachusetts June 5, 6 and 7.

The Congressman, in an exclusive interview, said that vocational education has come close to assuming the proportions of a crusade with him because of his belief that the one real danger to our economy lies in the lack of properly trained personnel.

He said, too, that if American education is to be saved, this salvation rests in the hands of the vocational educators.

U.S. Rep. Pucinski told the assembled group of new, prospective or currently active distributive education teachers that the U.S. economy has already exceeded the \$920 billion mark and that D.E. is "the most important of all vocational education disciplines because it must train the millions of Americans who move the goods to keep the economy going."

"Millions of Americans who produced goods in this country," he stressed, "are totally reliant on those in distributive education who devise the means and techniques for moving the finished product from factory to consumer."

Throughout his address, Rep. Pucinski emphasized the need for more meaningful education for young people today as the answer to the unrest on college campuses and in high schools.

He warned that "unless we give vocational educators the funds to make education meaningful, we will continue to see an increase in the turmoil in American Schools."

"Both the Johnson and Nixon administrations have recommended half a billion dollars less for vocational education than Congress authorized for 1970, he pointed out. "Congress last year authorized \$766 million of federal aid to vocational education and both administrations are recommending that only \$279 million be appropriated."

"This short changing of vocational education is an invitation to disaster in American education," he warned. "Millions of

young people are graduating from (or dropping out of) high school, totally unprepared for the world of work . . . most don't even know how to apply for a job."

As chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, which started hearings on the unrest in the nation's high schools Wednesday, Mr. Pucinski is well aware of the educational crises facing the country.

He cited a recent study which showed that 60 percent of the high schools in America have experienced some form of disorder to a greater or lesser degree, in the last year and said that the people at this conference held "the key to making education meaningful and reducing the cause of this unrest."

If these educators failed in this task, the whole nation would fall, he warned, predicting somberly that "we can expect even more serious upheaval on American college campuses when the present group of high school graduates arrive next fall because, to a great extent, these young people have been disillusioned with the quality of the education they have received at the high school level."

"All over the country," he said, "taxpayers are rejecting school bond issues because they are disenchanted with the kind of education youngsters are getting. Only by developing occupational training courses to give education more relevancy to the world of work can we hope to reverse this downward trend."

Rep. Pucinski also noted that one obstacle to this reversal is the insistence of the traditional academicians on teaching all youngsters college preparatory courses when only 20 percent of high school graduates today actually complete college.

Of those who do complete college, a large percentage have been exposed to vocational education training during their high school careers, he said, reiterating his belief that much of the problem which exists in education is that there is no connection between school curriculums and the working world.

Fred Rockett, distributive education coordinator for Wakefield High School, who is attending the conference, said that Cong. Pucinski received a standing ovation from the educators who had listened appreciatively to his dynamic and perceptive presentation.

PATRIOTISM—THE VOICE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we hear daily from a motley collection of leftists, pacifists, do-gooders, and assorted bleeding hearts about the inhumanity of asking young men to serve in our Armed Forces, it is good to hear the views of mature men who have served our flag in combat in the far corners of the earth. These are men who know, and who have earned the right to speak.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I include a resolution from the Gen. Douglas MacArthur Post No. 1507, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Broomall, Pa., following my remarks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has, since its inception, strived for the downfall of our capitalistic system and Whereas the USSR has, without abatement, conducted espionage activities in the highest echelons of our government and

Whereas despite findings by duly constituted congressional committees and sub-

committees as to the activities of persons in governmental employ, both in the civilian and military, elected and appointed, no definitive remedial course of action has been undertaken and

Whereas despite Soviet aid to the Viet Cong enemy in military hardware and related supplies, our government continues to grovel before the USSR and seeks a furtherance of trade, aid and social contact with citizens of that dictatorship even while our servicemen are being killed and maimed by said war materiel and

Whereas our government's "appropriate response" to increased acts of terror by the Viet Cong enemy includes free and unfettered use of the major port of Haiphong thereby permitting the enemy war machine to be nurtured and replenished; and

Whereas the USSR Trawler "fishing" fleet consistently encroaches upon our territorial limits and conducts electronic surveillance by so doing and, from time to time, purposefully harasses our merchant and naval vessels; and

Whereas there exists no hard evidence that we have so much as hurled a spit ball in defiance of this arrogance on the part of the USSR trawler "fishing" fleet;

Be it hereby resolved that a message of congratulations be sent to the Captain and crew of the tankship U.S.S. *Eso Honduras* for ramming and sinking one of the USSR Trawler "fishing" fleet.

It is understood by the membership of this Post that said ramming and sinking of the Trawler may well have been accidental and that the management of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey undoubtedly took a very dim view of the deed since the membership is aware of the Rockefeller tie in with Cyrus Eaton in commercial ventures said to include increased trade with the Soviet enemy, but notwithstanding the displeasure of the management of said Captain's employer corporation, we feel that at long last and for once, accidentally or not, a well deserved blow for liberty has been effectuated and that congratulations for the fait accompli are in order.

This resolution was voted upon and passed at a regularly stated monthly meeting of said VFW Post 1507, of Broomall, Pennsylvania, on Monday the 24th day of March in the year of our Lord One Thousand Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Nine and the Post Adjutant was duly authorized and directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Captain and noble crew of the U.S.S. *Eso Honduras* and others.

GEORGE F. JOHNSON,
Senior Vice Commander.

CAN THE INFANTS SURVIVE?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 25 years ago, we were on the threshold of a monumental scientific breakthrough. The atomic bomb was about to be born. Little did we realize at that time the multitude and magnitude of the problems that were to be born with it.

Today, after years of developing bigger and more powerful bombs along with the means of accurately delivering them to any spot in the world, we are now seeking means of protecting ourselves from the awesome destructive power unleashed a quarter of a century ago.

In the current ABM controversy little if any mention is made of the problem of radiation effects on succeeding genera-

tions, even if the ABM worked perfectly and there was no physical destruction after an all-out nuclear exchange.

I have recently received a letter from Prof. E. J. Sternglass, a member of the department of radiology, University of Pittsburgh, along with a computer analysis which shows remarkable correlation of excess infant mortality in the United States with the average content of radioactive strontium-90 in milk. This suggests an emphasis on the development of a defensive system with nonnuclear interceptors rather than deployment of the proposed Safeguard ABM which is designed to disarm incoming missiles by detonation of a nuclear device.

I submit for the RECORD and for the edification of my colleagues, Professor Sternglass' letter and his article, "Can the Infants Survive," from the June 1969 Bulletin of Atomic Scientists.

The letter and article follow:

JUNE 12, 1969.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
Federal Building,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. GAYDOS: In response to the request of Mr. Zajicek of your staff, I am glad to send you the enclosed background material relating to the problem of radiation effects from nuclear weapons, and its implications for the decision on whether or not to deploy an Anti-Ballistic-Missile System.

The particular aspect of the whole problem of the growing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, which has concerned me for many years, is the little discussed but potentially extremely serious question of unanticipatedly severe effects of fallout on the developing human embryo and infant.

From a computer analysis of infant mortality in the United States involving every state in the union except Alaska from 1935 to 1966, our group in the Radiation Health Department at the University of Pittsburgh has found that there exists a state-by-state and year-by-year correlation of excesses in the normally expected infant mortality rates with the average content of radioactive Strontium-90 in the milk, the teeth and the bones of the infants during the preceding 4 years.

As shown in the enclosed computer-printed maps of the United States, the excess infant mortality reached a maximum value of 72% above normal for the U.S. as a whole by 1966, corresponding to almost 1 out of every 2 babies that died before reaching age one.

The highest excess mortality in the Continental U.S. was found to occur in the District of Columbia, where it reached 158% above normal, or close to 2 out of 3 babies that died in 1966 between the ages 0 and 1 while the least deviation from expected rates occurred for New Mexico (-11%) due to its very low rainfall and location southeast of the Nevada test-site. For Pennsylvania, the computer print-out shows a 56% increase above normal, corresponding to more than 1 out of 3 infants that died. Hawaii showed the highest excess of any state, 204%, probably due to its very high rainfall of 140 inches per year that brings down almost three times as much radioactivity as in the Eastern U.S., where typical annual rainfalls are 40 to 50 inches.

As described in my paper presented last month before the International Symposium on the Radiobiology of the Fetal and Juvenile Mammal at the Hanford Laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission, these totally unexpected effects are probably due to Strontium-90 going not only to the bones, but also to the male and female reproductive cells, leading to genetic damage some 100 times more serious than had been anticipated by all past calculations.

The fact that this direct correlation cannot be explained solely by such other possible causes as urban slum problems, air-pollution, DDT or cigarette smoking follows from the evidence that the first marked increases in infant mortality took place in those states directly underneath the known path of the passing cloud of radioactive dust from the first atomic bomb explosion at Alamogordo, New Mexico, July 1945. This is shown by our computer-plotted maps of excess infant mortality for the years 1946 and 1950, which indicate that a change towards excess rates took place only in the states of Texas, Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia but nowhere else in the entire United States. (See Figure 23 of the Hanford Paper).

The implications for the ABM question may be summarized briefly as follows. If, as seems difficult to explain in any other way, the release of 200 megatons of fission products during peacetime testing led to the death of about 1 extra infant out of every 100 born, then the release of the fission products from some 6,000 or so ABM warheads each containing 2 to 4 megatons, or a total of some 12,000 to 24,000 megatons, in an attempt to destroy some 1500 incoming Russian warheads, then essentially no infants would survive to maturity either in the U.S., or any other country in the world.

Thus, it now seems clear that if at any time the deterrent should ever fail, and even if the ABM should work perfectly and save all our cities from physical destruction, the survivors would only be condemned to watch their newborn children die before they could give birth to another generation.

In the light of this evidence and its far reaching implications for the survival of our nation and, in fact, the entire human race, every effort must clearly be made to avoid this new and fearsome upward turn of the nuclear arms race if at all humanly possible.

Furthermore, before such fateful decisions as to the number of nuclear weapons designed to protect us are to be taken, Congress has a right to demand that the Public Health Service first undertake a major effort to check whether Strontium-90 is indeed the causative factor responsible for our excess infant mortality, or whether there exists any other explanation that will better account for the ominous facts uncovered so far. Not until this is done under conditions as independent as possible from the pressures of the Defense Department and other interested government agencies could any responsible Congressman be expected to vote for the approval of what may well turn out to be the final spiral in the mad race towards the extinction of human life on this planet.

Sincerely yours,
ERNEST J. STERNGLASS,
Professor of Radiology and Director of
Radiation Physics.

CAN THE INFANTS SURVIVE?

(By Ernest J. Sternglass)

(NOTE.—Discussion of chances of recovery from a major nuclear war becomes meaningless, charges physicist Ernest Sternglass, when the children of the nation that launched the strike would die before reaching maturity. Dr. Sternglass's comment is based on data he presented in the April "Bulletin." Dr. Sternglass is a member of the Department of Radiology and Division of Radiation Health, University of Pittsburgh.)

F. J. Dyson's "Case for Missile Defense" (April "Bulletin"), although obviously based on a deeply felt moral revulsion against nuclear war and a sincere desire to minimize its apocalyptic consequences, nevertheless rests on a fundamental fallacy as to the nature of nuclear weapons which has until now been widely accepted in the absence of any serious evidence to the contrary.

This basic fallacy, which vitiates all four of the points in favor of defensive missiles

made by Dyson, is to regard nuclear weapons as basically nothing more than large explosive devices or fire-bombs accompanied by a flash of radiation, whose effect may be more or less judged by the local destruction they produce on the targets at which they are aimed, with relatively minor long-range radiation effects on distant populations or succeeding generations that pale in comparison with the immediate effects.

However, the mounting evidence for unexpectedly serious biological effects produced by low dose-rate fallout radiation on the reproductive system and the developing human embryo outlined in the April "Bulletin" makes it clear that the more important aspect of the large-scale use of nuclear weapons in warfare as far as mankind as a whole is concerned would be their action as a subtle new form of biological poison that could lead to the extinction of nations through their action on the genetic material.

The reproductive cells and the developing early embryo can apparently be seriously damaged by ingested or inhaled quantities of Sr-90 some tens to hundreds of times smaller than those needed to produce leukemia or bone cancer in the mature adult. Thus the situation can arise whereby many cities and their existing populations might survive a nuclear war as a result of ABM systems combined with shelters, only to have the society come to an end as the infants born to the survivors die in their first year of life.

We find ourselves confronted with the utterly new situation in which, contrary to all our past thinking, even targets that are either not attacked, or are protected by an anti-ballistic missile system, can be destroyed if these "targets" are people. Dyson's point that "if you are sitting in a city which is not attacked, the defense has worked" therefore becomes specious: the population might indeed have been saved, only to see the end of the very society which they sought to preserve as the newborns die one by one before reaching maturity as a result of the inhaled and ingested radioactive fallout quickly distributed throughout the atmosphere.

It is therefore clear that in the light of the long-range worldwide biological effect of nuclear weapons, all past calculations as to casualties, "loss-exchange ratios" and chances of recovery from a major nuclear war in the presence or absence of anti-missile systems or shelters become utterly and completely meaningless. In fact, even the threat of a massive first strike by one major power against another loses all credibility when the resulting release of fission products into the world's atmosphere would be sufficient to insure that the children of the nation that launched this strike would die before reaching maturity.

And yet this is precisely what the existing data on infant mortality as a result of the very limited peace-time testing of nuclear weapons show: The U.S. infant mortality reached about twice the normally expected value by the time the test-ban came into effect in 1963, in a manner directly correlated with the amount of Strontium-90 in the milk and infant bone. This means that close to one out of 100 children born died before reaching age one as a result of the release of some 200 megatons' worth of fission energy or some 20 million curies of Strontium-90 in remote test-sites and at high altitudes above the atmosphere. Since a first strike, in order to have any chance at all of being effective, would have to involve some tens of thousands of megatons, detonated close to the ground, probably in the form of biologically more effective small multiple warheads carried by MIRVs (multiple independent re-entry vehicles), it is clear what the effect of such a massive release of long-lived fission products into the circulating air-currents of the atmosphere would be, regardless of where the bombs were aimed or where on the ground or above the atmosphere they would detonate.

And since ABM systems, whether effective

or not, force an escalation of the number of offensive warheads, not to speak of the additional multimegaton warheads in the three-to-five antimissiles needed for each incoming warhead to achieve interception, the net result of their installation would be to seal the doom of mankind ever so much more firmly if the now unstabilized deterrent should ever fail.

The ethical and moral considerations that moved Dr. Dyson to opt for more defensive rather than offensive missiles must therefore be extended to the broader question: Does any nation have the right to destroy the lives of innocent children in countries throughout the world in a vain effort to insure the survival of its own particular ideology and way of life, by weapons that release an indiscriminately-acting, long-lasting biological poison into the world's atmosphere?

RESIST FREEZE IN BROADCAST LICENSES

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed by pending legislative proposals which would seriously undercut the right of the people to be assured that the radio and television frequencies are licensed, and periodically relicensed, in the public interest. In a letter presumably addressed to all Members of the House I have been importuned by the broadcasting lobby to support a measure that would go far in turning the present 3-year license of broadcasters into a perpetual easement, with little or no chance of change.

This anticompetitive legislation is ill advised and should be rejected. It makes a mockery of the policy that the airways are licensed by the people and for the people and for prescribed periods only.

In order that the Members may appraise this issue I am placing in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. Theodore H. Walworth, Jr., vice president and general manager of WNBC-TV and my letter of reply.

The letter and my reply follow:

JUNE 11, 1969.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: Presently pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are more than fifty bills entitled, "A Bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses." This is perhaps the most important piece of broadcast legislation to have been offered in many years, and one that vitally affects the entire broadcast industry, including broadcasters who serve your district. The need for legislation of this type is so urgent that I want to bring it to your attention.

As you perhaps know, radio and television broadcasters are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to serve the public interest, convenience and necessity. Licenses are issued for a three-year period and are renewed at this interval, if, in the opinion of the Commission, the broadcaster has appropriately served the needs and interests of his local audience. Thus, every three years all licensees report to the Commission on their stewardship of their broadcast franchise.

Under present law, anyone may challenge,

with a competing application, the renewal of a license, and the Commission has no choice in such cases but to schedule a full evidentiary hearing on the two competing applications. Such hearings may take as long as three years to complete and are costly and time consuming to all parties, including the Commission.

Not only does the present procedure cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to all concerned, including the Government, but many individuals and groups feel that recent Commission decisions have the effect of favoring new applicants over incumbent broadcasters in such competitive hearings. As a result, there has been a sharp increase in the filing of new applications at renewal time. The new applicants submit grandiose predictions of their proposed program service and attack the ownership structure of present broadcasters, especially when the incumbents are owners of other stations or have interests in other media. In weighing the respective applications, there is a real danger that the existing license holder's many years of pioneering and past broadcast performance may be disregarded in considering the relative proposals of both parties.

The bills that have been filed in the House of Representatives would, as at present, permit FCC review of the broadcaster's performance every three years at license renewal time to assure that he has continued to serve the public interest. But, one very important new provision is added to the present law. Under this proposal, new applicants would not be permitted to contest a renewal application until after the Commission had first made a determination that a renewal of the incumbent's license would not serve the public interest. In other words, a broadcaster's record of performance would be judged against his own promises and not against the blue-sky proposals of a newcomer. If the Commission found the record of the incumbent to be a good one, the license would be renewed and that would end the matter. On the other hand, if the Commission, after a hearing determined that the license should not be renewed, then it would accept applications from others for the frequency in question.

If the new Bill is enacted, licensees will avoid the harassment and uncertainties which threaten to destroy the industry, but the interests of the public will continue to be protected. A copy of the language of a typical bill is attached for your convenience and review.

I urge you to consider filing or co-sponsoring a similar bill. I further urge you to request an early hearing and quick action on this proposal. It is vital to all radio and television stations serving your district, as well as throughout the country, that legislation of this kind be enacted as soon as possible.

Thank you for your thoughtful attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

THEODORE H. WALWORTH, JR.

JUNE 24, 1969.

MR. THEODORE H. WALWORTH, JR.,
Vice President and General Manager,
WNBC-TV,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WALWORTH: This replies to your letter of June 11 requesting my support for legislation that would amend the present communications law by providing that new applicants for broadcast licenses would not be permitted to contest a renewal application until after the Federal Communications Commission had first made a determination that a renewal of the incumbent's license would not serve the public interest.

I must advise you that I oppose the point of view expressed in your letter and oppose enactment of the proposed legislation. It seems to me that the measure completely loses sight of the principle, engrafted in the Communications Act and basic to the juris-

diction of the FCC, that the radio and television waves—the frequencies—comprise a finite and precious national resource and are to be managed and licensed only for the benefit of the public and only in the public interest.

In this view, with which I doubt many would disagree, a frequency is licensed consistently with the public interest only when the best qualified broadcaster offering the best available programming is awarded the license. Anything less than the best available service is patently not in the public interest.

Your proposal to restrict new applicants to situations in which the Commission has already determined that renewal to the incumbent would not serve the public interest effectively prevents the Commission from ascertaining what the public interest requires. In other words, if the job being done by the incumbent is not so grossly inadequate in the Commission's view as to require that his petition for renewal be denied, then the Commission may never know and would be precluded from finding out whether a superior prospective licensee exists. The effect of such a rule requires little elaboration. Mediocrity would be firmly entrenched; potentially superior service would be ruled out. What is needed, in my opinion, is more rather than less competition for the privilege of providing radio and television programming to the public.

I am not unmindful of the possibility that irresponsible applications may be filed in bad faith by applicants who have neither the intention nor the ability to back up their promises. The cure for this is to devise rules by which such applications can be sifted out and rejected, not to freeze existing license relationships forever.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

JOE McCAFFREY, 25 YEARS AS A
CORRESPONDENT ON CAPITOL
HILL

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 25th anniversary of Joe McCaffrey's career as a press,

radio, and television correspondent on Capitol Hill. One of the Capitol's favorite people, Joe McCaffrey effectively conveys his solid grasp of the essence and feel of Congress in his perceptive radio and television commentaries to the public.

It has been my great pleasure to have been able to follow Joe's quarter of a century work in covering congressional activities. I not only have enjoyed listening to his evening reports over radio and television through those years, but I have treasured the fact that through this long period I have had the opportunity to have the frequent association with him.

As a former newspaper reporter and as one who has been in Congress during the same period Joe McCaffrey has been on the Hill, I think I am qualified to judge his record. Joe approaches his work with an objective point of view, always stressing the necessity of accuracy in reporting the news he relays to his listeners. He has always been impartial and fairminded in his treatment of the news.

Joe McCaffrey has always respected the trust and confidence Capitol Hill has placed in him. He has always respected the obligations and responsibilities of being a reporter and commentator. He is proud of his profession and he has brought additional honors to it.

Joe McCaffrey would be a valuable man to our educational systems throughout the country in teaching students about the legislative process, its people and its institutions. No one is more expert in the field. I have always been impressed with his intimate working knowledge of Congress and his thorough understanding of the substantive issues involved—issues that he must know so well to properly serve the people who daily wait for his reports. No commentator recognizes more than Joe McCaffrey does, the heavy responsibility that falls on him in keeping the people informed through objective, unslanted reporting of the news.

I am proud to join Joe McCaffrey's legion of friends in saluting him on his 25 years of great reporting as a Washington correspondent.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, few men, robed with such high office, have shown the common touch, the spark of simple humanity, which marked the tenure of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the United States. Not since John Marshall has there been a Chief Justice who has made such an important contribution to the development of constitutional law. His 16 years on the High Court spanned a difficult time in our history. From the very start he met difficult questions squarely, with the decision on school desegregation in *Brown v. Board of Education*. His overriding concern for equal rights was reexpressed, again and again in decisions on voting, legislative reapportionment and criminal due process. Always motivated by a strong belief in the sacred value of the individual, he consistently showed a responsiveness to the needs of our changing society, with a courage, integrity and humility, a warmth and gentleness and a wisdom that commands our respect. He was not a doctrinaire or arbitrary man. He bore the weight of bitter criticism silently and with dignity. At the end there were even some who accused him of being antagonistic to the great traditions which he himself helped to establish. He always remained above such partisan controversy, and ruled as he felt commonsense and justice dictated whether the result would please the liberal or the conservative faction. His departure brings the loss to the Supreme Court of a great statesman. Although he leaves public life, may his wisdom continue to guide us.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 26, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us.—II Corinthians 4: 7.

O God of everywhere and always, be unto us the God of here and now. We are grateful for our Nation and the people of our Nation, treasures in earthen vessels. Realizing that Thy presence and will are made known through men, let us not forget that we should be instruments of Thy purpose and that as a people we find our meaning in Thee. Help us especially to be instruments of Thy peace.

So guide us by Thy spirit that we may perceive in the events of our day Thy presence and Thy transcendent power. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MEDICARE COVERAGE

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am filing legislation today which authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreement with a State to provide coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged—popularly known as medicare—for annuitants of teacher retirement systems, and other public employee retirement systems. The bill permits States to take the initiative in negotiating with the Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare for coverage of such employees, and it

provides that States entering into such agreements shall reimburse the Federal hospital insurance trust fund for payments made to annuitants under such agreements and for the administrative expenses incurred by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in carrying out such agreements.

The bill requires no appropriation—neither at present nor in the future. The bill explicitly authorizes the Secretary to terminate any agreement once he ascertains that a State has failed to provide for full compliance with the agreement. Thus it will be up to the States to pay the cost of the program. It will not cost the Federal hospital insurance trust fund a cent. A State which elects to participate will reimburse the social security medicare trust fund for all benefits paid out plus all administrative expenses. My own State of Connecticut, for example, has already passed such a law and now only awaits congressional authorization