

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE FOURTH OF JULY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, our national holidays are occasions of more than passing interest to anyone familiar with American traditions, for they represent the wisdom of the past, all of which is vital to our current understanding.

There is, for instance, a lesson to be learned from the grand tradition of the Fourth of July: That the magnificence of American nationality could never have been secured without unity—the willingness to submerge all minor disagreements in the interest of the common good.

This surely is one lesson that we, as a people, have learned.

On this occasion—Independence Day, 1969—all Americans close ranks, free of discord, in response to the stirring pressures of the moment and the clarion call of our national destiny. Political factions mean nothing on this day, for there is in the air the sound of universal rejoicing that this land, our Nation, remains free and unswervingly devoted to defense of freedom everywhere.

In keeping with the bipartisan nature of the day, it is appropriate, I think, to recall the views of Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President of the United States, respecting the basic political ideals of Thomas Jefferson, the first Democratic President. In setting forth, as author of the Declaration of Independence, the proposition that "all men are created equal," Jefferson won the undying respect of Lincoln who said in this regard:

All honor to Jefferson—to the man who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, foresight, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document, an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there, that today, and in all coming days, it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.

No one could say it better than Abraham Lincoln; many have seen fit to second his remarks and to join in his praise of Jefferson, who in fact sounded a rallying cry for all mankind, that is still, today, heard around the world.

We all are well aware that the forces of evil and corruption are fully as energetic as those of peace and decency, law and order. We all are well aware that from the moment this country was founded, the forces of hate, of privilege, of outrage and mischief have endeavored—sometimes openly, sometimes covertly—to seize control of our Government. That they have not succeeded is the result of a thousand battles and a thousand victories by those to whom the views of Lincoln and the views of Jefferson stand as monumental truth.

What is the battle cry today? The same as it was in 1776, in 1865, and all the great years of American history: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

Let us go forth to insure the realization of this noble idea, in the name of the men it is a God-given honor to recall and revere, today and every day.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE PAUL J. KILDAY

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the passing of a former Member of Congress and a great Texan, Judge Paul J. Kilday. His record of public service stands as a tribute to patriotism and love of his country. His preeminence on military affairs and military justice while serving from 1939 to 1961 on the House Armed Services Committee was earned through his efforts for the major military measures of our time, among them historic paybills and the extremely important Uniform Code of Military Justice. His proven knowledge, ability, and fairness led to his appointment by President John F. Kennedy in 1961 to the Court of Military Appeals. His synthesis of the need for law and order in military organizations with the equally pressing need for fair trial and due process has earned for him a place in the hearts of men serving in the military.

His honors, befitting his labors, were many: the Air Force Association's Citation of Honor, the Army Times Accomplishment Award, honorary membership in the Fleet Reserve Association, the Honor Bell by the Military Order of the Carabao, honorary life membership in the Reserve Officers Association, the Veterans' of Foreign Wars Gold Medal of Merit and an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Tex.

He was a man of stature, strength, courage, patience, and wisdom. He was a man of great love for his family, his community, his State, his country, indeed, for all men. He was a great American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Paul J. Kilday, a Texas Portrait" by Leroy Jeffers, published in the May 1969 issue of the Texas Bar Journal be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PAUL J. KILDAY

(By Leroy Jeffers)

Paul J. Kilday, born in Sabinal of Irish immigrant parents who came to Texas

through the old port of Idianola, brought up in a devout Catholic home with five brothers and two sisters on the banks of San Pedro Creek in the near West Side of San Antonio, was a late living embodiment of the greatness that is America. When he died suddenly and peacefully on Columbus Day, 1968, at the height of a brilliant career, he entered not only into the rolls of Saints of God, which was his first concern, but into the halls of honor especially reserved for those who combine the great lawyer, the great public servant, the great judge, the great Texan and the great American.

Educated after Catholic secondary schools at St. Mary's University in San Antonio and Georgetown University Law School in Washington, D.C., Paul Kilday returned to his beloved San Antonio to begin his professional career, in which he was soon joined by his lovely, delightful and able wife, Cecile Newton. From his marriage to this charming and highly competent woman, sister of the fabled former San Antonio sheriff Alfonso Newton Jr., he was blessed with two loving and lovely daughters, Mary Catherine and Betty Ann, who were always his love and his delight.

As a dynamic and effective practitioner in the firm of Kilday and Howard, his performance was such that he was the obvious and only conceivable choice for the post of First Assistant Criminal District Attorney at the beginning of the reform administration of Criminal District Attorney John R. Shook on January 1, 1935. It was then that I became his colleague and his intimate and devoted friend while we were fellow prosecutors in the Criminal District Court of Judge W. W. McCrory. Those were great days with a great lawyer, Paul Kilday was first and last a lawyer. His reverence for the law; his high dedication to the noblest ideals of the profession; his energy and imagination in investigation and preparation; his almost clairvoyant brilliance in tactics, strategy, and cross-examination; and his Old Testament prophet force and sincerity in summation made him the greatest trial lawyer I have ever known—looking back over this now three and one-half decades at the bar. Our work together through more than three hundred contested jury trials of *hand-picked* cases saw less than a dozen acquittals—and with severe prison sentences and seven death penalties saw a dramatic decline in the crime rate and the murder rate in Bexar County. When they tell you punishment doesn't deter, don't you believe it. Paul Kilday knew better.

Yet he was a man of great kindness, warmth and compassion. There lives in San Antonio today a good, sound citizen who was under a death penalty for a senseless, unprovoked murder in an East Commerce Street bar. Paul Kilday called me in the late hours one night and said: "That is not a death penalty case. We can't live with ourselves if he dies. We must go to the Board of Pardons and Parole." We left in the hours before dawn the next morning for Austin. We asked the Board to commute the sentence and they did.

In a fabulous campaign in which he assumed the familiar role of prosecutor and made his opponent and the incumbent, the late and fiery Maury Maverick, the defendant, Paul was elected to Congress in 1938. My principal contribution was a volume of an actually delightful (though most tactless) autobiography entitled "A Maverick American" which I autographed: "To my great friend, Paul J. Kilday, on the occasion of his candidacy for Congress. 'Would that mine adversary would write a book.'" Paul, like a prosecutor, harried Maury with extracts from his intemperate volume throughout the campaign. In a final flurry he concluded

his closing campaign address in Maverick Park by shouting "It's trash" and flinging the book into the audience (where through pre-arrangement it was retrieved for posterity). Though it was desperately close—and in the days before voting machines, hung on a thread until late Sunday afternoon—Paul won to the strains of his great campaign refrain "When Irish Eyes Are Smiling."

Paul Kilday, always the lawyer, served his district, his country, and his God in the Congress of the United States and especially on its House Armed Services Committee from 1939 to 1961. Congressional colleagues far and wide have always said that members always came in and filled their seats when it became known that Paul Kilday was to address the House, which he did sparingly, because they knew that they were going to hear a great lawyer who would have something scholarly and valuable to say.

On his Committee he became the preeminent authority on military affairs and military justice in the United States government. He drafted and sponsored to passage the primary military measures of our time, including historic pay bills which provided our men in uniform with living wages. This great lawyer perceived and ferreted out the abuses of justice contained in an authoritarian military system. It was his hand that drafted the Uniform Code of Military Justice. He was the architect of the Court of Military Appeals that applies and enforces it. Most fittingly President Kennedy appointed Paul Kilday to that court in 1961 where he attained the acme of his great career. With the clear, incisive, logical reasoning and rhetoric of his trial lawyer days, the craftsman-like opinions of Judge Kilday have asserted law—have declared order—have confirmed authority—but have required *fair trial and due process*. Generations of military men, living and dead, can rise up and call him blessed.

The honors that Paul Kilday received during his brilliant career would fill many pages. To name only a few: in 1955 he was awarded the Air Force Association's "Citation of Honor" for his tireless efforts in building our national armed strength and enhancing military service as a career; in 1957 he was awarded the "Army Times Accomplishment Award" in recognition of his outstanding leadership in military personnel legislation; in 1958 he was awarded honorary membership in the Fleet Reserve Association; in 1960 he was awarded the "Honor Bell" by the Military Order of the Carabao; in 1961 he was elected an Honorary Life Member of the Reserve Officers Association; also in 1961 he was awarded the Veterans of Foreign Wars Gold Medal of Merit "in recognition of his many outstanding, historic contributions to national security"; and in 1963 he was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Mary's University in San Antonio.

On October 12, 1968, a multitude of Judge Kilday's former Congressional colleagues paid moving tributes to him on the floor of the House of Representatives. Congressman Poage of Texas declared that he had "never known a man in this Congress or elsewhere who had so fine an ability to make other people understand the substance of complicated matters" and that he had "never known a Member of this House on whom the Members could more completely rely." Speaker McCormack stressed the great contributions that Judge Kilday "has made to the strength, the dignity, the stability, and the progress of our country." Minority Whip Arends described Paul Kilday as "a wise man, a very intelligent person, and a determined individual with conviction and principle." Congressman Mahon declared "Paul loved his country, he loved its military services, he loved its courts of law." Chairman Rivers of the Committee on Armed Services extolled him thus:

"He was a great lawyer. He had a great

analytical mind. He loved the law. He could see the innermost things in the thinking of those who wrote it, and he too wrote good law. He was at home on the court, because he knew the military law. He was an authority on the tactics and the strategies of the military armies of all civilizations, particularly our own, and our own military. A most unusual man was Paul Kilday, thoroughly dedicated to what was good for America."

Congressman Gonzalez, who succeeded Paul Kilday in Congress, declared that the name of Paul Kilday "invokes everything that is symbolic of good government, loyalty, efficiency, and absolute integrity and trustworthiness." Like tributes of admiration and affection flowed on and on.

The life of this great Texas lawyer, prosecutor, Congressman, and judge exemplifies the great American ideal. From his humble home of Irish immigrant parents, devoted to their Catholic faith, there came not only this great man and his two lovely sisters but his beloved brothers Jim—outstanding lawyer and transportation authority; Owen, legendary Chief of Police and Sheriff of San Antonio; Pat, a foremost business executive; Frank (the delightful "Father Pete" of the Catholic priesthood); and Tom, West Point All-American and a hero of the Normandy invasion.

When the cynics ask: "Isn't the United States set up to serve the privileged?" and when the iconoclasts declare: "The American system is obsolete and doomed to destruction"—the voice of faith answers: Look at the Kildays!

Paul Joseph Kilday—lawyer, gentleman, friend, prosecutor, Congressman, judge—great Texan and great American—God Rest His Noble Soul!

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY BILL NEEDED NOW

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see recently that the President sent us his executive message concerning air transportation. In general, the approach taken there is good and I commend the administration.

At the same time, I am keenly disappointed that this message is some 6 months late in getting here; that it was sent only after subcommittees in the other body scheduled hearings on the subject; and that it came after my own subcommittee had postponed hearings when it became apparent in March that an administration agreement on this vital question was not imminent.

As I said on March 20, in introducing two bills dealing with this subject, this is a critical problem, and it is one which demands immediate attention. The lead-time required to implement the changes deemed necessary is at least 2 to 3 years, and events almost weekly since the first of this year have given us reason to know that we must address aviation on a stepped-up scale.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to review the major provisions contained in my bill, and compare them with the proposal sent up last week.

Briefly, the bills I introduced with my able colleague, the gentleman from California, DON CLAUSEN, call for the creation

of an aviation trust fund, similar to the highway trust fund we now have. Contributions into this fund would come from virtually all classes of aviation users, and include increasing the passenger tax from 5 to 8 percent; levying a 2-cent-per-gallon fuel and gasoline tax on commercial airlines; and an 8-cent-per-gallon tax on general aviation; creating a 3-percent air freight tax; and authorizing a U.S. Treasury contribution into the trust fund of an amount of \$300 million per year.

Expenditures out of the fund are authorized in five ways: First, \$150 million for funding the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; second, \$250 million for development of air navigation facilities under section 307(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; third, half of the collections on the general aviation fuel taxes for the development of State aviation programs; fourth, half of the collections from the commercial aviation fuel taxes for operational grants to airports served by commercial airlines; and fifth, the balance of funds for administrative expenses, maintenance of air navigation facilities, and research and development.

Mr. Speaker, it is the broad purpose of these bills to assess user charges as broadly as possible, and to create a Federal program which will give us the assurance that this problem will be confronted on a continuing basis.

Now, in comparing this approach with that sent to us by the administration, I am not sure that the goals, in fact, are the same, but I approve of their efforts to spread the tax and strengthen the State aviation agencies. Other points, however, need attention.

In the first place, there is no provision for a trust fund. Instead, we are asked to create a "designated account" in the Treasury. Apparently, this account would not be protected from assaults, by other programs competing for funds, and there is no assurance that fees collected from aviation users, in fact, would be used to rehabilitate our crippled aviation systems.

I would even go on to say that to my knowledge, there is nothing now in existence which could be termed a "designated account." The understanding I have of it is that it is rare, offbeat item not generally recognized in usage today.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I would like to make about the plan submitted by the President is that it does not practically deal with the political problems existing in the field of aviation. It is no secret that the factionalized field of aviation has prohibited us for several years from taking any effective action. The only way, in my view, to overcome this stand-off is simply to assess the fees as fairly as possible, and make it clear to all concerned parties that the country will not tolerate further delay.

As you know, the problem, most bluntly stated, is that general aviation resents being assessed almost any fuel tax, and they avidly strive to maintain the right of access of all classes of users to all airports, big or small. On the other hand, the commercial carriers are distressed over the major hub congestion and schedule delays resulting from the popularity of general aviation; moreover,

they strongly protest the imposition of any commercial fuel or gasoline tax which would not be distinguishable on a passenger's fare.

This is the standoff, and this basically, is the problem which has left us with no effective legislation to date.

I feel that the only way to overcome this problem is to face it directly. This is the reason I have recommended the imposition of all types of fuel taxes, and assessments on all conceivable classes of aviation users.

I was distressed to see that the administration recommendation relies in major part simply on a general aviation fuel tax of 9 cents a gallon, an increased passenger tax from 5 to 8 percent, while avoiding completely the issue of a fuel tax on commercial flights.

In my view, this approach does not respond to the political problems and does not provide any leadership to get the issue off dead center. More importantly, this recommendation will not inspire in all parties the feeling that the others are paying their fair share.

In January of this year, shortly after the new Cabinet was installed, we heard that aviation was to be one of the major projects of the new administration. I would venture to say that the hopes we heard expressed then have been bent considerably during the interim.

Presently, I am anxious that we proceed now in committee to study all of the alternatives presented. We already have waited too long, and the responsibility now falls on us to make up the lost time.

Time is of the essence. The American people are not going to accept further delay. If a great national air tragedy were to occur, we the Congress would have to share part of the blame. Air congestion; air travel delays; poor access to and from airports; slow handling of baggage; outdated navigational and control equipment; and delayed construction of landing facilities—these are the critical problems we face in the area, and these are the important elements to examine in any airport bill. Let us get on with the hearings.

CAPITOL HILL RESTAURANT WORKERS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as one who has worked long for the cause of adequate compensation for Congressmen and Senators and their staffs, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) and others who have spoken out concerning the plight of food workers on Capitol Hill.

To an outsider it must seem unusually cruel and unjust for Members of Congress to have allowed their own salaries to rise substantially while, at the same time, they are taking steps to hold down the pathetically low pay of the people

who work in their restaurants and cafeterias. I am sure it would never occur to anyone outside these Halls that individual Members have so little to say about such matters.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked into the manner in which the wages of our food workers are determined, and I will frankly state that I believe the Architect of the Capitol, who has this administrative responsibility, has gone out of his way to prevent reasonable increases in the employees' pay. At some point it was decided to fix these wages by the wage board approach. However, the Architect has rejected the Federal wage board and the District of Columbia wage board, either of which would have meant substantial increases to our restaurant workers, and instead set up his own, unofficial, hip-pocket wage board to decide on the proper level of restaurant wages.

In my judgment, there is absolutely no justification for the wage policy now in force for these workers. It is my very strong recommendation that such policy matters be removed from the Architect and made the responsibility of appropriate committees of the House and Senate. If we are to bear the criticism for injustice to our employees, we at least ought to have some voice in the policies that are made.

It has come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Architect has dismissed Mr. Wendell Quinn, a restaurant employee who had the audacity to exercise some leadership in organizing the employees into an association. It was not my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress of the United States was antiunion, or that it opposed voluntary associations of employees seeking to redress grievances or improve their conditions. I want to make it clear that I strongly object to this firing, and I urge that Mr. Quinn be reemployed without delay.

I hope and trust that the House will take prompt steps to correct the injustices being done the good people who serve us so faithfully and well and with such good cheer day after day.

A STUDENT SPEAKS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, contrary to popular belief, the vast majority of students attending our colleges today do not subscribe to the riotous tactics and insurrection so prevalent on our campuses today. There are those who prefer to call attention to their grievances, whether real or imaginary, by means of peaceful demonstration. They want to be heard but deplore the use of violence and destruction as a means of achieving their ends.

I submit for the RECORD and call the attention of my colleagues to a letter from Richard N. Lettieri which was editorialized in the McKeesport Daily News on Friday, June 27:

A STUDENT SPEAKS

Richard N. Lettieri, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Lettieri, 613 Laurel St., Versailles, is a graduate of McKeesport Area High School where he was president of the senior class and a captain of the football team. He went to Lafayette College in Easton, Pa., where he was graduated this month. He plans to enter law school this fall.

While at Lafayette, where he majored in philosophy, he was president of the senior class and captain of the football team. He also led a peaceful and successful student demonstration in behalf of a greater student voice in his college's affairs.

In an article written for the Los Angeles Times news service, he outlined some of his thoughts about his country and his generation's attitude toward our times. We thought they were worth reading and we offer them here.

"In a recent letter to graduating classes, President Nixon touched on the major question of our time—'Why?' It is a question that haunts the student throughout his college career.

"Since generations before us have shown how to build a nation and of what that nation should be built, we are left to judge how well the job has been done.

"Sometimes we are overcritical, attempting to destroy and undermine the core of our society, a society that has enabled us to ask the question 'Why?'

"Sometimes we are impatient, showing intolerance and scorn instead of reason and respect.

"Sometimes we are arrogant, making demands when requests might be more appropriate.

"But despite our criticism, despite our impatience or our arrogance, this generation is bringing a new honesty and sincerity into society.

"We are asking moral questions in the spirit of justice, not of self-interest, and for the most part in the spirit of conflict but not of violence.

"I feel that most students would like to remain within the framework of the democratic system, using the tools of petition, protest, and confrontation but stopping short of violence.

"In sharp contrast are those who have rejected democratic change and have resorted to violence, intimidation and even terror. These 'wreckers,' as Yippee leader Jerry Rubin has so appropriately called them, offer solutions no more clearly defined than the name 'wreckers' implies.

"Herbert Marcuse, considered by many the philosopher of the New Left, also has doubted the success of democratic means in rectifying injustice. He believes the situation calls for more drastic means but admits uncertainty as to the possible outcome of violent revolt.

"However, he and the student radicals believe that this uncertainty is not sufficient to delay destruction of evil in our society. They believe that their 'great refusal,' as Marcuse calls it, is the correct starting point and they feel no responsibility to supply something to replace what they destroy.

"Responsible students refuse to accept this. The basic assumption of social reform is that improvement can be made. Condoning change without a substitute leaves no assurance that the result will be an improvement.

"Those who have resorted to violence and have violated the spirit of constructive conflict have lost the respect and support of their fellow students who hold similar idealistic goals. However, this is not merely a dispute over tactics, since the radicals' pessimism undercuts the belief in successful democratic reform: the division becomes one of basic political ideology.

Now we must ask to whom we owe allegiance—our form of government which slows the realization of our goals, or our

consciences which demand that we settle our moral questions without delay. The majority of today's graduates do not view the question as one of either-or.

"They are convinced, instead that the two can be reconciled by utilizing democratic processes and achieving social remodeling quickly but within our governmental framework and without violence or disruption.

"But we must work together. As President Nixon wrote in his letter. 'These are not problems to be faced by one generation and ignored by another. All of us must face them.'"

Young Richard Lettieri, it seems to us, represents the kind of student who "has something to say" and deserves to be heard.

If we fail to take the opportunity to deal with students who share his views, we will eventually have to deal with the "wreckers."

BIBLE TRANSLATION DAY

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House joint resolution calling on the President to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September as "Bible Translation Day."

I am also inserting herewith an article which appeared in the June 21 issue of the New York Times and which spells out the purpose for and the true meaning behind the legislation I am introducing here today. I encourage my colleagues to read this very stimulating and exciting article.

During our congressional prayer breakfast meeting in Las Vegas at the International Exposition of Flight, 2 years ago, which Arthur Godfrey and I chaired, Dr. Cameron Townsend was one of the group discussion leaders wherein the emphasis was placed on a number of missionary-aviation programs organized and working in various sections of the world.

The Wycliffe Bible Translators, Inc., is but one of the "flying peace corps" operations which I am associated with. This organization has effectively used the aircraft in transporting Bibles that have been written and translated into over 400 languages, into some of the most remote sections of the world; many of which would not be accessible except for the ability to use small aircraft.

The Summer Institute of Linguistics, which is likewise involved in this worthy project, is headed by Prof. Kenneth L. Pike, who is working with Dr. Townsend's organization in providing primers, dictionaries, and textbooks written in tribal languages and dialects.

People throughout the world desperately need to improve their ability to communicate and this is the purpose and intent of this legislative proposal—to tell the world that we in the U.S.A. are a Nation under God, dedicated to advancing the principles embodied in the "Golden Rule."

Certainly, the airplane has once again demonstrated its flexibility toward helping people to better understand each other through the medium of commu-

nication. These "flying missionaries" are, indeed, carrying the "Word of God" to a very needed segment of our world's population.

In recognition of their great work, I am introducing this resolution today and urging its passage.

I include an article from the New York Times that succinctly details the progress of this great and growing international multilingual effort:

EXPERT LINGUIST SPREADS THE WORD WITH MISSIONARY ZEAL

(By Israel Shenker)

STANFORD, CALIF.—In "My Fair Lady," Prof. Henry Higgins taught a primitive Cockney named Eliza Doolittle to speak correctly. Prof. Kenneth L. Pike of the University of Michigan has taken the whole world of primitive tribes for his province, and he is trying to understand what they say.

He wants to give their languages a written form and printed materials—above all, the Bible.

An unusual amalgam of scholastic and divine, Professor Pike is an authority on linguistic and one of the most zealous of missionaries.

As he explained in an interview here at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, where he has been spending the last year, the linguistic-missionary work is carried on by two organizations with interlocking directorates: the Summer Institute of Linguistics, and the Wycliffe Bible Translators, Inc.

FIVE-HUNDRED STUDENTS A SUMMER

Professor Pike is president of the 35-year-old institute—which holds courses each summer for a total of about 500 students at the University of Oklahoma, Washington and North Dakota, and in four foreign countries.

Graduates, who often continue as members of the Wycliffe group, constitute the corporation, based in Santa Ana, Calif. Their work is sustained by their personal funds and by donations from church groups and others.

Named to honor John Wycliffe, who first translated Old and New Testaments into that primitive language called English, the corporation began as a single man—William Cameron Townsend, a self-trained linguist who communicated his fervor to others.

"We recruit for motive," said Professor Pike, "and the first has to be religious motive."

"We're starting on the assumption that God is very much there, and very much running things in a way we don't understand. He's the boss, and He wants us to use our abilities. Among these abilities are intellectual pursuits, and among these intellectual pursuits is the study of language."

SOUNDS STUDIED

For the study of languages, in the beginning is not only the Word, but also the sound. As Professor Pike put it: "The sounds we speak are those we make by moving something above the thorax—lips, tongue, soft palate, vocal chords, and once in a while something else in the back of the throat."

"In Asia, a belch—rattling the mouth of the esophagus—expresses appreciation, as for a good dinner. I included belches in my book of sounds, and I tried to learn belch talk."

"My 'Phonetics,' published in 1943, was an attempt to exhaust all sounds the human voice could make except whistles and trills, which my technique couldn't include." (Professor Pike has nothing against whistles—he has even whistled up a Cheyenne conversation with modulations on a sliding tube.)

"With sounds you can produce an infinite variety," he said. "Take 'ee.' Talk through your tongue and it doubles the

number of sounds, double up your tongue and there are more, talk through your nose—still more. Eventually, repeating this procedure with other sounds, you get several million altogether."

In Mazatec, a Mexican tribal language, "father," "devil," and "Lord" sound wondrously alike; in Guatemala's Cakchiquel, "our Saviour" and "a deceiver" are hard to tell apart.

Mexico's Mixtec, one of many tongues which Professor Pike set out to scale, had pitfalls galore. The sound "chaa" had difference meanings depending on its pitch: it could signify "come," "man," and "will you smoke a cigarette?" When the pitch was less than perfect, the result could be blasphemy, as in Matthew, VIII, 7: "And Jesus said unto him, I will come and heal him."

From the millions of sounds available, Professor Pike drew up a list of 300 to help train linguist-missionaries. In 25 years of practicing and preaching, he has found only about five sounds not included in his 300.

"One of them we encountered in Africa," he said. "You take the lower lip and flip it against the upper."

From simple sounds it is a hop, lip and jump to deeper knowledge. "After we've got the students aware of the kinds of sounds they may meet," said Professor Pike, "it's up to them to write these sounds down in a crude approximation. But then they don't know what's important and what's not important in what they've heard."

"Our problem is that we must train students for languages which they don't know, which no one else knows, and for which there are no teachers."

The linguist-missionaries must be capable of handling not only sounds and grammar, but also dramatic form. With the Baribas of Dahomey, the third person is used for introductions, the first person for action.

But the choice of person also depends on who is hero, who villain. Person-to-person niceties help in translating lines such as: "Jesus said, 'No one can come to the Father but through Me'" or (perhaps) "Jesus said that no one can go to the Father but through Him."

ANTHROPOLOGY IMPORTANT

Bible translators have to appreciate anthropology as well. It is essential, for example, to know that the Mnong Roliem people of Vietnam, if they are still there, consider the ear not only a hearing instrument, but also the seat of memory and emotion.

The institutes give students two summers' work in linguistics, and then three months of training in primitive living at a jungle camp.

"When we turn our people loose in the jungle on a language," noted Professor Pike, "they often get started all right, and then run into problems. At this point I come into the picture. I often work on 20 languages at once, and think of it as code-cracking."

"Though we have 2,000 people for 440 languages they aren't all Ph.D.'s in linguistics—there aren't that many in the world. Even if there were, they wouldn't want to live in the jungle for 20 years."

LANGUAGES ON FIVE CONTINENTS

Wycliffe-Institute men have dealt with tribal languages in 18 countries on five continents. In the most recent institute bibliography of work by its members, subjects range from the parochial ("Tonomechanics of Northern Tepehuan") to popular ("The snake that gives money: a Totonac myth") to pedagogic ("Tlpmayamoonawi naowa kapoma gavav yiba vat"—"How the coconut tree and sago tree came to grow in different places").

Languages run the gamut, from such obscure families as Enga-Huli-Pole-Wiru to such little-exercised tongues as Amaraeri, Dogrib, and Izi—which is not as simple as it sounds.

To help decipher this complex mix, Professor Pike leaves Michigan every third year to

work abroad, where missionaries deal also with classic matters such as health, schools and preaching. He points out that primitive peoples who come into contact with modern civilizations often lose hope and—as he put it—“disintegrate morally.”

“If we can get the Bible to them in their language,” he insisted, “and get them to try to read it, and take it as a source of hope and courage, they may be able to survive the transition.”

Wycliffe-Institute men have put out eight New Testaments in as many primitive languages, and at least a gospel in about 130 additional tongues. There are about 2,000 languages to go. Translating the New Testament into any one of them usually takes about 15 years. A gospel can be rushed into print after a mere five years of tribal living.

REWARDS SYSTEM HELPING THE RETARDED HERE TO READ

Two months ago, 12-year-old Noreen thought that the letters B-A-L-L spelled “doll.” David, 10, could not read his name. And Sandra, at 11, stared at the word “look” and told her teacher:

“I know it, I recognize it—we learned it in class. But I can’t say it. I don’t remember what it means.”

Today, because of a state-funded experimental program in which a child is given extra playtime for doing well in his schoolwork, these youngsters no longer fidget through class periods, staring hopelessly at the letters that crowd their books or gazing listlessly out the windows.

And each one can now read a short essay or story and then answer questions on what he has read.

With 147 other children, most of them from the slum areas of South Jamaica, these three are enrolled in a remedial reading and mathematics course organized by District 28 in Queens—which includes Forest Hills and Rego Park as well as South Jamaica.

CONVERTED STUDIO USED

Each school-day afternoon since April 7, in a converted dance studio on Merrick Boulevard, they rushed back and forth between the lavender and gold-colored playroom on the first floor and the mirror-lined classrooms on the second floor.

And after nine weeks of being rewarded for high test scores with a game of table tennis or pool, they have begun to grasp the fundamental concepts they failed to learn in nine school terms.

The students in this program are among thousands of New York City school children who are seriously retarded in reading. Of 582,000 elementary, intermediate and junior high school students tested last year, one out of three was one year behind the national norm and one out of five was at least two years behind.

And the program itself—operated by the Educational Advancement Center, 89-28 Merrick Boulevard—is one of nearly 300 projects being operated by the Board of Education in an effort to correct retardation. As Seelig L. Lester, deputy superintendent of schools in charge of instruction, put it, “we want to try everything that comes to our attention, any approach at all.”

STRATEGY DEFENDED

To critics, the center’s reward theory is a thinly disguised form of bribery. To parents who promise their offspring money or trips to Europe in return for high grades or giving up cigarettes, it is simply common sense.

To behavioral psychologists—and to the 13-member staff of the center—it is a strategy for changing behavior patterns.

“I’m sick and tired of people asking why Johnny can’t read,” Polo C’deBaca, the center’s founder, explained. “What I care about is not why, but how to teach him to read.”

Whether or not the gains of such children

as Noreen and David and Sandra are more than temporary remains to be seen. In the meantime the teachers at the center are not only encouraged by the children’s rising test scores but also by their increasing enthusiasm.

“I like to come early—then I can finish my lessons and do some extra reading,” Noreen explained one recent rainy afternoon as she pushed open the front door and slipped into the still empty building.

Then she hurried up the stairs and into her classroom. She hung up her raincoat, went to a bookcase on the side of the room and pulled from a large stack of manila folders the one marked with her name. Inside were her assignments for the day—several reading selections, a pronunciation exercise, a mathematics lesson and a quiz.

Then she picked up the equipment she needed—a tape recorder on which to play her pronunciation lesson, earphones and books—and chose a desk in the corner to work. After Noreen turned in her lesson she got her reward, calculated according to the center’s rather elaborate scoring system.

The center, which is financed by the state under the Urban Education Act of 1968, was established by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, one of a number of companies in the field of educational technology. The center’s creation and subsequent operation have cost \$244,000—the amount allotted by the state—and of this, \$90,000 went to Westinghouse.

OPINION POLL—FOURTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the first week in June, I mailed to all postal patrons in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan my fifth annual opinion poll. Of 140,000 questionnaires sent out, to date 16,250 have been returned. The ballot was so arranged that both husband and wife could express their preferences separately. A total of 29,087 citizens voted in the poll.

There were nine issues listed. In seven of them the participation was practically 100 percent. That is, there were almost no blank ballots. On two issues, however, the number of blank ballots were sizable; and these two issues were Vietnam and the draft. 4.10 percent of the people chose to leave their ballots blank on the Vietnam issue and 5.26 percent did not answer the question on the draft.

Tabulation of the returns was made by an independent data processing firm in the Washington, D.C., area and the results are as follows:

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you favor the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense System proposed by President Nixon?	
Yes	52.25
No	27.02
Undecided	20.70
2. Should the Federal Government guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?	
Yes	7.62
No	87.13
Undecided	5.24

3. Should Congress establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, Michigan?

Yes	57.52
No	21.01
Undecided	21.41

4. How would you deal with the war in Vietnam now?

Pull our forces out and come home, even if this means a Communist takeover	12.13
Increase our forces there to achieve a military victory?	23.61
Withdraw our troops as quickly as they can be replaced by South Vietnamese, even though our withdrawal is unilateral?	39.38
Continue the present level of American participation and the Paris peace talks, seeking a negotiated settlement for stable peace in Southeast Asia	15.88
None of these	4.90

5. Do you favor cancellation of Federal scholarships to college students participating in campus disorders?

Yes	91.28
No	6.60
Undecided	2.09

6. Would you at this time—
Abolish the military draft and rely on a career army obtained through voluntary enlistment for our national defense?

20.91	
Draft men by random selection with quotas to be filled out of the youngest age groups, as President Nixon recommends?	42.01
Continue the present Selective Service System?	31.82

7. In 1966 the people of Michigan turned down an Amendment to our State Constitution lowering the voting age to 18. Should Congress submit to the State legislatures for ratification an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States lowering the voting age to 18 across the country?

Yes	30.00
No	64.88
Undecided	5.09

8. The Supreme Court recently struck down State laws requiring a year’s residency in a State to qualify for benefits under its welfare laws. Do you think welfare programs should now be taken over by the Federal Government and made uniform throughout the United States?

Yes	48.41
No	41.22
Undecided	10.31

9. Do you favor the proposal to turn the Post Office over to a Government owned Corporation?

Yes	56.14
No	27.42
Undecided	16.40

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF THE PHILIPPINES

HON. ADAM C. POWELL OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July the Philippine Islands is celebrating the 23d anniversary of the independence of their country.

Throughout the 20th century, the ties between our two countries have been very

close. During the 48 years when the Philippines were under our flag, the U.S. Government helped the island become a showplace for democracy. World War II served to strengthen our union, for the Filipinos fought alongside American soldiers in the defense of their island homeland.

As a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization the Islands form a part of the chain of free countries containing the spread of communism.

The Philippine Government is rightfully taking a place of leadership in Asia and the Pacific. Today the Islands are the world's largest producer of coconuts and manilla hemp.

Stability in areas such as Southeast Asia depends largely on the success registered by countries like the Philippines. It is my fervent hope that the Philippines, entering a new year of independence under the guidance of President Ferdinand Marcos, will continue to register the achievement and progress it so earnestly seeks.

I am very pleased to extend best wishes to the Government and people of the Philippines and congratulate them on their anniversary.

THE CITIZEN-SOLDIER

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. Speaker, on July 5, a distinguished citizen-soldier, Maj. Gen. Rowland F. Kirks, whose 97th U.S. Army Reserve Command embraces the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, the eastern portion of West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, delivered the commencement address to the graduating class at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The appropriateness of his most timely address is all the more significant because of the example set by General Kirks in fulfilling the challenge he presented to his audience.

Under unanimous consent, I include General Clay's introduction of General Kirks, as well as General Kirks' address, in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BRIG. GEN.
FRANK B. CLAY

Major General Rowland Falconer Kirks attended the Virginia Military Institute from which he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant of Cavalry in 1935. His five university degrees include two doctorates. He holds five diplomas from United States Army institutions including two from the Command and General Staff College and one from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

He entered World War II as a First Lieutenant of Cavalry, and was progressively promoted to Captain, Major and Lieutenant Colonel. He served in the European Theatre of Operations as Chief of Combat Intelligence for the United States Ninth Army and concluded his overseas duty in the military government as Chief of Foreign Trade, Headquarters United States Group Control for Germany.

Subsequent to World War II, General Kirks served as Commanding Officer of the 354th

Civil Affairs Area Headquarters B, Ft. Myer, Virginia and then was assigned to the mobilization designation as Deputy Director of the Civil Affairs Directorate, Office of the Deputy of Staff for Military Operations, Department of the Army.

General Kirks was promoted to Major General on the 6th of December 1966 and was assigned on the 22nd of December 1967 to his present command as Commanding General of the 97th United States Army Reserve Command, First United States Army.

Prior to his appointment by President Truman as Assistant Attorney General of the United States, General Kirks served successively as Professor of Law, Dean of the School of Law and President of National University.

General Kirks served on the Board of Education of the District of Columbia from 1953-1962.

He is an attorney practicing in the District of Columbia.

Active in civic, charitable and religious affairs of the nation's capital, General Kirks is past Chairman and current member of the Salvation Army Advisory Board; he is presently the President of the Board of Trustees of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, and is a member of the Kiwanis Club of Washington, the District of Columbia and Federal Bar Association, the Barristers, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I present a distinguished citizen-soldier, Major General Rowland F. Kirks.

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. ROWLAND F. KIRKS

General Clay, staff and faculty of the Command and General Staff College, members of the graduating class and honored guests.

It is a pleasure to visit this beautiful post. I am indeed honored to be invited to address this graduating class of the Command and General Staff College and to share this significant day with you.

There is a perfectly justifiable feeling of comfortable satisfaction in reaching today's ceremonies, for you have scaled the heights of military achievement. You well deserve the accolades of military attainment which will be conferred upon you this morning. You have demonstrated the finest traits of competence, dedication, perseverance and determination to perfect yourselves militarily. You have my most sincere congratulations on your significant accomplishments, the more so because I know that you have given to the correspondence portion of this course many hours which you could have devoted to leisure time pursuits, to being with your wives and families. Your completion of this course reflects the "true grit" possessed by each of you as Army Officers.

At one point in history, being graduated from the Command and General Staff College was considered the end of formal professional education. But, such is not the case today. I commend to your most careful consideration seizing the opportunities that still lie ahead of you. Advances in theory, as well as in the science and technology of war are so rapid and continuous no one in uniform dare indulge himself the illusion of complacency and self-satisfaction of believing, "I know it all" or "I know enough to safely ride out the rest of my service career to retirement without learning anything new."

Even if the latter is a personal possibility your obligation to the service and those who are in your footsteps and whose education and training is your responsibility demand more of you.

Of course, you are entitled to a sixty day breather before the next academic year begins in September and I trust you enjoy it to its fullest.

Remember that the fine courses presented by The Army War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and The Army Logistics Management Center will challenge your interest as well as your talents.

This recommendation compliments your outstanding achievement for a job well done and in no way detracts from the fulfillment of a major goal in your career. I suggest that there are even higher goals ahead which in turn hold their rewards.

In the moments afforded me this morning, I shall seek to challenge your vision of what I conceive to be a neglected, if not overlooked, aspect of the dual life which you lead—that is the civilian responsibility of a citizen-soldier. My remarks are applicable to the professional soldier as well and are to be distinguished only in degree.

An appropriate point of origin for my thesis is to be found in the oath of office you took when you were commissioned, to "... support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic ... without any mental reservation. . . ."

The prime threat to the United States in the next decade, as far as can be discerned at this moment, is not external but internal. There is no single world power, or combination of world powers, which can subdue the United States by force of arms or will be so bold or indiscrete to even attempt it.

But there are internal forces which have already hurled down the gauntlet of self-destruction. They are bold enough to attempt to execute that which no foreign power is willing to contemplate.

The United States is involved in an internal crisis. Some even refer to it as our third revolution. The first being the revolution when we gained our independence; the second, the War Between the States; and the third, today's turmoil and turbulence which is besmirching and solely straining our social fabric.

We are witnessing our cities convulsed with senseless destruction in the name of "civil rights" . . . universities disrupted and even closed by self-styled revolutionaries in the name of "academic rights" . . . honorable military service scorned and avoided by cowards and self-proclaimed intellectuals in the name of "morality" . . . democratic processes impeded and distorted by advocates of anarchy in the name of "freedom" . . . youth anesthetized or artificially exhilarated by drugs, in the name of "self-expression" . . . public places littered and defaced by aimlessly wandering hippies and yuppies in the name of "love and peace".

In the world of the pseudo-intellectual, washed and unwashed, it is the in thing to be against every manifestation of anything of value in America. The cry of those who have abandoned their responsibilities to our society is: Down with the American Society!

As a citizen-soldier you are a unique individual, and as such, your Government and your fellow citizens look to you for a unique type of performance as a citizen. You are a dual personality. You possess the best of two worlds—that of being a civilian as well as being a soldier.

You have achieved a high goal as military officers. Have you achieved equivalent heights in your civilian activities? You deserve the accolades of military attainment which will be conferred upon you this morning. Do you deserve equal accolades for your attainments as a civilian?

Are you in civvies as professionally trained to meet this internal challenge as you are in uniform to meet the external threat?

Are you as dedicated to the preservation of this land of ours from internal ills when you wear a grey flannel suit as you are dedicated to preserve it from external assaults when you wear combat greens?

Have you put the same number of hours into the perfection of the civilian tools of citizenship as you have into the professional tools of war?

Specifically—have you exercised the most cherished privilege of citizenship in a democracy—that of voting? Have you voted in every election—local, state and national—in

which you were entitled to vote? In the Presidential election last November, 120 million citizens were eligible to vote and only 72 million voted; 48 million did not. Were you one of these who did not?

Have you served as a member of your local, state or national government in addition to practicing your profession or pursuing your trade?

Are you involved in your Church's activities? Do you participate in any way in its governance? There is a wave of amazing conduct surging through many religious institutions of this land which shake the very foundations of our respective faiths. It is becoming the vogue apparently to acquiesce in threats of blackmail and extortion. There are some national Church leaders who because of sheer cowardice are giving in to threats, relinquishing their Church properties and abandoning their religious services to interruption by thugs and hoodlums. These clerics rationalize such cowardice with a glib and facile tongue in the name of forbearance, reasonableness, conscience, love of our enemies, cleansing our souls of racial arrogance and callous smugness.

Do you actively and vigorously demand and work for the preservation of your religious inheritance whatever it may be?

Do you serve as a member of your local Board of Education or on the Board of Trustees of the university from which you were graduated?

Have you served as a member of the jury or on the local crime commission? Or, have you begged off or maneuvered out of it when afforded the privilege and opportunity to serve?

There is a cult of violence in the land, in the cities and on the campuses. Today we find scholars, writers, poets, artists and students glorying in the apocalyptic spectacle of burned and looted cities, in the anarchic turmoil on campuses, and in the general disruption of law and order. Yet no society can tolerate a breakdown of its laws and expect to survive. This is so regardless of how misguided idealists or spineless educational and governmental leaders rant about freedom and democracy, crying aloud the myth that violence is an inevitable result of correcting just grievances and civil rights issue.

It is true that a just society must strive with all its might to right every wrong even if righting wrongs is a highly perilous undertaking. We need mayors of cities and presidents of universities who will delight in battle. They have to be encouraged and supported by an informed and aroused citizenry. You have the talent and training and you have taken an oath to act. I am sure you have been awaiting the clarion call. It has been sounded.

Do you take to the press, radio and television in support of justice and domestic tranquility in our streets and on our campuses?

Have you the courage to denounce crime and corruption in government and in business? You have courage when you are in military green—do you when you are in civilian grey?

Do you demand respect and obedience in your home and in your office as you do in your military unit?

Do you exercise the same forthrightness in stamping out permissiveness and incompetence in your civilian environment as you do in your military command?

Today the ROTC program is under attack from many quarters and on many campuses. What have you done to combat this stupid manifestation of muddleheaded thinking? What have you done to assure the future of this program in your alma mater or in the college in your community so that young men who believe our nation worthy of protection may prepare themselves to defend it, should the need arise?

On the 2nd of June of this year the Sec-

retary of the Army in the commencement address at my alma mater, The Virginia Military Institute, referred to this national asset in this way: "ROTC has proven itself the most successful way to assure a broad representation of backgrounds and philosophies in our officer ranks. It is fortunate that no single institution can meet the Services' requirements for officers. The Army alone commissions over 15,000 new officers through the ROTC program annually. They come from all over the nation. They are educated in some 350 different colleges and universities and in a wide variety of academic disciplines. Thus the ROTC officers entering the Services each year provide the best possible guarantee of a truly representative and diverse officer corps. To be strong and healthy, our Service leadership must be as varied in background as the nation itself. ROTC assures that it will be."

This program, challenged and derided by irresponsible individuals within our civilian community, is the primary source of officers for the active Army. Do you realize that as of 1 February 1969 of 520 U.S. Army generals on active duty 154 were commissioned through the ROTC program? At one point, both of the United States Field Force Headquarters in Vietnam were commanded by lieutenant generals who started their careers as ROTC cadets. Five of our divisions in Vietnam, at another time, were commanded by major generals with ROTC backgrounds. Today the Assistant Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, the principal military advisor to the Paris negotiating team, and the recently appointed Deputy Commanding General of our forces in Vietnam were commissioned via the ROTC program. During World War II more than 100,000 ROTC graduates served as officers.

As a member of this elite segment of our citizenry—the citizen-soldier—are you doing all that you are capable of to insure the preservation of this single most valuable asset of our Army—the principal source of its officer personnel?

In asking you these questions, I seek to stimulate in each of you a dedication in your civilian approach to life equal to the dedication inherent in your military outlook, and to urge you to take positive, constructive action to counteract those forces that would destroy our society. You must stimulate to action and lead the silent majority of our nation.

Become involved! Seek elective or appointive government office. Speak up for law enforcement. Fight crime and corruption. Be proud to express your patriotism. Strive to eliminate incompetence in your offices as you do in your units. Educate those with whom you come in contact to be alert to those forces which are eroding us from within and to join you in the fight to destroy them. Set the example for your children and other young people by showing them you care enough to give of your time and thought by serving on the Board of Education, by being active in your Church, by acting as an advisor to youth groups.

Speaking from personal experience, I can assure you that you will benefit by becoming involved. I have grown in maturity and depth as a result of my participation in the activities of my Church. In the process of working with others on the Advisory Board of the Salvation Army, I have learned compassion and an appreciation of the problems of those who have, in many instances, reached the depths of despair and frustration.

Many of my associates have found deep fulfillment in their social and civic work with such groups as the Boy Scouts of America. The opportunity to help a young boy develop moral fibre, learn the true meaning of principle and experience the spirit of teamwork, has enabled many a man to better appreciate what youth can do when it is motivated and

dedicated to building the Nation, rather than destroying it.

Have you the courage to set the example in your own homes? Our determination to teach our children values, to give them principles, to instill in them self-discipline—will reap many benefits for the nation as well as for them as human beings—for they are the future of America. Our best defense against the internal enemy.

The role you play in your community as a citizen-soldier sets you apart from all others as an instrument of competence, balance, organization, dedicated service to God and country. Your non-militarily trained neighbor looks up to you, he expects more from you because you have more to give.

Do you recognize this unique status which you have in the eyes of your fellow citizen? By heritage and the mores of our culture we look upon the men of the cloth with reverence and we have been seldom disappointed; we respect those in the judicial black robe as the dispensers of justice and our respect is well placed; we set apart doctors as those who by training and dedication are charged with the health and welfare of our people and what a remarkable service they perform.

And how is the citizen-soldier viewed in this panorama of those who are set apart from the masses?

This is how I visualize this unique citizen. As a civilian he is a civic leader in every facet of our daily life. He provides the balance and trained judgment, the loyalty and the dedication which has been the very essence of his military training. He grasps the reins of leadership in every phase of his community life; in his Church; in his local government; in his institutions of learning; in civic and charitable activities.

As Army officers you are the inheritors of the finest military traditions that the mightiest nation in the history of man has hammered out on the anvil of more than 150 military campaigns. You take your place beside men who have written illustrious pages in American history and have acquired a common heritage and bond with Washington and the men of the Continental Army; with Grant and Lee; with Teddy Roosevelt; with Pershing, MacArthur, Marshall, and Eisenhower. As military men you are helping to write history.

You are charged today with the obligation of preserving this heritage, instilling it in your successors so that this nation of ours and the hopes and aspirations of all free men shall not perish from this earth from want of professional military excellence. As long as you are in uniform, I have no fear of your dedication to Duty, Honor, Country. As long as you fill your role as soldiers, I have an abiding faith in your capacity and willingness to pay the supreme sacrifice to preserve this nation of ours from all external enemies. By being graduated today from the Command and General Staff College you confirm the fulfillment of the motto of this institution "in time of peace prepare for war."

Of him to whom more is given, more is expected. To you my fellow officers more shall be given today, tomorrow more shall be expected. This morning you are the elite of the Army. Tomorrow morning you shall be the elite of our civilian communities.

I salute you—the citizen soldier.

THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, recently Federal District Court Judge John W. Oliver of Kansas City, Mo., a very able

judge, spoke on the subject of law, order, the courts, and students. It is a useful speech because like so many good ones it asks provocative questions and avoids easy answers. It makes the listener, or the reader, think—a condition that needs to be cultivated more in these messy days. At one point, Judge Oliver appropriately quotes from the great Federal Judge Learned Hand, who said:

Liberty is the product, not of institutions, but of a temper, of an attitude toward life; of that mood that looks before and after and pines for what is not . . . it is idle to look to laws, or courts, or principalities, or powers to secure it. You may write into your constitutions not ten, but fifty, amendments, and it shall not help a farthing . . . if it have no stay but law.

Judge Hand went on to say that the blessings of liberty rest upon broad public acceptance of concepts "of fairplay, of give and take, of the uncertainty of human hypothesis, of how changeable, and passing are our surest convictions, which have so hard a chance to survive in any times, perhaps especially in our own."

It is an unusual speech and worth reading. It follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. OLIVER OF KANSAS CITY, MO., FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE, ON RECEIVING THE AMERICANISM AWARD OF THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF MISSOURI AT KANSAS CITY, MO., JUNE 28, 1969

I gratefully accept your Award as a representative of the judicial branch of our government. I do so with some misgivings because Justice Holmes once said that "the best service we [judges] can do for our country and for ourselves [is] to hammer out as compact and solid a piece of work as one can, to try to make it first rate, and to leave it unadvertized."

Most of the day by day work that judges perform certainly is unadvertized; it is practically unknown. Public judgment of the administration of justice must rest upon fragmentary reports of the unusual and the exceptional case which, for reasons neither apparent nor explained, are deemed to be newsworthy.

I therefore consider your recognition of a member of the judiciary as a recognition of all judges who toil in the vineyard. I assure you that it makes all judges feel that their work may be worth while to know that there are at least some who hold opinions different from those from whom judges not infrequently hear.

It comes as a matter of surprise to many people, for example, that Justice Holmes once was moved to speak publicly about letters, not always anonymous, he received which reflected a deep hatred and distrust of the Supreme Court of the United States. It may surprise some of you that in 1913, as today, and indeed as in all the days since the time of Chief Justice John Marshall, the Supreme Court was not the most popular institution in the United States. Somehow we get the idea that everyone loved the Supreme Court in the good old days.

In 1913, Mr. Justice Holmes had been on the Court for ten years. He confessed that it was painful "to know that many see sinister motives" in a judge's action "when one spends all the energies of one's soul in trying to do good work, with no thought but that of solving a problem according to the rules by which one is bound."

He philosophically suggested that "the attacks upon the Court are merely an expression of the unrest that seems to wonder vaguely whether law and order pay." He, of course, added that a judge worth his salt

"must take things philosophically" and to understand that "no one can complain if any institution, system or belief is called upon to justify its continuance in life." And so it is today. The designation of a judge as the recipient of your award makes it easier for judges to be philosophical and I thank you on behalf of all my brethren on the bench.

I have been asked to talk about an unrest that is current today; the unrest of students which has erupted into violence. This has happened not only in the leading universities of France, Germany, Italy, and South America, but in many of our own American universities.

When I read last night's Kansas City Star I thought I was going to have to shorten what I had been thinking about saying this evening. A columnist ended his column devoted to a convention of college administrators with the statement that although "more questions were raised than settled at the convention, . . . it is apparent the colleges are facing their problems honestly and doing everything within their power to resolve them." I almost gave a sigh of relief because I have long believed that if appropriate identification is made of our real problems, and if those problems are in fact honestly faced, we can, in a relatively short period of time, turn our attention to the new set of problems which always seem to take the place of the old.

A closer reading of the entire column, however, revealed that two full newspaper columns were devoted to an inquiry into, among other things, "the proper relation of athletics to academic life." It seems that the recommended solution to the apparently major problem faced by our educational institutions would simply "forget the pros, . . . and merchandise college athletics as pros merchandise their products." "They must sell the public on the fun of college football and the enjoyment of returning to the campus on a football Saturday." "They must appeal to the blue collar worker." In other words, colleges should work to get their share of the entertainment buck.

A single sentence in the column was devoted to the admittedly unsatisfactory effort "to see that the student-athlete is graduated."

Another single sentence stated: "A better effort is being made to understand the Negro athlete, his background, and his needs."

I could not help wonder whether the students involved would place a like emphasis on the problems of higher education discussed on last night's sport page. I even wondered whether a good many students are not questioning the relevancy of having an educational institution in the business of competing at all with professional athletics.

A prophet I have always thought to be wise once taught that "one generation passeth away, and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth forever." He maintained that "there is no new thing under the sun." I suppose the question we should ask ourselves tonight is whether Ecclesiasters really knew what he was talking about.

A man with whom you all are familiar was able to write one August, apparently after the close of summer school, that "our University goes on well. . . . As yet it has been a model of order and good behavior, having never yet had occasion for the exercise of a single act of authority." In fact, that well known man was able to say in August that "all is well" at his University.

The following October, however, presented an entirely different picture. The same man stated that "a serious incident has just taken place." He said that fourteen students had gathered on the lawn of the University; that two professors who went to investigate the noise and uproar were "received with insult, and even brick-bats were thrown at them." When two of the students were

seized they refused to give their names. Instead, they called on their companions "for a rescue, got loose, and withdrew to their chambers." It was reported that the Faculty met the next day "to denounce the offenders."

The students, however, answered the faculty "in writing and in the rudest terms, and charged the Professors themselves with false statements." Other students, so went the report, who were in "no way implicated in the riot, and knowing nothing about it, immediately signed the answer, making common cause with the rioters, and declaring their belief of their assertions in opposition to those of the Professors."

What a difference between the serenity of August and the violence of October. But how much difference is there between the students of today and those of 1825, the year of the riot at the University of Virginia, which Thomas Jefferson was describing in his letter of August 27, 1825 to Ellen W. Coolidge, and that of October 13, 1825 to Joseph Coolidge, Jr!

There are, I feel reasonably sure, some very substantial differences between the 1825 riot of the University of Virginia and those which we read about on the front pages of our newspapers today. Mr. Jefferson intimated that the original fourteen University of Virginia students were "animated with wine" and that at first they had "no intention, it is believed, but of childish noise and uproar." Those of you who were students during Prohibition Days probably at least saw a fellow student animated with something at least as strong as wine become involved in what could well be described as "noise and uproar." But the fact that student unrest in the 1930's and even in the 1940's may have followed the pattern of the 1825 riot does not mean that the same thing is true today.

The most recent 172 page staff study of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, entitled "Shut It Down: A College in Crisis," could well be said to present an entirely different picture. That study was devoted to San Francisco State College. That study currently reports that "it is misleading to attribute the cause of violence to outside agitators." It suggested that "the causes lie much deeper." "The students," the report continued, "see themselves as noble people fighting battles to uplift nonwhite races and promote reforms or revolution that will produce a better way of life." But, the report stated, students must come to recognize "that the language of the gutter, the shock rhetoric, a willingness to mount barricades, vandalism and personal assault do not constitute a valid or effective means of getting a better education."

The Cox report on the trouble at Columbia University points out that some of today's students seek to create unrest whereas the student of your day and mine got into trouble quite accidentally.

Additionally of interest is the way students rally behind their colleagues in time of stress. Although only a group of students violate regulations which are acceptable to the student majority, the use of particular police and national guard forces to enforce those regulations, rather than use of other means of maintaining order, has apparently united an entire campus in a manner quite similar to the reaction produced in 1825 when two professors tried to get the names of a couple of wine-bibbers. Whether this is right or wrong is not the question; the question is whether action and over-reaction is part of the complexity of the problems that must be faced.

The study and reflection I have been able to give the problems inherent in the student unrest of today suggests that students in the 1960's react with quite a similar sense of solidarity as that apparently demonstrated by the students of Mr. Jefferson's beloved University of Virginia in the year 1825. The

biggest difference, I believe, between the students of 1825 and those of 1969 lies in the causes of discontent which prompted and prompt their respective confrontations with authority. It is one thing to become excited about whether students are to be permitted to become animated with wine and engage in what students of all ages have considered to be a bit of innocent noise and uproar. It is quite another thing to share a profound unrest which grips not only students but their parents and grandparents.

Morton Kondracke's column "New Perspective on Campus Turmoil from Young G.O.P.", also in last night's Kansas City Star, quotes generously from the report made by the 22 Congressmen who recently visited a number of colleges and from the individual comments of several of the Congressmen who participated in the study. That report noted a genuine concern of large numbers of today's students "over what they feel is the difference between the promise and performance of America." "For the most part," said the report, "we found a perceived neglect of human problems to be the single largest motivating force behind the alienation of today's student."

This revolutionary country of ours did ordain and establish the Constitution under which we still live "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." Those beyond the apparently magic age of thirty are convinced that our Union is more perfect than it was in the time of our fathers and particularly in the time of our grandfathers. But today's students ask just how perfect is our Union?

Those who have followed the past forty years of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, as distinguished from the sound and fury produced by those decisions, know that we gradually move closer to a civilized system of administration of Justice. But today's student asks what are we doing about the causes of crime. They ask whether we are really interested in the reformation and rehabilitation of offenders. How many of you, they ask, have even seen the inside of a jail or a prison? Do you, they ask, really know anything about even the physical conditions of such institutions?

Domestic Tranquility?—Common Defense?—General Welfare? They ask us whether we have read a newspaper lately.

It is possible that today's students are not content with the parental answer that things are better now than they were when you and I were. I like to say, younger? Is it possible that today's students believe more deeply in the ideals expressed in the Preamble of the Constitution than their parents and that they do not believe that there are valid answers to why our Nation must move so slowly to attain those ideals?

Perhaps this may be a part of the generation gap because history teaches that revolutions are not built on new ideas; they draw upon older values and visions. Many of the ideals eventually expressed in our eighteenth century Constitution and Bill of Rights originated as long ago as the Athens of Pericles. What happened was that Americans of Colonial Days began to take those old ideas and ideals seriously. And perhaps something of that sort is again happening; in a different time and in a different way.

But, is it not fair to ask, whether all that sort of talk is inconsistent with the actions of today's students who take over buildings, kidnap faculty members, and destroy property in general? Of course, those actions are inconsistent with the ideals stated, but is it not also fair to ask whether university administrations and faculties have been able to develop administrative procedures which anticipate and appropriately deal with those minority of students whom

they know will attempt to provoke a confrontation, which, if improperly handled, will solidify a majority of the student body against those responsible for the administration of an educational institution?

We can ask appropriate questions but I suggest we must go very slow about coming to any conclusion that any easy answers are readily available. Judges serve posts not dissimilar to those served by persons responsible for the administration of an educational institution. They, of all people, know that answers to difficult problems are not easy to come by. They know, for example, that many members of the public are fully convinced, on the basis of the most meager factual information and without any knowledge of the complexity of the problems involved, that they could have imposed a better sentence than the judge charged with that awesome responsibility. The same people, I suspect, are fully convinced that they could have figured out a better way to deal with a student confrontation than any university chancellor.

Are no all of us tempted, for further example, to have rather firm ideas about what should and should not have been done at San Francisco State? Do not many people sincerely believe that a judgment may validly be based on the six sentences quoted last week by the Associated Press from the 172 page report recently made to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence?

If those six sentences fit our preconceived ideas we commend the Study Group for its insight and wisdom. If those six sentences do not jibe with what we already think, are we not sufficiently confident of our preconceived judgment that we easily dismiss those six sentences on the theory that the people who wrote them are so uninformed that they are in favor of coddling hippies.

I suggest that there is a great deal of wisdom in what Judge Learned Hand said over thirty years ago when he stated that "while it is proper that people should find fault when their judges fail, it is only reasonable that they should recognize the difficulties." The same thing may be said of university administrators.

"Perhaps," he added, "it is also fair to ask before the judges are blamed they shall be given credit of having tried to do their best. Let them severely be brought to book, when they go wrong, but by those who will take the trouble to understand." Before we assess blame on university administrators in regard to student unrest should we not take the trouble to understand the problems involved?

I recently listened to a university chancellor describe the reasons that controlled his decision in regard to a recent student confrontation. In the discussion that followed the question of what part new laws and courts could and should play in controlling current student unrest was raised. The suggestion that courts should not be counted on for any long term solution was not received with enthusiasm. Indeed, it was clear that many were convinced that if someone would just pass a law, preferably a very tough criminal law, and if courts would just put enough students in jail, all the other students would send home for their father's coonskin coat, his silver gin flask, become concerned about the football team and who should be elected queen of the R.O.T.C. ball, and the unrest on the campus would go away.

The suggestion that constitutions, courts, and laws are not enough to maintain the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and to our Posterity is not an original idea. William James stated the idea implicitly in 1907 when he said "the civic genius of our people is [the] only bulwark" of a democracy which he believed was "still upon its trial." He suggested that American democracy could not withstand the test unless we, the people, de-

velop the "habit of trained and disciplined good temper toward the opposite party" and the habit of "ferce and merciless resentment toward every man or set of men who break the public peace." The latter idea suggested community disapproval rather than resort to criminal or other punitive sanction.

Judge Learned Hand expressed the same idea explicitly throughout his long and distinguished career. In 1930 he said that "liberty was a plant which is slow growing and needs [an] equitable climate." He said that liberty is "the product, not of institutions, but of a temper, of an attitude toward life; of that mood that looks before and after and pines for what is not."

And he said, "It is idle to look to laws, or courts, or principalities, or powers to secure it. You may write into your constitutions not ten, but fifty, amendments, and it shall not help a farthing. . . if it have no stay but law." The Blessings of Liberty, he said, rest upon broad public acceptance of concepts "of fair play, of give and take, of the uncertainty of human hypothesis, of how changeable, and passing are our surest convictions, which have so hard a chance to survive in any times, perhaps especially in our own."

During World War II he told us that it is false to "rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws, upon courts." "Liberty," he said, "lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, now law, no court can even do much to help it."

In 1952, when witch hunts were in vogue, Judge Hand again reiterated that "the powers of courts are too limited to reach the more controversial questions that arise" in times of strain and conflict. Judge Hand deeply believed that we, the people, must develop "an informed sympathy with, and understanding of, the desires and values of others."

Learned Hand, as William James before him, urged that we must develop the habit of an open mind and a recognition that "the deepest convictions of one generation are the rejects of the next." He stated that:

"I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where non-conformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists, to win or lose."

There are those, both young and old, who today reject the principle that all ideas should be given a fair field and an honest race. There are those who say I am free to curse and shout down all who disagree with me. The Blessings of Liberty do not legitimate "the ruthless, the unbridled will; it is not freedom to do as one likes." "That," Judge Hand told us over a quarter of a century ago, is a "denial of liberty, and leads straight to its overthrow. A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few; as we have learned to our sorrow."

There are, of course, ample provisions in existing laws which provides penalties for all illegal conduct that has occurred on particular campuses throughout the country. Existing laws vest ample power in available courts to issue injunctions, if injunctive relief is deemed an appropriate remedy by those responsible for the maintenance of the peace on a particular campus. And courts are available for the protection of the rights of any student who may be illegally treated by a particular university administration.

Those laws have either been used or not used dependent upon the judgment of the authorities responsible. Whether appropriate administrative disciplinary procedures have been adopted and enforced in a particular institution is a question which we can ask but not answer because we do not know enough about what is taking place on any particular campus.

I am confident that there is no magic easy solution to the problems that exist on any campus. Indeed, experience suggests that the report of the 22 Congressmen is probably correct. That report concluded that both radical and moderate students alike brought home that "the end to the Vietnam war would not mean an end to campus unrest." Students are deeply concerned, said the report, not only about Vietnam and the draft, but also about problems of "racism, the military-industrial complex, poverty and hunger, the 'police state,' economic oppression, and misplaced priorities." Can we say that it is wrong for anyone, including students, to feel and express concern about those questions?

If it is true that today's student is more committed to getting on with the public business of making the ideals expressed in the Preamble to the Constitution more of a reality than is presently true today, I would think that it would follow that today's students will join us in our declaration of faith in our constitutional institutions, provided those institutions produce reasonable movement toward the attainment of our long-standing commitments.

If today's students do not come to share our faith in America, and if the performance of your generation and mine does not reasonably warrant acceptance of that faith, are we not doomed to see something new under the sun? It will not be new so far as other countries are concerned, but liberty's last best hope would vanish from the earth should we fail in our endeavor.

I am afraid that, like the meeting of the athletic directors, we have raised more problems than we have solved. Perhaps the advice from the Sports' editor is valid. He suggested that we face our problems honestly and do everything in our power to resolve them.

The power of America lies in the hearts of her people. We must never forget that America's greatest asset is the young people of this Nation, many of whom are students. Indeed, there are more students today than there are farmers, a fact that emphasizes the number of people who give every evidence of being restless. The challenge that young and old must face together, attended as it will be with a considerable amount of noise and uproar, is to make the system of government in which we believe work with the appropriate speed and effectiveness that the times within which we live demand.

I hope you share my faith that we can and will meet that challenge.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS HEARINGS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during its field hearing in California a few weeks ago, our Subcommittee on Census and Statistics heard some interesting comments from Mr. Don M. Muchmore, chairman of the board of Opinion Research of California, which is in the business of conducting public opinion polls. Said Mr. Muchmore:

I believe that considering the amount of information provided, considering its exhaustiveness and accuracy, the cost for the Census is extremely small. In addition, I would like to suggest that even this low cost could substantially be reduced if Census materials were to be sold to users at much higher prices than is presently done. Even if prices were to be raised many times over, price levels would remain reasonable, so low are the prices presently charged.

Mr. Muchmore elaborated on this later in the hearing, as follows:

I would say this also, a critical factor, if the Census is going to cost \$250 million, is to do something so that the cost is reduced, and to me the most effective thing that can be done is to evaluate what product you have. If you have a product which is worthwhile, which the census is, then talk to the companies that you are selling it to, look at your publications, decide what a fair cost is going to be in your evaluation, talk to these companies and see if they will pay that price. In most instances you will find that these companies are willing to pay more without any question whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Muchmore has offered an excellent suggestion, and today I am introducing legislation to carry it out.

Presently, the Secretary of Commerce may furnish census tables and other data and make special surveys for State and local officials, and private concerns and individuals, upon payment of the actual cost of such work.

My bill will amend this section of census law to continue this arrangement for State and local governments, but private concerns and individuals will be charged the actual cost of these special services plus 50 percent. I think, in view of Mr. Muchmore's testimony this is a fair charge for information which private concerns probably could not develop except at a much higher cost. The additional 50-percent surcharge is based on the precedent of the law governing the sale of additional copies of Government documents offered for sale by the Superintendent of Documents. Under this law—section 1708 of title 44, United States Code—the Superintendent of Documents may sell such documents at a price based on the cost as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments to the census law which I have introduced are fair and are based on sound practices both in and out of Government.

THE ALBERT G. LANE MEMORIAL AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING CITIZENSHIP

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week Lane Technical High School in Chicago graduated its largest graduating class in the city with some 1,300 young men receiving their diplomas. It was my privilege to be honored at this commencement ceremony when I was presented the Albert G. Lane Memorial Award for Out-

standing Citizenship by the school's principal, Dr. Donald J. Racky.

Lane Technical today stands out as a symbol of excellence in education and it is a tribute to the outstanding programs maintained by Dr. Donald J. Racky, the school's principal, that most of the young men who received their diplomas are going on to colleges and to universities.

Dr. Racky and the entire faculty at Lane Tech can take pride in the fact that the young men they have guided through high school are today among the best educated young people in Chicago.

I am grateful to the faculty, the student body, and Dr. Racky himself for the award bestowed upon me.

Following is my commencement address prepared for this occasion:

Dr. Racky, members of the faculty, graduates, parents, and guests, I am honored to accept this Albert G. Lane Memorial award for outstanding citizenship.

In these tumultuous times, it is an enriching and humbling experience for an American to be reminded that good citizenship is not a static thing. We grow as citizens as we mature as individual human beings.

I am deeply grateful for this award. As a representative in the Congress for almost eleven years now, I know this award should be shared by the people of Chicago's 11th District who reflect their outstanding citizenship by their own actions every day. They, and millions of Americans like them, make this award meaningful and I accept it on their behalf, in trust for the future.

As I look out over this assembly tonight, I am reminded of a line I once read that said:

"Perhaps the most valuable result of all education is the ability to make yourself do the thing you have to do, when it ought to be done, whether you like it or not."

This quotation comes to mind because it is traditional at commencements to try looking into the future, making a guess or two at what lies ahead for graduates. Almost invariably, commencement speakers take the easy route and paint rosy pictures of that future.

But in these times I don't think it would be either wise or kind for me to make that kind of speech. I think instead I will treat you as your very presence here today has entitled you to be treated, and that is as adults graduating from one of the finest schools in America, who are capable of hearing the truth.

Your education prepares you for the future, but it can do little to help you face it honestly unless you can perceive yourselves as people who are a real extension of the lives of all those who existed before you.

This is a complex idea to get across because it is not in our American tradition, as a rule, to dwell too strenuously on our past when we contemplate our future.

Very few of us—young people in particular—think of the "Founding Fathers" or the "pioneers" or the early settlers of this Nation as specific people with aspirations that perhaps were unfulfilled, with goals that possibly were never met in their lifetime.

The men and women who lived before had problems in their own lives, but each succeeding generation represented a greater step forward in human development, just as you do today.

As you are all perhaps painfully aware, the giant hang-up of my generation was the Great Depression of the 1930's, followed almost immediately by the holocaust of World War II.

The depression and the war affected all

of us when we were in school and memories of those years continue to shape us, for no one ever forgets his own youth.

No son or daughter of our affluent society today can know what it cost in individual effort for a boy or girl to complete high school in those times. And only the very brightest or the very richest were admitted to college.

Today, a college education is considered virtually an American birthright, but millions of bright and hungry-to-learn students were forced by the circumstances of their point in time to leave school forever and go to work in those depression years.

One-third of America then was ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed. We, who had been hungry and who had seen our parents even hungrier, vowed that our children would not inherit a world without hope.

Today more than 80% of Americans share fully in the benefits of America's abundance and progress. It is not enough—not nearly enough—but it is a beginning.

Our children face polluted, overcrowded cities and a world in turmoil, but they also share in unprecedented facilities for health and education—Unheard of and even unyearned for opportunities to create a world of beauty and possibly even one of peace.

Our parents gave us less, and their parents before them less yet. You young people should not be persuaded to blame your parents for not furnishing the world with wall to wall perfection, for your own children will soon be judging you.

Once upon a time a generation meant a span of about 20 to 25 years. Not Today. Today knowledge is doubling every 10 years. Youngsters now in the 7th and 8th grades will be profoundly affected by this information explosion, as will their younger brothers and sisters in the first and second grades.

So, for all practical purposes, there is now a span of only 5 years between generations. This will have a momentous effect on your lives, for you will be considered "young" for an even briefer time than we were.

And—make no mistake about it—you will be accepted as realistic, relevant, and aware only so long as you outdistance those bright young people crowding in so closely behind you.

I do not mean to frighten you, only to ask you to look at the truths of your own point in time as intently as you can and to make a mature judgment of your real place in a rapidly changing world.

President Kennedy said on many occasions that life is unfair.

To millions of Americans, old and young, it is unfair. To tens of millions beyond our shores, it is not only unfair, it is intolerable.

Yet now is a time when professional hand-wringers pity the poor American youngster who has no one to look up to because his parents are so materialistic—interested only in new color television sets and wrapping the world up in plastic.

"Poor boy," they say. "How can he find himself in a world made by others?"

Well, I suggest that this popular notion of "finding yourself" is both naive and dishonest. It is a hoax being played on those who refuse to think for themselves, and to shoulder their own responsibilities.

Life is not a game of hide and seek, where the true you is hidden. We make not find a self.

And all the copping-out and blaming others for all the ills of our supposedly corrupt society cannot remove the ultimate necessity of facing yourself, as a person, and deciding what effort you will make to give your life strength and value.

Therefore, since I cannot speak for anyone but myself, I plead for leadership—the strong and imperative leadership—of reason.

I plead for freedom of expression for every-

one as long as it is free from force and violence.

Above all, I plead for civility and compassion and love, even for those whose deeds and words are "unlovable."

We—your generation and mine—will, I hope, be sharing this Nation at least for a few more years. Together we must be willing to experiment and make some mistakes.

I look at this very different world from the one I inherited from my parents and I am troubled.

Fanaticism and unreality clamor for attention on all sides. There is rigidity in ideas. Points of view are becoming polarized and differences are rarely discussed, let alone faced.

As ridiculous as it is to hear young people insist that "You can't trust anyone over thirty," it is equally unfair to listen to adults branding everyone of school age as "crazy kids."

As you leave the protection and solidity of this great institution, I caution you not to sacrifice your independence to anyone—young or old—who seeks to imprison your mind with a single set of ideas of right and wrong.

The world has never suffered from a shortage of fools because reason is not the exclusive prerogative of any age group.

In discussing reason and its application to our lives, we must also mention violence, for somehow violence is becoming a characteristic of your generation—a hallmark of our youth today.

If it persists, you—all of you—will be blamed for not stopping it, merely because you lived and were educated as a product of this point in time.

Those who protest that the younger generation is merely "trying to communicate" are blind to the dangers in accepting violence as the first, and therefore the only effective means, of communication.

Force never communicates when we are striving for understanding. You can't hear what anyone is saying if you persist in shouting yourself.

Power may come out of a gun barrel, but not insight or truth.

It must be your individual responsibility to think clearly about effects, as well as about causes, for you make a mockery of your independence if you do not.

The changes taking place in the world today cannot be stopped or turned aside. Sixty-five nations have been established since the end of World War II—a total of 136 nations in the world today.

The desire for all people to share in that progress has produced a social upheaval known as the "Revolution of Rising Expectations."

You will be hearing more of it in the future.

The voices are undeniably eloquent and whether originating in the slums of Calcutta or London or in the ghettos of our own blighted cities, those voices demand a response.

The information explosion further contributes to the turmoil and excitement of these times.

It has been estimated that, starting with the time of Christ, the first doubling of the world's knowledge occurred about 1750; the second in 1900; the third, 50 years later, in 1950; and the fourth, only 10 years later, in 1960.

More than 90% of all the scientists who ever lived on earth are alive today. Their numbers increase daily. And many of you in this class will shortly join this avalanche of scientific brains and achievements.

The world's scientists estimate they will learn as much in the next 15 years as man has learned in all preceding centuries, since the very beginning of time.

The effects of this sheer technological

whirlwind will influence and ultimately alter the living conditions of everyone in your world of tomorrow.

And with all of this we are confronted with the horror of a world that increases in population and pollution faster than our ability to cope with them.

Today there are 3 billion people on earth. By the year 2000, when you will be witnessing the graduation of your own children as parents, this number will have jumped to more than 7 billion.

Keeping these people housed, clothed, and fed—and hopefully away from one another's throats—will be the overriding concern of the prosperous nations.

The United States, by virtue of its size and immense reservoirs of natural resources, must have some answers ready. Our Nation's position of leadership is secure and you, through the outstanding education you received here at Lane, will play an important role as individuals in preserving that leadership.

As a world leader, the United States must start providing an answer to man's greatest dilemma—why it is that since intellect gained dominance over instinct, man, the human animal, has become the most destructive of all living creatures?

Some of you here tonight may provide a small measure of help for these questions that cannot remain unanswered much longer.

Governments are supposed to solve questions, but governments are only as good as the people they serve. And that's where each of you has the capacity to provide growth and intelligence and concern toward resolving these questions.

As a generation, mine has been judged selfish and materialistic. Perhaps we were, and are.

But we were shaped by seeing too many people suffer too much from material want. We remember too many starving children, and children who had to work.

We have walked too many miles through too many cold mornings to work long hours at low pay and returned home at night to parents with fear and worry in their eyes, and pain in their hearts.

Somewhere along the line, your parents here tonight decided it would not happen to you.

Somehow they would provide you with the vitamins and milk, the warm clothes, the comfortable home and the good schools to give you a running start at an independent life of your own.

Because of it, you are here today, the biggest, healthiest, brightest, handsomest generation to inhabit this or any land—ever.

You are going to live longer, suffer sickness less often, work fewer hours, learn more, see more of the world's grandeur and have more choice in selecting your life's work than any other generation who ever existed before you.

You will have more leisure, more chance to achieve, more opportunity to pursue goals that will enhance your development as individuals and contribute markedly to the environment around you.

My generation has failed, as all those that have gone before have failed, to find a method of insuring lasting peace for all the world.

Despite all our efforts, we have not found an alternative to war.

Perhaps your generation can create a world in which we will no longer need either laws or police to enforce them, or armies to prevent men of one belief from transgressing against others.

I would be foolish not to wish you this power to persuade the world that peace can be achieved while there are yet men here to enjoy it.

But I would be unrealistic if I didn't express doubt that violence of men and nations will be erased forever during your lifetime.

Rather, I think you must endure the clamor and the confusion and the injustice, as we have.

But no man of conscience, regardless of his age, should ever give up striving for peace, whether in his relationships with his fellowman; with others, or in association with nations.

I urge you to learn to hate injustice without hating the unjust, for once you brush aside the humanity you have in common with all other men, you forsake your ability to reason.

No generation confers power on the next. You will grow into it, regardless of us.

I would be disappointed if you were not impatient with the tediously slow working of representative democracy. Winston Churchill correctly said that it is an impossible system of government, but the best that man has yet devised.

Guard your right to disagree with your public officials and public institutions. Take an interest in your community and refuse to be complacent with the status quo.

But do not advocate frequent changes in laws and institutions merely for the sake of change. As Thomas Jefferson said: "Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with progress of the human mind."

"As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as a civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors."

Seek to give some of the time and leisure that will be so abundantly available to you in service to your fellowman—to your brothers.

And never weary of thinking for yourselves and questioning those in authority. In that way, the separate efforts of each of you—however small and seemingly insignificant—will insure a future secure enough to protect all human life and compassionate enough to value it.

Above all, as you leave Lane Tech tonight and assume the challenges to be dictated by the days and years of your own life, you might give some thought to these words that were written in a much earlier century by a man who was also trying to communicate across the generation gap of his own time. He said:

"Go placidly amid the noise and the haste, and remember what peace there may be in silence . . . speak your truth quietly and clearly.

"Listen to others, even to the dull and the ignorant, for they too have their story.

"If you compare yourself with others, you may become vain or bitter, for always there will be greater and lesser persons than yourself.

"Enjoy your achievements as well as your plans. Keep interested in your own career, however humble: it is a real possession in the changing fortunes of time.

"Exercise caution in your business affairs, for the world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals, and everywhere life is full of heroism.

"Be yourself. Especially do not feign affection. Neither be cynical about love, for in the face of disenchantment, love is as perennial as the grass.

"Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth.

"Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with dark imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness.

"Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gen-

tle with yourself. You are a child of the universe no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here.

"And whether or not it is clear to you, no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should."

Good luck and thank you!

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF ALGERIA

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 7 years have passed since the free and independent state of Algeria received her independence from France on July 5, 1962. Since that time tremendous economic advances have been made by the Algerian people.

The government of President Houari Boumedienne has pressed for a state-controlled economy despite shortcomings and setbacks. A healthy sign is the self-criticism published occasionally in the pages of the government-controlled press, pointing either to mismanagement or to deficiencies in sectors of the economy. Thus Mr. Boumedienne has given the Algerian people a clear indication that he wants to close the gap between the affluent and the destitute by illuminating the various problem areas.

For the third consecutive year efforts are being mainly directed to the development of industry. Algeria is basically an agricultural country, but the Government contends that without modern tools and chemicals the land cannot be properly developed. Instead of spending their foreign currency for importing these items and other commodities, the Algerians want to create domestic industries for such products.

Published figures show an ambitious industrialization program for 1969. About \$700 million was marked for industrialization, with 80 projects on the list. Some of the projects include:

First, a tractor and diesel plant; textiles, sugar, cement, and canning factories.

Second, a contract for the construction of a natural gas liquidation plant at Skickada in eastern Algeria, concluded with a French firm in December 1968.

Third, a multi-million-dollar iron and steel complex at El-Hadjar, also in eastern Algeria, scheduled to partial production this year.

Algeria is in an enviable position compared with that of many other developing countries in that she has a steady and almost guaranteed income in hard currencies. The sophisticated position of her economy enables Algeria to initiate long-range industrial and other development projects.

United States and Algerian relations were enhanced in October 1968. The Algerians signed an agreement with the Getty Petroleum Co. of the United States. Under the partnership between Getty and the Algerian state oil concern, the Algerians have maintained major control of the company.

Algeria's future looks bright. On its 7th anniversary of independence, let us in the United States extend our greetings to the people of this democratic North African state and wish them rapid progress and prosperity during the forthcoming years.

REMAKING SOCIETY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, "Message for Revolutionary Generation: You Can Remake This Society," which appears in the July 15 Look magazine, offers sound advice. Its author, the chairman of the Urban Coalition and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, is one of our wisest leaders.

Mr. Gardner points out that many of our institutions need to be changed. One institution which urgently requires change is the U.S. House of Representatives. That is where the real power of the conservative who wears the label Democrat is. There he benefits from the outmoded system of unmodified seniority. There the conservative Democrats with their allies on the Republican side dominate the key committees on Appropriations and Ways and Means and generally slow the whole legislative process.

In two books, "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House," I have urged specific reforms which would modernize the House. This is not a major element in the reform of one of the two parties but the most important reform necessary to make the Democratic Party truly responsive to our society's needs.

Mr. Gardner's article follows:

MESSAGE FOR REVOLUTIONARY GENERATION:
YOU CAN REMAKE THIS SOCIETY
(By John W. Gardner)

This Spring, I received a letter signed by three undergraduates at a major university. They said, "We don't like the fanaticism, the coercive tactics and the ego games of the extremist leaders. But we think things have to change in this society. What can we do?"

I have had the same inquiry—"What can we do?"—from many young people. The quick answer is "Plenty!"

But first, you are right to say there are things that must be changed. Our nation is in deep trouble. There are intolerable injustices to be corrected, outworn institutions to be over-hauled, new solutions to be found—and you can't live placidly as though you hadn't noticed.

If we are to root out the evils, deal with the swift pace of change, meet new conceptions of human need and preserve the vitality of this society, our institutions must undergo quick, far-reaching adaptation.

As young people, you are well fitted to renew human institutions. You have the necessary freshness of vision. You have the necessary impatience. And you are not yet entrapped in custom.

But if you are to benefit from those assets, you are going to have to think hard about the realities of social change. The extremist student leaders have devised some theatrical and destructive games that provide the thrill of conflict (and great ego inflation for the

leaders themselves) but accomplish virtually nothing in the way of real social change. The extremists are dependent for their success on the permissive atmosphere of academic life. For all their talk of changing the world, they are playpen revolutionaries, imprisoned by their own tactics in the only world that will tolerate them.

The weaknesses of most political action by youth, here and throughout the world, have been inexperienced and futile assaults on the wrong targets, aimless and destructive bursts of anger and violence, and the willingness of many to be exploited by irrational, narcissistic and cynically manipulative leaders. Over and over, we have seen that violence and coercion do not lead forward to constructive change but backward to repressive countermeasures.

What are the alternatives for you? To my mind, they are many and exciting. The best proof that they exist may be found in last year's political campaigns.

Those of you who served as campaign workers committed yourselves to disciplined endeavor to cope with the world on its own terms. In doing so, you left an indelible mark on the year 1968. You may have started something that will change everything.

What I propose is that you now bring your enthusiasm and commitment to a very specific set of tasks that *must* be carried through if this nation is to measure up to the challenge ahead: 1) *reform of the major parties*; 2) *reform of the electoral process*; 3) *reform of state and local government*.

What you have seen in the past year must have whetted your interest in the machinery of party politics and the workings of the electoral process. Some of you have been so repelled or discouraged that you have given up both on the parties and the process. But others, perhaps most of you, are not discouraged because you sense that you have really set some changes in motion. Few professional politicians would have predicted that the Democratic convention of 1968 would outlaw the unit rule not only at the national convention but down to the state and local levels. Few would have believed the convention would require that delegates be chosen under procedures open to the public. Yet those revolutionary steps were taken—and you played a major role.

At the local level, thanks in part to your efforts, new candidates with fresh views appeared in many places. Incumbents were forced to reassess their positions on important issues, including the war. Local party chairmen were in some instances replaced. School boards have been forced to reexamine their policies.

That is only a taste of what can come. You know how badly a fresh breeze is needed. You know that we need to shake up the means by which the parties manage their affairs, choose their delegates, run their conventions. You know what peril for democracy lies in the skyrocketing expenses of political campaigns. You understand how archaic are the processes of the electoral college.

Similarly, you have gotten at least a glimpse of the critical need for reforming state and local government. You care about the idea of participation, and you know that most participation must necessarily be at the grass roots, a level dominated today by antiquated and creaky political machinery. State and local governments are ripe for major changes. You can have a major hand in bringing about those changes.

Here are some of the activities young people could engage in (and I would include many age levels and many kinds of people: ghetto youth with natural leadership capacities but not much education, college undergraduates, graduate students, young professionals, teachers and businessmen):

Sign up for work in your own party; write Sen. Fred Harris or Rep. Rogers Morton,

chairmen, respectively, of the Democratic and Republican national committees, and ask what plans they have for involving young people in party work. (They have such plans.)

Run for elective office, or do volunteer staff work for someone running for office.

Enter government service at state or local levels.

Help design and participate in publicly or privately financed internship programs that will enable young people to get a taste of public life before entering it as a career.

Form a local group to study in depth the social problems that confront your community, and present your findings to appropriate legislators and administrators.

Insist on participation by youth in civic organizations concerned with social problems. Say to civic leaders, "You don't like it when we take unconventional action; then give us a piece of the conventional action."

Do volunteer work for organizations dedicated to good government, and recruit others of your age group to do likewise; if you find no organization that suits your purposes, form your own.

Form a local youth organization to study the processes of state and local government, to discover practical means of improving it and to take action.

These suggestions stress state and local politics, but I'm not suggesting you forsake the national arena. Every member of Congress has roots "back home," has ties with local party machinery and worries about what his constituents say. You can reach him.

College and university professors of government can help you explore the realities of the world you hope to change, through courses for credit, field projects and extracurricular action. Law school professors can advise you on model-state legislation, conflict of interest, new instrumentalities for citizen action and so on.

Mayors, governors, state legislators and members of Congress can give you counsel on the workings of government. (I know that only a few such public figures will have the adventurousness—or is it shrewdness?—to do so, but a few may be enough!)

All civic organizations should make a point of bringing young people into the heart of their activities. Foundations should provide funds for action-oriented research and programs.

I propose that you form local organizations to pursue these matters. I do not wish to suggest the form the organizations should take, because your purposes will vary. Some of you will wish to work through the Young Democratic or Young Republican organizations. Others will be inclined to form new organizations.

Just the fact of your participation in local politics and government will in itself have a powerful and beneficial effect. It will be good for the community and good for you. But mere participation is *not* the goal. You could enter the system, adjust to it perfectly, end up at the top—and leave us exactly where we are now. The purpose is not just to enter the system. The purpose is to change it for the better. Your elders have shamefully neglected the task of improving state and local government. You can correct that.

The object is the redesign of institutions, the renewal of society. It will take all the intelligence and energy and shrewdness you bring to bear. But the stakes are high.

The object is to win—not to make yourselves feel noble, not to indulge your anger, not to pad your vanity but to renew the society.

Human institutions can be changed, if you care enough to work at it, if you care enough to study the machinery you want to change and find the points of leverage.

At this critical point in our history, we can less and less afford to limit ourselves to routine repair of breakdowns in our social processes. More and more, we must un-

dertake the imaginative redesign of those processes. We see in all clarity that many of our institutions are ill-fitted for the tasks the modern world presses on them; yet they stubbornly resist change, even in the face of savage attacks by those who would destroy them.

Unless we are willing to see a final confrontation between institutions that refuse to change and critics bent on destruction, we had better get on with the business of redesigning our society.

You can renew this society. But not in a fit of impatience and not without effort. You must be discriminating critics of your society, seeking to identify, coolly and precisely, those things about it that thwart or limit human potentialities, and therefore need modification. And so must you be discriminating protectors of your society, preserving those features that strengthen the individual and make him more free. To fit yourselves for such tasks, you must be sufficiently serious to study your institutions, sufficiently dedicated to become expert in the art of modifying them.

The time is ripe for constructive and far-reaching improvement in our institutions. No one person, obviously, can do it alone. But young people all over the country, working together, might produce just the leaven, just the stimulus, just the lift of spirit that this nation needs to move on to the next stage of development.

THE BUDGE COMMISSION TAKES OVER IN WASHINGTON

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article in the June issue of the *Institutional Investor* about Hamer H. Budge, a distinguished former Member of this body who is now serving with equal distinction as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. For 10 years from 1951 to 1961 Hamer Budge was a Member of Congress from the Second District of Idaho, the district I am now privileged to represent. He earned a reputation as one of the ablest and most effective Members of the House. Following service as a district judge in Idaho, Hamer Budge was appointed to the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1964 by former President Johnson. He was appointed Chairman earlier this year by President Nixon. His leadership as a member and Chairman of the Commission has won him wide acclaim. As part of my remarks, I include the article by Heide S. Fiske:

THE BUDGE COMMISSION TAKES OVER IN WASHINGTON

(By Heidi S. Fiske)

(NOTE.—When Hamer H. Budge was appointed chairman of the Securities & Exchange Commission last February, about all that most Street observers knew about him was that he was the senior Republican on the Commission and that his earlier record as a congressman from Idaho qualified him as a conservative Republican at that. (The AFL-CIO judged that Budge voted "wrong" on 13 out of 13 major bills in 1957 and 1958.) Today they know little more, for Budge tends to keep his views to himself and to stress that they are his views, not necessarily those of the Commission as a whole.

(In an attempt to learn how he approaches his new task and what he thinks about the major issues facing the investment industry today, Senior Editor Heidi Fiske conducted a two-hour taped interview with the chairman in late April. In addition, discussions were held with the other three commissioners and several important members of the staff. Here, and in the interview excerpts which follow, is an attempt to round out the picture of the man who is at the helm in a time when the investment world is undergoing profound changes.)

Hamer Budge is a quiet, smiling man of considerable charm and no pretentiousness. He perches precariously on the very edge of a chair and leans forward attentively when you talk to him. Rather than go to the trouble of moving to a bigger, fancier office when he became chairman, he stayed in his old one, which is smaller than those of some of his colleagues. He just had a few walls knocked out in adjacent quarters to make room for extra secretaries. The main decorations in his office are an American flag, four large photos of Idaho countryside, and a picture of his daughter (an only child, who is now 9 years old) raising her right hand with him when he was sworn in as an SEC commissioner five years ago.

In the opinion of one fellow commissioner at least, Budge will have a tougher job than his predecessor. "Manny was chairman at an easier time," this commissioner says. "For one thing, he worked with brand new commissioners who, so to speak, didn't yet have ideological bases from which to operate. And he had highly visible issues to deal with, issues that could be inveighed against. The judge, on the other hand, will have to face broad, vague, structural problems."

The new chairman of the SEC is called "the judge" as universally as former chairman Cohen was called "Manny." The reason is not just the euphony of the phrase Judge Budge. Nor, for that matter, is it simply that, in the three years before he joined the Commission in mid-1964, Budge served as a district judge in his native Idaho. He is called "the judge" because of his entire approach to his job.

The contrast with Cohen was perhaps best put by a commissioner who said that "his is more of a judicious than an advocate nature." Where Cohen initiated action and rode herd on it to the end, Budge seems to sit more at the end of the line, deciding on his stand when all the facts and other verdicts have been assembled.

There is also a difference in the emotional temperature of the two men. "There is less table pounding now," says another commissioner. "We talk less and the tempo is slower; there isn't the staccato there used to be." Ironically, though Budge is considered more interested in the opinions of his fellow commissioners than was his predecessor, he holds fewer meetings: three a week instead of one or more a day. And in sharp contrast to Manny Cohen, Budge seems to want less SEC intervention and more of the fundamental decisions made in the courts, the Congress, or the marketplace—at least as far as his fellow commissioners now see it.

There are differences between the present chairman and Cohen which proceed from their very different backgrounds, too. Brooklyn-born-and-bred Cohen spent his entire working life at the SEC, moving up to director of the Corporation Finance Division before his appointment to the Commission late in 1961. One commissioner sees the result this way: "Manny had grown up with these acts and had developed an attachment to some particular interpretations." On the other hand, Budge, formerly a congressman in his state and in the U.S. House of Representatives, proceeds without these attachments. Because he knew the laws so intimately, Cohen tended to be concerned with the technical intricacies of some measures; Budge

takes a broader-brush approach. Above all, Cohen, in the words of one of his colleagues, "was Mr. SEC and he felt it very strongly. Other views were kind of an attack on the institution." Budge occasionally seems more inclined to discuss views other than his own.

Not that he doesn't have strong views—rather he tries to soft pedal them. They can be discerned, however, in his colleagues' consensus about his approach and in his dissents from SEC opinions. His fellow commissioners agree with the way his views have been represented in the press so far; he is, they say, against concentrations of power; and for the small broker-dealer and the regional firm.

Hamer Budge's dissents from the Commission's recommendations over his five years at the SEC would tend to bear this out. Surprisingly, this consensus man has dissented on more cases than any of the other present commissioners, eight times in all. Four of his dissents have asked that sanctions against small—and in all but one case non-New York-based—broker-dealers be lightened. One strong dissent came up when the First National City Bank asked to market its special equity fund to the public. Budge said no; the other four commissioners said yes. The remaining three dissents involved utility holding companies. For instance, in one case Budge felt that the act did not permit such a company to put up low-cost housing. In the other two he objected to proposed mergers of utility companies.

The Institutional Investor questioned Budge on every major issue facing the investment world today. He replied very cautiously, like a judge asked to comment on a case before all the evidence is in. Thus, he refused to discuss the pending mutual fund legislation, noting that the SEC's views are available in any case, since the Commission supported S34, the Sparkman Bill. He also declined to comment on the interlocking issues that the commission rate hearings would discuss: volume discounts, institutional membership, and so forth—although he made a few guarded comments on the industry's need for capital and the merits of public ownership. Quite often, he asked to defer his judgment on an issue, such as the market effect of hedge funds, until the institutional study the Commission has just embarked on is over.

Where he did voice his opinions, he tended to do so—much as does the man who appointed him chairman—in very broad terms. It was not clear whether this was another expression of his caution, or came about because he cares more about the broad aspects of an issue, or because he is not conversant with some of the ramifications of the issues. Consequently, the following excerpts from the interview serve more to provide an overall view of Budge's approach, and to indicate where his feelings are strong, rather than to detail exactly what he intends to do about the industry's problems.

Question. Is it your general approach to try to avoid putting restrictions on how a man should run his business?

BUDGE. Just as an across-the-board statement, I feel the government should not tell people how to conduct their affairs. We should look at the end result and see that the purposes which the Government is seeking to achieve are achieved, and not the mechanics that are followed to achieve them.

Now, for example, in the back office, I think that the brokerage houses should get their affairs in order and get them in order as soon as they can. Otherwise, they have to get out of business. By the same token, I would not be honest with them or with myself if I were to say: "I think you should do this and do this and do this to solve your problems," because I don't know one-tenth as much about how to solve their problems as they do. I would want to insist that they achieve the result, but how they do it, I

would rather leave to their judgment, because I think they are better informed.

Question. Some people have said yours will be a "cops-and-robbers" commission—that is to say more oriented towards enforcement where criminality is concerned than towards the industry-structure issues. Do you agree?

BUDGE. Well, I was a judge for three years; a congressman for ten and for six years a member of the legislature. I think my legislative leanings are perhaps stronger than my judicial ones, which is just the opposite of what these people say is true. When new types of mutual funds or letter stock, for example, come in, when there are changes in circumstances which require new rules of the game within the ambit of the regulations which the Commission has adopted historically under the Act, then I would like to have the Commission look on it as a continuing obligation to legislate, to keep up to date, to see that it is meeting the current situation with the rules under which it wants me to operate.

THE VALUE OF REGIONAL FIRMS AND REGIONAL EXCHANGES

Question. How accurate do you think are these widespread characterizations of you as someone who is for the small guy over the big, and the regional guy over the central?

BUDGE. I would like to see the regional broker-dealer, the smaller broker-dealer, stay in office, not only because he performs a service to the community as a broker-dealer, but also because he fulfills a very real need of getting equity capital for the small businesses around the country. Now, that does not mean that I am against the New York-based firm, because I am not. I think everybody in this industry should be treated the same way. I am not for the big or the little, but I do feel that the small broker-dealer is disappearing from the scene—the regional broker-dealer—and I think that that is not a good thing for the regional investor or the regional company.

Question. Are you concerned that the regional exchanges should stay alive or are you not sure that that is necessary?

BUDGE. This is rather a difficult area because there are regional exchanges and regional exchanges, as you know. There is as much difference among some of the regional exchanges as there is between the central market and the regional exchange. (Budge would not comment further on this; he would not say in what terms he saw the difference, or what effect it would have on his thinking about the need for regional exchanges.)

Question. Do you think that regional exchanges are an essential part of a healthy functioning set of securities markets, or could they be eliminated without ultimately harming the investor?

BUDGE. It seems to me that in today's markets they have all had plenty of business. I think it is a question of whether or not they can adapt themselves to the conditions and survive on their own rather than a question of what we think they should do.

THE BACK OFFICE PROBLEM

Question. Do you think that the back-office problem is going to get worse before it gets better?

BUDGE. No. The statistics that I have seen indicate that the conditions are considerably improved. That does not mean that we are, by any means, out of the woods.

Question. Are you considering restricting member firms trading for their own accounts as one way of goading them into speeding up their back-office efforts?

BUDGE. It is not under present consideration, but it certainly is one of the things that could very easily be reversed unless the back-office problem continues to improve.

Question. Do you consider it a misuse of a firm's prerogatives for it to say: "We have

too much work; we are going to cut the smaller customers out of our business rather than the bigger?"

BUDGE. I have misgivings, certainly, and particularly on the New York Stock Exchange firms, because one of the elements that they have stressed in defending the present commission rate structure is that it permits them to take care of the small investor. So it would seem to me that the member firms have an obligation to take care of the small investor.

I don't know just what causes it, but it seems to me that the small investor is going into the market in increasing numbers through an intermediary, a mutual fund or something else.

Question. And doesn't this snowball the problems for those small investors who do not choose to do that?

BUDGE. I think that is true. I am not sure that it is in the investor's best interest to go through an intermediary to get a share in American business. I have some misgivings about that.

Question. Do your misgivings focus exclusively on the concentration of power this creates?

BUDGE. No. I think that if a person wants to buy some AT&T—or whatever else it might be—that he should be able to do it directly without going through any intermediary. I would hate to see that privilege disappear. Where is the Monthly Investment Plan, which Merrill Lynch was promoting a few years back, today?

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF NYSE MEMBER FIRMS

Question. What are your personal feelings about the value of public ownership of member firms?

BUDGE. These firms need more capital—there is no question about that. I don't know whether this is the right and only way to furnish that capital, and I won't know until these rate hearings are over.

Question. Suppose the commission rates were to stay exactly as they are now. Do you think they could raise this capital internally under the present commission schedule?

BUDGE. I don't know. Actually, the commitments that some of these institutional firms have are just terrific.

Question. Do you mean the amount of money they have tied up in positions and things like that?

BUDGE. Yes. The borrowing is tremendous just to carry the supplies that they have.

Question. You speak as if you might be a little concerned that it is a house-of-cards in some cases—that if the market reversed and these positions were worth a lot less, this borrowing power could boomerang. Do you feel that way?

BUDGE. I do. Getting back to the public ownership question, I think it might raise important conflicts of interest.

Question. Do you mean because the firm would tend to get into other businesses?

BUDGE. Yes. Also, from a regulatory standpoint, considering how quickly companies can be taken over under the present mechanism, it may be pretty hard to tell just who holds the establishment from day to day. There might be people moving in, buying a controlling interest in a company, that the regulators—the self-regulators or the Commission—would not want in that business and controlling that house. It would be pretty hard to do at the present time. We pretty much know who is in control of the brokerage firms today, and we are expecting a very high degree of integrity from those people. If we are to know and expect the same degree under public ownership, we would pretty near have to know who is buying a control position or an influencing position in a publicly-owned brokerage house.

Question. How would you feel about publicly-owned brokerage houses getting into other financial businesses, to the extent that

they are not prohibited by law from so doing?

BUDGE. I don't know. I would want to give that a lot of thought. It is an area where I would start out with a reservation.

Question. What about the crucial question of institutional ownership of a publicly-owned brokerage firm? How would you feel about Fidelity owning 20 per cent of Merrill Lynch?

BUDGE. From the regulatory standpoint it gets to be pretty difficult to expect the same degree of reliability and the same degree of performance when too many people get to be acting as their own brokers. I would certainly want to be convinced that we could get the same degree of integrity and compliance with the rules of the self-regulatory agencies and our own rules as we now expect from the houses which are divorced from those customers. If the partners of the house are not free agents, if they are just employees of someone else to whom the Commission would have to look, I think from a regulatory standpoint that I would want to know more, to feel a little more comfortable that that is a good stance.

Question. What about the rather basic change in the general concept of what is a mutual fund, such changes as hedge funds and other things bring to the industry?

BUDGE. I have always envisioned the mutual fund as being an investment for the long pull. I had never envisioned it as being an instrument for in-and-out trading.

Question. Do you feel that it would be appropriate for the Commission to take any kind of action against the formation of this sort of fund?

BUDGE. There again I think the institutional study is going to give us and the industry a lot of information as to just what the effects of the activities of these new types of funds are—and our conclusions as to whether they should be legislated out of existence would have to wait till then.

Question. It is interesting that you consider it a genuine question that it might be of value to legislate these out of existence.

BUDGE. I don't know.

HOW INSTITUTIONS USE THEIR COMMISSIONS

Question. Do you think that it is justifiable for an institution to use commissions for any other purpose than getting an order executed as well as possible, say, for research?

BUDGE. I think that is a business decision. If the firm wants to use its resources for research, that is a bona fide operation. I don't know why we would question it.

Question. Would you consider it also a business decision for a mutual fund to use its commissions so as to promote the sale of its funds?

BUDGE. Assuming that they got the best execution, I don't see that the Commission should start telling people to whom they should take their business.

CORPORATE TAKEOVERS: THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONS

Question. What role do you think institutional investors are playing today in corporate takeovers?

BUDGE. There is a tendency, although it is very hard to pin down, for institutions to act together in a rough alliance in connection with conglomerate takeovers. Personally, it troubles me whether that is a proper role of, say, mutual funds. I think it is not, but that is just a personal opinion.

It seems to me if you could show that a group of financial institutions did act in concert there might very well result from that concerted action an effect on the market which we would deem to be malignant. That would be the way I would approach it, I think. It also could be reached, if the evidence were good enough, under the tender offer bill, showing that they were a group. It might be that we should endeavor to learn

more about what they are doing in this area. Maybe the institutional study will get into this.

It might even be possible to see whether 10(b)(5) action would be pertinent, if they know other people are going in with the purchase. But that presents a lot of problems. It would change the theoretical foundation we proceeded on in the insider trading cases. My own inclination would be, if we move in this area, to use some vehicle other than 10(b)(5) to avoid adding to the concern that exists as to the scope of 10(b)(5).

Question. Let's suppose the institution doesn't know other people are going in on the purchase. Suppose Company X's management tells the institution it wants to take over Company Y, and says that it is going to pay a certain price above the current market for Y's stock when it tenders. Would you consider it a misuse of inside information if the institution then bought Company Y stock?

BUDGE. Yes. And I think that is what is going on at the present time. But we have not brought such a law suit, and, as I say, it would change the theoretical foundation of the insider trading laws since the person has no relationship to the target company.

Question. Are you concerned that institutions could act in such a manner as to move whole companies around, not just big blocks of stock?

BUDGE. They are doing that now. I don't know that it is our responsibility or our concern who owns the company and what they do with it, unless there is manipulation or fraud. Take this Pan American case. A lot of other people in the government became concerned that a company that owned a hotel and a casino in the Bahamas was now about to control Pan American Airways; but that is no violation of the laws that we administer as far as I am concerned.

I am also concerned about the securities which are being issued in connection with takeovers. I cannot understand what their value is. I can see that the dividend rate is promised to be substantially greater, but the securities that are being offered are usually new securities where no markets have been established for them. I don't know how anybody puts a dollar value on those packages. We in the Commission, and I as an individual, have made no conclusion that a conglomerate, as such, is a thing of evil. But after about the fourth layer of convertible preferreds, it is pretty hard to tell—when you don't know how many people are going to convert.

JUDGE BUDGE

Question. Which of your decisions as a judge are you proudest of or do you think had the most importance?

BUDGE. When I was in the state capitol the suits against the state officials came before me. I found all of those to be very interesting—even reviews from the state tax commission, or habeas corpus actions against the warden in the penitentiary.

Question. That sounds like a pattern—as if you liked actions where someone who, by being voted into office, or just by the nature of the position he held, was almost in a fiduciary capacity and misused that capacity.

BUDGE. That was the contention in a lot of those cases.

One law suit of a different nature also sticks in my mind. When I was practicing, I filed a complaint and I got an attachment, including garnishment of assets of a general agent for an insurance company, and I had about \$18,000 tied up under that garnishment in the bank. The attorney for the person I had sued went into the courthouse and convinced the judge in an ex parte hearing, without giving me any notice of it, that that attachment should be discharged. The judge signed an order about 2:30 in the afternoon discharging that attachment.

I learned about it when the bank called me at ten minutes to 3:00 p.m. I rushed up to the courthouse and the judge immediately knew that he had made a mistake. He reinstated the attachment, but the \$18,000 was out of the bank.

For that reason, and some other experiences that I had while practicing, and while I was on the bench, I just don't like to proceed on an ex parte basis—that is what we call it in law; just coming from one party, from one side. I like to hear the other side before I take any action that I think might really get that \$18,000 out of the bank.

JOURNALISTS STUDY CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful articles I have seen dealing with the problem of disorders on the American college campus and touching particularly on coverage by the news media of such disorders is the following article by Jack Colwell of the South Bend Tribune published in the June 27, 1969, issue of that newspaper.

Mr. Colwell's article follows:

JOURNALISTS STUDY CAMPUS DISORDERS (By Jack Colwell)

PALO ALTO, CALIF.—"Ignorance Was Bliss." So reads a slogan painted on a fence here at Stanford.

It is a slogan of a generation afforded so much education and opportunity that it found out what's going on and, in many cases, decided that it doesn't like it.

What this means for America—advancement, repression or chaos or maybe some of all three—is a topic of a Stanford Journalism Conference on "The Second American Revolution: Social Ferment 1969."

The site is appropriate, here in the state where, if frequency and severity of student unrest is a measuring stick, Reagan-type hard-line repression is a total failure.

TIME IS APPROPRIATE

The time is appropriate. This conference comes in the wake of a Students for a Democratic Society convention in Chicago which showed that SDS could conduct a convention more disorderly and undemocratic than could the Democratic Party.

It is appropriate too that newspaper editors and writers and television newscasters and commentators are attending.

While Gov. Reagan and the SDS are guilty of offering some simplistic solutions, each playing into the hands of the other and widening the generation gap, the news media surely have failed at times to go beyond quoting extremist statements and surface reporting of major clashes.

Commentator Edward P. Morgan, a conference participant, warns that a "dangerously garbled message" will go forth to a public with a desperate need to understand what is happening unless there is concentration on the journalistic "why" as well as the "what."

INVOLVE SOME CRITICISM

And Prof. John R. Searle, of the University of California in troubled Berkeley, is among those suggesting that there are many "whys" for student protests, some silly but many involving just criticism.

As have other faculty speakers here, Searle directed much of his criticism at tenure-

protected faculty members who sometimes seem so pre-occupied with their own quest for academic-world status and the search for grants from government and industry that they have no time to offer students instruction which is meaningful in a modern world.

University administrations too slow to respond to just complaints and too quick to throw up their hands and call in police for the confrontation sought by radical students also have come in for less than favorable comment.

CAN SWAY LARGE NUMBERS

Because of such an atmosphere, Searle notes, it often has been possible for a limited number of radical students to sway vast numbers of moderate students to their side in a battle over a symbolic issue, often an issue selected not for negotiation and solution but because it probably can't be negotiated and likely will lead to confrontation.

"Radicals in Berkeley all wanted Reagan to win," said Searle. "They were glad he used the National Guard. They were glad the police killed somebody."

There is nothing like police marching on campus or tear gas falling from a helicopter to stir up anti-administration sentiment among students who initially had no sympathy for the demands of radicals.

ADDS TO DOUBTS

And when peaceful student protesters with legitimate issues, such as Indiana and Purdue University students protesting huge tuition increases, find they are regarded by segments of older generations with the same respect accorded the SDS, this also undoubtedly adds to doubts about responsiveness of society.

In the campus arena, it may well be true that a Ronald Reagan is getting what he needs, a confrontation in which he can play the role of a tough law and order advocate, and the SDS is getting what it wants, a confrontation in which too harsh suppression will provide it with issues and support.

It may be comforting for much of the public lump all campus issues and students protests in a simple Reagan-against-SDS type package.

But, no matter what the slogan on the sign suggests about the past, ignorance may not be bliss in the future.

FRIGHTENING PROOF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit, Mich., television station WXYZ-TV broadcast a call for action to combat the pollution of the environment by its vice president and general manager, Dean McCarthy, on June 20, 21, and 23, 1969. So that my colleagues may be aware of Mr. McCarthy's comments, I insert the text of his editorial comment at this point in the RECORD:

FRIGHTENING PROOF

We're destroying our own world. The statistics on our air, water and land pollution mentioned in Channel 7 editorials all this week, give us frightening proof. It's a question, now, whether our corrective efforts will ever be able to catch up with the damage already done.

The people are our only hope. As they are the biggest contributor to the pollution problems . . . so, too, are they most guilty of dragging their feet on efforts to solve the

problems. Just last week, Governor Milliken said that the people had spoken, firmly, in demanding that action be taken to combat our pollution threats. We frankly question that such a statement is really justified.

Certainly, we've all expressed our concern. But, far too often the people resist the efforts that could be made in their behalf . . . either because they cost too much . . . or because they feel they're being asked to give up too much in return.

Government has reached the point when they can now begin to make some meaningful progress in reversing the destructive process. But, until all of us begin really meaning what we say about wanting our world saved . . . there's still little hope of doing it.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE—THE FOLKS AT HOME EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my feeling that, too many times the opinions of the people have been overlooked or disregarded by their elected representatives. Too often, I fear, we are inclined to let those immediately surrounding us—the professional pollsters, the newswriters, interpreters, and columnists, and the bureaucrats—have more influence on our decisions than the folks back home. With this thought in mind, and with the help of volunteer workers, I recently mailed out my first annual legislative questionnaire to the citizens of the Second Congressional District of New Mexico, inviting them, individually, to advise me of their views and opinions on some of the major issues facing Congress and the Nation.

The response to this questionnaire was tremendous. Almost 30,000 answers have already been received, and approximately 10,000 of them had additional comments attached. Answers came from every single community and all of the 18 counties in my district—from people in all walks of life—from Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike. Because of this diversified and widespread response, I believe that this poll is a reasonably accurate expression of public opinion. I am pleased to report the results of these replies for the information and review of my colleagues:

[Answers in percent]

- Should the Federal Government develop laws to prevent strikes by public employees?

Yes	-----	61.0
No	-----	32.6
No response	-----	6.4
- Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?

Yes	-----	30.0
No	-----	66.7
No response	-----	3.3
- Do you favor legislation which would return to the States and local governments for use as they see fit, a percentage of the money now collected in Federal income taxes?

Yes	-----	70.2
No	-----	23.0
No response	-----	6.8

4. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?

Yes ----- 5.2
 No ----- 90.5
 No response ----- 4.3

5. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a Government-owned corporation on a self-supporting operation?

Yes ----- 70.9
 No ----- 21.3
 No response ----- 7.8

6. Red China—Do you favor U.S. support for admission of Peking to the United Nations?

Yes ----- 21.2
 No ----- 72.4
 No response ----- 6.4

7. Do you agree with President Nixon's desire to install a network of anti-ballistic missiles to protect our ability to strike back at an aggressor?

Yes ----- 74.6
 No ----- 19.0
 No response ----- 6.4

8. Should Congress approve a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary non-denominational prayer in public schools?

Yes ----- 84.3
 No ----- 12.0
 No response ----- 3.7

9. Do you favor the Administration's action which takes postal appointments, promotions and transfers out of politics and puts them on a merit basis?

Yes ----- 92.3
 No ----- 4.0
 No response ----- 3.7

10. Do you favor the Foreman bill which would cut off all U.S. aid and trade with nations trading with or aiding North Vietnam?

Yes ----- 88.7
 No ----- 7.5
 No response ----- 3.7

11. Concerning Vietnam, should we—

Continue the Paris negotiations----- 15.7
 Commence the withdrawal of U.S. troops ----- 21.7
 Move to win militarily----- 56.7
 No response ----- 6.0

12. Would you rate President Nixon's overall performance since he took office?

Excellent ----- 25.5
 Good ----- 56.3
 Not so good ----- 18.7

Mr. Speaker, these views and results speak strongly and forcefully for a concerned American people—God-fearing, taxpaying citizens—people who believe in the free enterprise system and in the preservation of our representative form of government. They are the kind of people who believe two and two still make four, and that all that glitters is not necessarily gold.

From the results of this questionnaire, it is evident that the people of New Mexico fully realize that every dollar that is received from Washington must be paid for by them or borrowed and paid for later by their children or grandchildren, with interest added. They know, too, that government has no money or income that it does not first take from the people. Most of these folks feel that they are getting more government than they need, and more government than they want.

A sound, down-to-earth thinker—a farmer, he was—said:

I reckon that taxes and death are inevitable . . . but it's a good thing that death doesn't get worse everytime Congress meets!"

I hope Americans never forget, or stray away from these fundamental, basic principles that made us what we are today. New Mexico folks have not, and I do not think the American people have, or will, but we could fall if we ever stopped relying on ourselves and started looking to government to solve all our problems and make all our decisions for us. Yes, America could go down, but if we ever do, it will not be because the world developed a hydrogen bomb—it would be because we have developed a philosophy that says the individual is no longer economically responsible for his own welfare, or morally responsible for his own conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues in the Congress and our national leaders, regardless of their political party affiliations, to give heed to these opinions, this feeling, this voice of the American people. Let us rededicate ourselves to the task of preserving our freedom, our heritage, our constitutional rights and principles and our great Nation "under God." Let us stop our continually increasing Government spending programs, let us initiate some tough, tight-fisted management over our wasteful, irresponsible foreign aid give-away programs, let us get back in balance again, economically and spiritually, and let us place the welfare of this great country ahead of political considerations.

WHAT THE WAR COSTS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the costs of the war in Vietnam continue to mount. It is draining our country of vital resources, in lives of young men and funds needed here at home.

Recently the Davenport Times-Democrat editorialized on the cost of the war. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling the editorial reflects the thinking of a large number of our people.

It is for this reason that I strongly support President Nixon's withdrawal of 25,000 troops from Vietnam and his determination to extricate this Nation honorably from the war in the near future. The editorial follows:

WHAT THE WAR COSTS

When the fiscal year ends Monday, the United States will have poured out more than \$81 billion on "special Southeast Asia" military spending in five years. The term in quotation is a euphemism from the Pentagon for the Vietnam War.

How much is \$81 billion?

To U.S. taxpayers, it has meant spending an average of \$44.3 million per day.

Here are other ways of looking at what otherwise is a mind-boggling figure:

If the \$81 billion were distributed equally among the 203 million men, women and children in the U.S. today, each would get a check from the U.S. treasury for \$399.01.

If distributed among the 26 million Americans estimated to be living under the "poverty line," each would get a windfall of \$3,115.38.

For a poor family of four, the total would be \$12,461.52.

It took the federal government 136 years—from 1789 to 1925—to spend its first \$81 billion, and that included the costs of waging both the Civil War and World War I.

Of course, a dollar went a lot further in those days. Many accused the Franklin Roosevelt Administration of wild spending. But from fiscal year 1934 through 1941 the New Deal managed to spend just \$68 billion, and part of that was the pre-Pearl Harbor military buildup.

The \$81 billion spent so far on Vietnam can be measured in other ways. All currency in circulation in this country today totals no more than \$50 billion.

And if 81-billion one-dollar bills were placed end to end, they would form a chain 7.7 million miles long—the equivalent of 15 round trips between earth and moon.

And even the exorbitant costs in dollars are not the worst part. Too many lives have been lost—more than 36,000 Americans, more than half a million Communists. And the \$81 billion doesn't include physical loss sustained by the Vietnamese and Vietnam.

A large and apparently growing group of our citizens now feels we ought to stop this outlay in lucre and lives. That widening consensus is based upon an altered view of the globe—a discard of the presumption that we have to police the world; a revision of our old convictions about monolithic communism; and the testimony of a host of informed observers, former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford the latest among them. Ending those staggering expenditures merits highest priority from those who run this nation.

THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of proposed legislation to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, I urge that expeditious steps be taken to improve the national record for fairness and justice by removing this stain from our law books. The law in question, title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, authorizes the Attorney General, upon declaration of an "internal security emergency" by the President, to arrest and hold citizens on grounds of suspicion that they might be capable of acts of espionage or sabotage. The fundamentals of due process of law are disregarded under the act. Access to the courts for trial or appeal is denied.

This law, which fortunately has so far not been implemented, serves no purpose today except to recall a dark moment during World War II when more than 100,000 American residents of Japanese ancestry were rounded up and held in U.S. concentration camps. Many of these citizens, swept up in a wave of fear and suspicion unique to American history, were native born. When the Korean war

began in 1950, these same forces of fear and suspicion motivated the enactment of the Emergency Detention Act, which was passed over the veto of President Truman.

It is inconceivable that a law should still be on the books that permits the rights of U.S. citizenship to be extinguished without cause, but rather simply on the basis of national origin or other indiscriminate reasons.

As would be expected, the Japanese-American Citizens League is in the vanguard of those fighting to repeal this measure. My distinguished colleague, Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA of Hawaii, cosponsor of this repeal bill, is calling for speedy action. I join in urging early hearings before the Committee on Internal Security.

UNFORTUNATELY, EVANS AND NOVAK WERE RIGHT ON DESEGREGATION GUIDELINES

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, Evans and Novak wrote their column on desegregation guidelines a full week before the fateful announcement of the administration position was made official. Their predictions—that Secretary Finch would give in to the overwhelming pressures within the White House and among those influencing the White House—has proven correct. I commend now, for the attention of my colleagues, these comments by Evans and Novak carried in the Washington Post, June 27—wherein the pressures applied for the ominous statement issued last Thursday, are clearly indicated:

FINCH PRESSURED INTO RETREATING ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION GUIDELINES

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The imminent surrender of Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), on school desegregation guidelines comes after months of vicious backstage struggling and pressure from the White House and Southern Republicans.

Finch had been standing almost alone against the rest of the Administration, including at least one HEW official—conservative Robert Mardian, the Department's General Counsel. Now Mardian's influence is on the rise.

The effect of Finch's retreat—over passionate opposition from his own Department's civil rights officials—will be repeal of HEW's power to impose deadlines on school desegregation, mainly on Southern school districts.

Thus, when the new guidelines take effect, Southern school districts will be able to stall desegregation beyond the present deadlines of September 1969 in some cases and September 1970 in others without losing Federal school funds.

This fund cutoff authority is the Federal Government's ultimate weapon to enforce desegregation. Without it, some Southern school districts will continue separate public schools for black and white well beyond the present deadlines and perhaps indefinitely.

That is only the immediate effect of the guidelines change. More difficult is its effect

on Southern school districts that have agreed in the past or are in process of agreeing to accept the HEW guidelines and desegregate.

A dramatic case is a telephone call to the HEW's civil rights division on June 24 from the School Board in Austin, Tex. Austin has dragged its heels on desegregation for years. But last month, under pressure from HEW, the entire school board sat in all-day session with HEW officials here to devise a desegregation plan. Also present were staff aides of Republican Sen. John Tower of Texas and Rep. Jake Pickle, Austin's Democratic Congressman.

On returning to Austin, the School Board wrestled for three weeks with a new plan and finally adopted one that even included some pupil bussing to assure racial balance in primary and secondary schools.

That June 24 call, however, notified HEW that the School Board had heard from Tower that a "major change" in the guidelines was impending. Therefore, the Board would stand pat until the change was announced and then "reappraise" its plans. That shattered the Austin model which HEW officials had hoped would pave the way for a desegregation break-through in Texas, starting with San Antonio and Lubbock.

Furthermore, when the new guidelines are announced, HEW will either agree to backsliding in desegregation plans already accepted in scores of school districts or risk a revolution. These districts, naturally will refuse to be penalized by their agreement to desegregate before the guidelines were changed.

Actually, the decision to change was made several weeks ago and was to be announced before Finch left on his recent vacation (from which he returned last Sunday night). But turmoil inside HEW delayed that announcement, and civil rights officials there are still fighting.

At this writing, however, there is little chance of stopping the new guidelines. The pressures are too strong from Southern Republicans, from Attorney General John Mitchell's Justice Department (which strongly favors the relaxation), and from the Republican National Committee (where they have the blessing of the chairman, Rep. Rogers Morton of Maryland).

The pressures have been intense. One Republican, Rep. Fletcher Thompson of Atlanta, Ga., flatly warned the White House that some Southern Republicans could not support President Nixon's tax bill unless HEW slowed down desegregation. In Thompson's own district, a new school was recently ordered closed on grounds that it was specifically located in a Negro neighborhood to avoid sending Negro students to white schools.

Perhaps more important, the Finch retreat fits the basic Southern political strategy that elected Mr. Nixon. Ever since he took office, the South has been demanding fulfillment of campaign pledges to ease desegregation. Only Finch and HEW's civil rights division stood in the way. Now Finch, too, has yielded.

THE ADMINISTRATION BREAKS ITS PROMISES WITH EDUCATION PROGRAM BUDGET REQUESTS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, when the Republican Party adopted its party platform plank on education and their candidate pledged that his administration would be second to none in its concern

for education, I am sure that many of us anticipated something quite different than what we got when we received the administration's first education budget. We did not expect that this budget would be \$5 billion below the level of appropriations which we authorized for education programs nor did we expect that this budget would be cut \$400 million from the bare bones education budget which was submitted by the previous administration in January.

I believe that, when the Congress votes by overwhelming majorities to approve education program authorizations, we act on the basis of a close assessment of the Nation's needs and resources and that portion of these resources which we believe should be used for education as opposed to other needs. Yet, from the education budget which the administration has submitted to us it would appear that it believes it has a better grasp of what is needed after only 6 months in office than the Congress had over the years when we authorized expenditures for the programs in question. Another interesting fact is that the programs which have been cut by the administration are the very ones which are designed to assist our urban centers such as my congressional district in northeast Philadelphia. These budget reductions will deprive children in these areas of the best possible education and the right to achieve their highest possible educational potential.

The Republican platform makes many pledges with respect to education. It begins with the high sounding statement, "The birthplace of American opportunity has been in the classrooms of our schools and colleges. From early childhood through college years, American schools must offer programs of education which are sufficient to meet the needs of all Americans—the advantaged, the average, the disadvantaged, and the handicapped alike." It then goes on to list the top priority education items for the party. It calls for expanded and better programs for preschool children, encouragement of State, local, and private programs of teacher training, the development and use of better teaching methods and modern instructional techniques such as educational television and voluntary bilingual education. It also urges that the States present plans for aid to be distributed to nonpublic schoolchildren and the inclusion of nonprofit private schools in the program planning process, as well as for greater emphasis on vocational education in the high school and post high school years and for increased grant and loan programs for additional higher education facilities.

In looking over the administration's budget requests for educational programs, it is appalling to find the lack of emphasis there has been on carrying out their platform pledges.

In the field of elementary and secondary education assistance, the administration's budget requests are \$2.5 billion below the level of expenditures which the Congress has authorized for these programs and \$233 million below the bare bones budget which was submitted by the previous administration. Budget reduc-

tions have been made in such areas as title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act assistance where the amounts requested are about \$1 billion below authorized levels and the dropout prevention program. The program of assistance for the establishment of supplemental educational centers has been reduced \$58 million from the Johnson requests and is \$450 million below the authorized expenditure level. No money whatever has been requested to fund the title II library resources program which has enabled public and nonprofit private schools in the city of Philadelphia and across the Nation to improve their library resources. No money has been requested for the guidance counseling and testing programs authorized under title V of the National Defense Education Act. No money has been requested for the equipment and minor remodeling programs authorized under title II of the National Defense Education Act and no money has been requested for the program of loans to elementary and secondary nonprofit private schools.

I am sure that you all are only too aware of the action which the House took this year in spite of objections of many of us combining the supplemental educational centers program, the title II library resources program, the NDEA title V guidance and counseling as well as testing programs authorized under title II of the NDEA effective in 1971. With only \$116 million requested by the administration for all these programs for the 1970 fiscal year while their authorized levels are over \$1 billion, I am sure you can see what a tug of war will occur when the States are faced with a choice as to the allocation of the meager funds which they will get for these programs if the administration budget requests are approved.

You will recall that one of the priority areas in the Republican platform's education plank called for increased assistance for bilingual education. Yet, we note that the administration's budget requests for this purpose are some \$30 million below the level which has been authorized by the Congress. We can also note that the platform pledge of support for education professions development has been ignored since the administration has requested sums which are \$15 million less than the Johnson budget and some \$350 million below the level of expenditures which we have authorized. Further, the budget requests for vocational education activities which got such a high priority in the Republican platform got no such priority in making up their first education budget. Requests for these programs fall some \$487 million below authorized levels. The requests for these programs completely ignore the 1968 report of the Advisory Council of Vocational Education, "The Bridge Between Man and His Work."

In addition, the administration has acted to reduce the amount of funds which will be available to our colleges and universities for facilities construction and, in a related development, the administration has ignored the needs of the various programs which provide assistance to low- and middle-income students

who wish to continue their educations. I have already elaborated on my feelings with respect to the administration's budget cuts in the higher education facilities programs and the student financial aid programs.

One of the programs which the administration has emasculated and which contributes very greatly to the school budget in my congressional district which is a part of the school district of Philadelphia is its reduction of \$499 million in the program of Federal aid to impacted school districts. There are millions of dollars involved for the city in this program; and, consequently we will lose millions if it is not funded at 100 percent of entitlements. We now have a crisis in the city with respect to school construction. Recently the oppressive tax burden which the citizens have had to bear evidenced itself in their refusal to approve an education bond issue. Luckily some banks in the city have agreed to make the city the necessary loans. I need not tell you what a crisis will result if the city does not receive 100 percent of its entitlement under the impacted areas program.

The administration budget for education has singled out libraries for particularly heavy cuts in the 1970 fiscal year. In addition to the elimination of the title II ESEA library resources program, which I have indicated has been eliminated completely, grants for public libraries under title I of the Library Service and Construction Act will be cut in half, construction of public libraries will be cut out completely, aid to college libraries will be cut in half, funds for training librarians have been cut in half and even acquisition and cataloging by the Library of Congress has been cut substantially.

These proposed cuts are appalling. They will stop Federal assistance for the construction of many new public libraries in the future—and may well jeopardize projects which are now receiving Federal funds. At least 276 projects which are pending in locations throughout the country will not be funded. In some instances these libraries do not now have their own buildings. In other instances the buildings are in a dilapidated condition and do not invite extensive public use. In still other instances, there is a real need for branch libraries to bring library services within the reach of more people.

The fund cuts which the administration has proposed will make it difficult for public libraries to expand, and in some cases maintain, existing services. Expansion of collections will be impaired as it becomes necessary to curtail acquisitions. In some instances services will be diminished. Mobile libraries, which often mean the difference between service and no service, will be curtailed. Many libraries will have to adopt shorter hours. Planning for new and better service will decrease. The reduction in college library resources will also decrease the ability of these libraries to make new acquisitions, to bring old collections up to date, and to acquire the latest research reports.

As I have indicated previously, the cuts in the budget which are proposed

for the various programs providing library resource assistance to elementary and secondary schools is likely to be particularly damaging. It will severely limit these schools in acquiring up-to-date instructional materials, textbooks, and music materials for use in educational activities.

All of these proposed budget reductions must be considered in the light of the function of libraries in the educational experience. They are the storehouse of basic materials. They can literally make the difference between a mediocre and a high quality education. They can provide a source of stimulation to an otherwise muffled existence—helping children to develop aspirations and to acquire knowledge they otherwise would not have. Libraries in my view have an extremely important role to play in the educational process and I believe that the devil-may-care way in which the administration has made wholesale cuts in the programs of Federal assistance for the development of this needed educational resource are unwarranted and foolhardy.

Mr. Speaker, the cuts which the administration would make in the educational budget will prove disastrous to our elementary and secondary schools as well as our colleges and universities. If all education programs were funded at their authorized levels, we would still only be spending 2.5 percent of the total Federal budget and a half percent of the gross national product. Certainly this is not too large an investment to make in the welfare of our children and the future of our country. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to study the administration's education program budget requests and ask themselves if this is really all we in the Congress can do for the schoolchildren of the Nation. I think we can do better.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF MALAWI

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to extend congratulations to Malawi on the fifth anniversary, on July 6, of her independence from Great Britain. Malawi is a small mountain-girted land of great beauty and pervasive poverty. While it has been desperately poor, no one starves. Pawpaw, bananas, peanuts, maize, and vegetables grow in sufficient quantity to fill stomachs if not pockets.

Before independence a villager could do no more than grow enough maize to feed himself and his family. But in the last 5 years Malawi's economic development has grown at an average yearly rate of 10-percent.

A key factor has been the introduction of better farming methods. The villagers' standard of living has risen. They are now able to buy better clothes and household goods. Many own radios and good furniture. Soon after independence adult

literacy classes were introduced, and now after work in the morning, villagers attend classes where they are taught how to read and write. The adult classes have helped reduce superstition. Men, women, and children used to regard the witch doctor with awe, even if he did not cure their ills.

New factories have been established to produce products formerly imported: Cotton textiles, blankets, paper bags, shoes, and farm implements; sugar and distilled spirits. Among the newest addition to Malawian industries is the country's first oil company.

Much of the recent progress of Malawi may be attributed to President Hastings Kamuzu Banda, who has actively and energetically led his people since their independence. The ancient hostility and suspicion between tribes and villages is lessening and there is a new unity and friendliness among the people. I wish them continued success in their enterprise of building a strong and prosperous nation.

**CRISIS IN WORLD STRATEGY:
SHOULD PRESIDENT NIXON
CHANGE MILITARY ADVISERS?**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the more I observe the unfolding of world power relationships the more I am impressed with the vision and courage of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In his testimony on May 3 and 4, 1951, before joint meetings of the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs, he made three significant statements—pages 55 and 145 of those hearings—as follows:

If the United States doesn't bring the Korean War to a decisive and victorious end, she will have to accept all the consequences of a disastrous defeat.

It is my belief that if you bring the Korean War to a successful conclusion, you will put off the possibility and diminish the possibility of a third world war;

If you continue this (war) indefinitely, it will eventually overtake you. It will spread.

Mr. Speaker, the historical facts are that General MacArthur's warnings were disregarded. The war in Korea did spread to Vietnam just as he predicted, and what amounts to a war for the world on many fronts, foreign and domestic—including so-called wars of national liberation—is now in progress, with even the United States marked for destruction.

In a statement in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18, 1967, page A1879, on "Crisis in World Strategy: An Appraisal," I listed crucial strategy spots and commented upon them: Suez Canal-Red Sea route to the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia, Southern Africa, and the Isthmus of Panama.

Since 1967 much has happened. Communist power has secured control of the Suez Canal-Red Sea route in the Near East, extended its naval power into the

eastern Mediterranean, endangered U.S. control of the Panama Canal without firing a shot, and currently threatens to force our withdrawal from the Vietnam war after the loss of nearly 40,000 of our finest youth.

More recently, North Korea has returned to the war picture with the capture of one of our naval vessels on the high seas and the shooting down of one of our naval aircraft over the Sea of Japan—both with impunity. Moreover, recently released officers of the *Pueblo* believe that the North Koreans are preparing to invade South Korea again.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to question the quality of the military advice that has guided our Presidents in vital strategic policy matters.

Fortunately, we have experienced professional officers of our Armed Forces who have served with distinction, both in peace and at war and who are qualified to evaluate the military judgment of Presidential advisers—among them Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane. In a recent illuminating report General Lane asks, in effect, whether the present administration will continue on the negative course that has brought repeated costly defeats for our country.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the indicated article by General Lane may be more widely read, I insert it as part of my remarks:

[From Human Events, July 12, 1969]

SHOULD NIXON CHANGE MILITARY ADVISERS?

(By Gen. Thomas A. Lane)

The apologia of Clark M. Clifford published in the July issue of *Foreign Affairs* magazine under the title "A Viet Nam Appraisal" offers fascinating fare for observers of the national scene. He does not tell all, but he surely reveals more than he intended. He recounts the transformation of Clark Clifford from hawk to dove.

The former secretary of defense is a man of many talents. As a young lawyer he had been counsel and close adviser to President Truman. During the Eisenhower years he established a successful law practice. With the return of the Democrats to power, he became an influential adviser to the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. On March 1, 1968, he became secretary of defense. His suave political presence has been in service to the Democratic party and American industry for 30 years.

As a loyal member of the Johnson entourage, Clifford had accepted the rationale of the President's war policy. Late in 1967 he undertook jointly with Gen. Maxwell Taylor a special mission to Viet Nam and to our Asian allies with a view to increasing allied participation in combat operations. Clifford was discouraged to find our allies supporting the war, but unwilling to increase their combat participation.

The reluctance of our allies influenced Clifford to question the going justification of our war policy. He could not understand that our allies were naturally opposed to expending their youth in a war of attrition which the United States did not want to win. Allied spokesmen were too polite to criticize U.S. policy as long as the United States was paying the bill. Mr. Clifford concluded that world conditions had changed!

Secretary Clifford took office soon after the Tet offensive of 1968 which so surprised and taxed allied military forces in South Viet Nam. Gen. Earle Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had returned from Saigon with a request for 200,000 additional troops. A special task force chaired by Secre-

tary Clifford set to work to plan the force increase. The group included Secretaries Rusk, Fowler, Katzenbach and Nitze; CIA Director Helms; Rostow of the White House staff; and Generals Taylor and Wheeler.

It appeared that the proposed troop increase would require a reserve call-up; possibly wage and price controls and other distasteful measures. But Clifford could get no assurance that even these measures would end the war. He asked the questions which a good lawyer should ask. What is our goal? How do we get there? What will these measures accomplish?

Clifford received vague and unsatisfactory answers to his inquiries. No one could give any assurance that the troop increase would achieve specific results, not even that the situation would be improved when the troop increase was made.

"When I asked for a presentation of the military plan for attaining victory in Viet Nam," he writes, "I was told that there was no plan for victory in the historic American sense. Why not? Because our forces were operating under three major political restrictions: The President had forbidden the invasion of North Viet Nam because this could trigger the mutual assistance pact between North Viet Nam and China; the President had forbidden the mining of the harbor of Haiphong, the principal port through which the north received military supplies, because a Soviet vessel might be sunk; the President had forbidden our forces to pursue the enemy into Laos and Cambodia, for to do so would spread the war, politically and geographically, with no discernible advantage.

"These and other restrictions which precluded an all-out, no-holds-barred military effort were wisely designed to prevent our being drawn into a larger war. We had no inclination to recommend to the President their cancellation."

There it is: government in paralysis! How shocking it is to learn that in that brilliant company, no one comprehended that the presidential restrictions spelled defeat. There was no one to demand that the rules of war be changed.

The presidential restrictions may have been intended to avoid being drawn into a larger war, but they were not designed to that purpose. Rather they assured conditions necessary for the success of the Soviet-backed "war of liberation."

It is naive to suppose that Red China would risk attack by U.S. air power rather than have Ho Chi Minh cease his attacks on South Viet Nam. And if the Soviet Union chose to enter a mined harbor, why should the United States be concerned about the consequences? Could no one see a discernible advantage in entering Laos and Cambodia to defeat the enemy and end the war?

Secretary Clifford and his company embraced without question these basic errors of war policy and sought other resolution of the conflict. There is no other solution. The substitute for victory is defeat.

Secretary Clifford reached some strange conclusions. People do when they refuse to face up to the truth. "I was convinced that the military course we were pursuing was not only endless, but hopeless." Right! But instead of correcting the military policy, he decided to disengage. Why? To reduce American casualties. Wouldn't South Viet Nam then be defeated? No, the increased responsibility for their own defense would be good for them.

The then-current South Viet Nam mobilization of 750,000 was equivalent to an American mobilization of nine million! Not since World War II had we borne such a burden. To suppose that South Viet Nam could then take over the U.S. combat role was preposterous. The arming and equipping of the South Viet Nam military forces was a good program too long delayed. But an

American pull-out when the war was at its peak could not be explained with platitudes.

President Johnson and Clark Clifford were well aware that President Kennedy had planned in 1963 to set up a coalition government in South Viet Nam and withdraw U.S. forces. But after the Vietnamese general threw out the Minh junta in January 1964 and condemned the Minh plan to neutralize the country, it became politically infeasible to pursue the coalition plan. President Johnson had to continue our support of the South. In 1965 he introduced U.S. combat forces to the battle to forestall North Vietnamese victory.

By 1968 the Johnson policy was in dispute. He was engaged in a war of attrition which he seemed powerless to resolve. Casualties were mounting. Senators McCarthy and Kennedy were attacking the Johnson war policy. They talked guardedly but openly about imposing a coalition government on South Viet Nam.

Secretary Clifford has concealed this part of the story. His decision to turn combat responsibility over to South Viet Nam could be related only to the Kennedy plan for a coalition government. In his examination of war policy, his instinct to heal the divisions of the Democratic party led him to accept the pleading of Ambassador Harriman and others that coalition government would offer a face-saving formula for United States withdrawal.

What Clifford brought to the issue was a lawyer's brief which would conceal the betrayal of an ally by pretending that South Viet Nam could take over the combat role.

This is why Clifford and other Democratic critics are impatient with President Nixon. Having made the decision to pull out, they want to do the job as quickly as possible. Pull out all combat troops by the end of 1970, they say. They believe the cry to end the fighting, even at the price of sacrificing the goal for which so many have died, will please the people.

But President Nixon has not made the commitment to impose a coalition government on South Viet Nam. He seems to believe that he can build up South Viet Nam to defend itself even as South Korea is doing. Such a program would allow a gradual and controlled reduction of U.S. combat forces. It would certainly involve continuing confrontation with the Soviet Union, a prospect distasteful to the Democratic doves.

By persuading President Johnson to his thesis of withdrawal, Clifford had bridged the gap in the Democratic party. The President would withdraw from the election campaign and would start the party on a course to diminish its differences about the war. Ambassador Harriman, chief architect of the Kennedy coalition policy, would become chief negotiator in Paris.

When, after negotiations extending from May to October, the North Vietnamese agreed to South Vietnamese participation in the Paris talks, South Viet Nam demurred at the conditions. Clark Clifford was outraged. Suddenly Saigon became responsible for the loss of American lives in the war. The secretary lost his cool and vented his frustration.

No doubt the Clifford impatience was related to the impending election. The Democrats needed an apparent breakthrough at Paris to help the election of Hubert Humphrey. Finally, on October 31, President Johnson brushed aside the Saigon reservations and announced the cessation of all bombing of North Viet Nam. It was a grand stand play to mislead the American people into believing that the war would soon be over. It failed, but only narrowly.

In rationalizing his conversion to withdrawal, Secretary Clifford subscribes to some patently unrealistic thesis which compromised the intellectual integrity of his analysis. For all his seeming candor, he is no less a politician.

Clifford argues that a fast withdrawal of U.S. combat forces would not jeopardize the security of South Viet Nam. He claims that our air and sea power could, with the South Vietnamese Army, secure the country. He forgets that our intervention with ground combat forces in 1965 was necessary because air and sea power with the South Vietnamese Army were not enough. Surely a fast pull-out of our forces could reduce the country to those straits again. This would be the condition requisite for coalition government.

Clifford writes: "There is, in fact, no magic and no specific military rationale for the number of American troops presently in South Viet Nam. The current figure represents only the level at which the escalation stopped."

The secretary is quibbling. Of course the military strength required to protect a country is not subject to precise formulation. But to imply that troop strength is not rationally related to military requirements is to misrepresent seriously the situation in South Viet Nam.

Clifford expresses the dovish view that "a high level of American casualties" is caused by our application of maximum military effort in South Viet Nam. A former secretary of defense should know better. He sustained the policy while he was in office. President Nixon has correctly ordered Gen. Abrams to minimize casualties. It is this purpose which requires maximum pressure on the enemy. By preventing the enemy from building up major forces in the south, Gen. Abrams increases the security and reduces the casualties of his own forces.

Clifford writes: "In the long run, the security of the Pacific region will depend upon the ability of the countries there to meet the legitimate growing demands of their people. . . ." This is misleading cant. The security of the region will depend upon the capacity of the free countries to repel Communist aggression. There is no other threat to the security of the region.

He writes further: "We cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that this is a limited war, for limited aims and employing limited power." This is the familiar and specious plea for restraint of U.S. power. Is the independence of an ally a "limited aim"? If the enemy raises the price, do we quit? Tell that to NATO. This kind of talk is used to conceal the confusion of leaders who are intimidated by Soviet aggression.

Perhaps the most significant revelation made by Secretary Clifford is the role of our military leaders in policy making. If he reported correctly that Generals Taylor and Wheeler accepted without challenge the President's three restrictions on the conduct of the war, this is the crux of our continuing failure in Viet Nam.

We cannot expect civilian leaders to distinguish between sound and disastrous military policy when their top military advisers fall to do so.

This war stems entirely from the three presidential restrictions. Without them, there would be no war. South Viet Nam could defend itself with only materiel support. To end the war, South Viet Nam must be allowed to destroy the aggressors where they are—in Laos, Cambodia and North Viet Nam.

The task can be accomplished without risk of Soviet or Red Chinese intervention if the operations are soundly projected. It is the military responsibility to chart sound military policy.

This observer had assumed that military leaders were recommending the denial of sanctuary and unrestricted counterattack against enemy forces waging war against South Viet Nam. It seemed probable that these recommendations had been overruled by the President on advice of the State Department.

Clark Clifford now tells us that whatever

the recommendations of subordinate military commanders in the inner councils of government, the top military leaders have embraced the presidential restraints as "wisely designed to prevent our being drawn into a larger war." He gives the public a new view of our Viet Nam tragedy. The senior military leaders are responsible.

It was distinctly the responsibility of the military leaders to foresee that the presidential directives would condemn us and our allies to a bloody, endless war of attrition which could not be won.

It was distinctly the military responsibility to show that the enemy forces could be decisively repulsed and defeated when our side could strike across the borders at the aggressors, and that such action would sharply reduce force requirements for the defense of South Viet Nam.

It was distinctly the military responsibility to show the President that such response, clearly authorized in international law, would not provoke Soviet or Red Chinese intervention as long as the clear consequence of such intervention would be war with the United States.

Who else in government is qualified to judge these questions?

Clark Clifford's article tells us that our senior military leaders have failed in their duty to the country. They have embraced the civilian rationalization of appeasement. They have in truth betrayed the political leaders whom they thought to accommodate.

This kind of military default is not rare in history. It has caused the fall of nations.

Abraham Lincoln fired the generals who failed. It took him three years to find in Grant a general who could win. There aren't many who can.

In this hour, the tragedy of Viet Nam is extended by President Nixon's retention of the Johnson generals. With them, he will founder as Clifford did.

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson were satisfied with losers. Will Richard Nixon continue on their course? This is the crucial question of American policy today.

SCHOOLS OF THE URBAN CRISIS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of addressing the annual convention of the National Education Association in Philadelphia, Pa.

During the convention, the task force on urban education issued a report entitled, "Schools of the Urban Crisis," which I think is worthy of the attention of all the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. It is for this reason that I insert the text of this report at this point in the RECORD:

SCHOOLS OF THE URBAN CRISIS

(Report by Task Force on Urban Education)
MEMBERS OF THE NEA TASK FORCE ON URBAN EDUCATION

Mrs. Irvamae Applegate, Chairman; Dean, School of Education, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minn.

Oliver W. Lancaster, Vice-Chairman; Office of Integration and Intergroup Education, Board of Education, Philadelphia, Pa.

Frederick Bertolaet, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Ruth Buehrer, Project Coordinator, Burnet Street School, Newark, N.J.

Mrs. Bessie S. Estell, Principal, Butler Elementary School, Birmingham, Ala.

Jose Garcia, Teacher, Byrd Junior High School, Sun Valley, Calif.

Richard Gousha, Superintendent of Schools, Milwaukee, Wis.

C. Edwin Linville, Principal, W. H. Taft High School, New York, N.Y.

Patrick J. McDonough, Executive Assistant, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.

Robert Martinez, Executive Director, Hillsborough County Classroom Teachers Association, Tampa, Fla.

Mrs. Jane Moody, Job Corps Regional Office, San Francisco, Calif.

Ferguson Rhemm, Teacher, Manual Arts High School, Los Angeles, Calif.

Wilson C. Riles, Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Compensatory Education, California State Department of Education, Sacramento.

Daniel Schreiber, Assistant Superintendent, Bureau of Curriculum Development, New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Samuel Shepard, Assistant Superintendent, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Mo.

Mary Helen Swaner, Advisory and Guidance Counselor, W. H. Adamson High School, Dallas, Tex.

Mrs. Bennetta B. Washington, Director, Women's Centers, Job Corps, Washington, D.C.

Ester Wilfong, President, Washington Education Association, Seattle, Wash.

Continuing consultants

Mario Fantini, Program Officer, Division of Education and Research, Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Robert Havighurst, Professor of Education, Department of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Staff advisory committee

Representing NEA: Sam Ethridge, Glen Robinson, Ole Sand, Gary Watts.

Representing NEA Departments: Richard V. Brown (ASCD), F. J. Johnson (ACT), John F. Kourmadas (NASSE), Dorothy Neubauer (DESP), George Redfern (AASA).

NEA staff

George W. Jones, Director.
Joseph A. Devlin, S.J. (Rev.), Program Assistant.

John F. Leeke, Professional Assistant.
Linda E. Morris, Professional Assistant.
Janet Tarkington, Secretary.

Technical Writer: Mrs. Jane Power, NEA Publications Division.

PREFACE

In August 1967, the Executive Committee of the National Education Association directed that the president and executive secretary of the NEA appoint a high-level committee "to develop plans for a forward-looking program for education and teachers in the big cities" and that this committee "recommend a program of action in this field . . . as early as possible."

In March 1968, the NEA Task Force on Urban Education was established and charged with a threefold responsibility: (1) to identify and explore the most critical problems of urban education; (2) to design immediate and long-range plans through which the 1.1 million-member NEA, in cooperation with its departments, 50 state associations, and hundreds of large urban locals, can most effectively contribute to the solution of urban education problems; (3) to recommend to other appropriate agencies, public and private, contributions they can make to help alleviate these problems.

The Task Force on Urban Education was composed of 18 educators, broadly representative of the education profession: classroom teachers, supervisory and guidance per-

sonnel, administrators, college and state department of education personnel, as well as representatives from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The Task Force members come from major urban areas throughout the country. They are people who struggle daily to improve the character and quality of education offered in the schools of our cities.

Because of the magnitude of the problems of urban education, the president and executive secretary of the NEA specified that this Task Force Report be a total NEA endeavor. In light of this, five departments contributed both staff time and financial assistance. The American Association of School Administrators, the Association of Classroom Teachers, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Department of Elementary School Principals, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals enthusiastically supported the work of the Task Force. It also received help from the NEA Center for Human Relations, the Center for the Study of Instruction, the Division of Field Services, the Research Division, other NEA departments and divisions, state and local affiliates, and interested outside organizations. Without the help and constant interest of these groups the Task Force could not have done its work with effectiveness or in depth.

The Task Force met several times from April 1968 to April 1969, examining research data and utilizing the services of special consultants, including parents, while developing this report. After a year of study and thorough deliberation, the Task Force formulated recommendations for positive actions that the NEA and other appropriate agencies should take to improve the conditions of education in the inner cities of this nation. Notable among these is the proposed creation of an NEA Special Project on Urban Education to be responsible for originating and coordinating urban education activities. The recommendations, together with a discussion of the forces in American society which make them necessary, appear in the following report.

This report is addressed to the National Education Association and its state and local affiliates. It will be of use also to other educators and citizens concerned about improving the conditions of urban education. The central focus the Task Force has chosen is the urban child. Each chapter discusses the present problems of urban education, what the Task Force sees as desirable, and strategies to remove the barriers and bridge the gap between the present reality and the ideal—the ideal which will allow each urban child to develop into a thinking, compassionate, decision-making human being.

INTRODUCTION

This report deals with urban education, or, more specifically, with public education in urban America. It focuses on the character and equality of education offered to millions of poor children—black, Spanish-speaking, and white—who inhabit the inner cores of our metropolitan areas. These are the children who attend the schools of the urban crisis. This report deals with schools: schools which are now undergoing a state of unparalleled emergency, suffering from decay, neglect, and continuing deterioration. Not every school in every large city is facing this crisis, but too many schools are.

Some school systems have undertaken, with some success, the reformation of their inner-city schools. Nor is the emergency confined only to the large cities. Many smaller cities with dense concentrations of black, Spanish-speaking, and poor white children have schools which are embroiled in the urban school crisis. This urban crisis extends beyond the schools and is inextricably related to other factors which determine the quality of life available to the citizens of the city. In most of our major

cities, housing and job opportunities also are inadequate. A poor man who did not receive an adequate education and is without marketable skills finds himself unable to get any job at all or gets one which does not pay him enough to provide adequate housing, food, or medical assistance for his family. His children, already suffering from poverty, often attend the inadequate schools of the urban crisis.

By whatever criteria are used, research indicates that those schools which this report deals with are clearly inferior to the other schools located within the city or in neighboring suburbs. One standard of measurement that can be applied is the availability and distribution of the human and physical resources which are generally considered essential factors in education. In comparison to other schools, the schools of the urban crisis have a greater number of pupils per teacher, a smaller amount of money to spend per pupil, fewer textbooks and other teaching materials per pupil, a greater proportion of teachers who are not fully certificated, a greater proportion of teachers with fewer years of experience, and many more older school buildings. Criteria involving results also illustrate the immensity of the crisis: These particular schools have more dropouts, more students who read at lower levels and perform less well on standardized tests, fewer students who graduate from high school, fewer who attend college, fewer who get jobs.¹

There is a cycle of inadequacy, created by many factors. As increasing mechanization of agriculture drove farm workers, many of them black people from the South, to seek new livelihoods in the cities, they occupied the core areas being vacated by middle class families, who were beginning to migrate to the suburbs. In addition, in the Southwest, many Mexican-Americans came to the cities to seek jobs. Simultaneously, the development of technology contributed to job scarcity for the unskilled labor market, which economic activity shifted to outlying, newly developing suburban areas. Racial and socioeconomic biases prevented the new urban poor from obtaining jobs.

It must be pointed out that the hearts of America's cities are rich undeveloped territories, as some Americans are aware and more are discovering. Beauty is there—grace of architectural line, the freshness of tiny unexpected parks, imaginatively designed gardens created from scanty resources. There art lives, in established museums and galleries, theaters and cinemas, but also in storefront playhouses, mural-covered fences and buildings, and the studios and studios of those whose spirits are nourished by the vitality of the city. The life of the city is well-known to offer terror and despair, the dullness of too little for too long, and the isolation of those who have nothing left to give. Little noticed are the vitality and self-reliance of those who have survived hardship and danger and the community of feeling and action that is growing from the sharing of new hope. The cities offer the possibility of finding new ways for Americans to live with one another because it is here that one may find the richness of the cultural diversity which is America.

Our cities, like other parts of the country, need good schools. The kind of education city children need is good education—education that works. City parents, like other parents, want their children to have good education. They want their children to be prepared to survive and compete as equals in our civilization. The schools of the urban crisis must offer their students the opportunity to construct a self-respect that will free them from insecurity. They must offer students the opportunity at the end of their school experience to choose freely between further education and entry into an occupa-

Footnotes at end of article.

tion with a future. The schools must develop their students as individuals.

Schools that do these things are good schools, wherever they are located. The principles of good education are constant, but their application differs in different environments and for different student populations. In fact, one of the most basic elements of good education is adaptability to the situation and the individual student—an element all too uncommon in the American educational institution and generally lacking in the schools of the urban crisis.

This Task Force recognizes that the United States, since its beginnings, has been composed of separate and unequal societies. There is the Western European society of the white majority; there are the societies of the black, poor white, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and Indian minorities. To fulfill the principles upon which this country was founded, America will have to reform its institutions so that all the cultures within it will be accorded equal respect; all citizens, equal rights.

The task

The schools of the urban crisis, as they now exist, perpetuate the cycle of poverty, the merry-go-round of despair and frustration. They consciously or inadvertently continue to discriminate against the poor and powerless. Many concerned Americans, educators and noneducators alike, have already taken steps to improve the schools, to eradicate the inadequacies, and to develop programs which will afford the citizens of urban America the same opportunities that other Americans have. The efforts of those who have been trying are commendable. Yet the situation remains critical. It is the responsibility of all those concerned with the future of this nation to accelerate efforts to improve inner-city schools.

America's central challenge remains: to develop its human resources, its children, so that they in turn can develop America.

The urban school crisis is not an isolated phenomenon but affects and is affected by the education offered in all schools in this country, whether suburban or rural. Children frequently come into the urban schools from rural areas. Educators frequently come into urban schools from suburban or rural backgrounds; many hope to leave urban schools for positions elsewhere. Too often the goals and methods of urban schools are based on those developed in suburban schools. The children whom these schools fail to educate affect schools in other areas by their negative impact upon the national economy. They are likely to be unemployed and thus compete for, rather than contribute to, public funds.

Desegregation

The students who attend the schools of the urban crisis suffer from the effects of racial discrimination. Racial strife, mistrust, and bigotry affect the schools and all other institutions not only in our urban areas but in the rest of the country as well.² One of the greatest problems facing America is that of ending racial and economic discrimination.

The first step in attacking this problem is the eradication of segregation. Forced segregation of minority groups by the majority is the denial of Constitutional rights, as recent court decisions and common sense indicate. Desegregation therefore means breaking down barriers which limit the freedom and opportunity of groups of citizens to exercise the privileges ensured by the Constitution. Some of these barriers are legal, but most are more subtle. Some are de jure; others, de facto. In public education, desegregation means getting rid of separate and unequal schools which are still sanctioned by boards of education and state legislatures and which prohibit children from multiracial and

multicultural experiences. It means breaking down housing patterns which arbitrarily limit the choices of the poor and the powerless, imprisoning them in areas others have abandoned and yet control. Opening up housing in the suburbs to black citizens also means that suburban students will no longer be segregated through the design of acquiescence of their parents.

The federal government has taken some steps since the 1954 Supreme Court decision, yet many people of this country—administrators and teachers, public officials, and citizens alike—have blocked efforts to remove once and for all legal and social barriers which impinge upon the rights of minority group citizens. It does little good to develop desegregation plans for our major cities if citizens of a state vote down open-housing laws. Recent studies have shown that the pace of school desegregation in America has been snail-like. The public schools are more segregated now than they were in 1954.³ America seems to be unwilling to accept even coexistence; unwilling to provide some Americans with the rights all Americans are entitled to. When one American suffers, all suffer. Denial of justice to one man or group is a denial of justice to all men. It is in each citizen's interest to work to assure all Americans the rights to which they are entitled under law.

Integration

The word integration is frequently used, but seldom understood. People say it is essential for quality education but rarely define either term. Does integration mean giving a white child a locker next to a black child? Does it mean bussing 60 five-year-olds from slum to suburbs? Does it mean hiring one Puerto Rican or Mexican-American professional staff member to improve the public relations image of a school or an education association?

Integration is not only racial but cultural, a coming together of different peoples in a social, esthetic, emotional, and philosophical manner—not a mechanical juxtaposition. It is pluralism rather than assimilation, based on respect for differences rather than on a desire for amalgamation. Respect does not try to "save" a person from the "mistaken" values that have always guided his life; integration is a salad bowl rather than a melting pot.

The kinds of experiences which would produce the mutual understanding and respect that constitutes integration among children of different races and backgrounds are necessary elements of education for life in this nation.⁴ Such truly integrated experiences can, furthermore, be provided every child of a metropolitan area, no matter how culturally isolated his situation.

In cities whose populations are now more than 50 percent black, in cities from which white parents are fleeing, in suburbs where black citizens do not live or are refused entrance, there will be schools which are all-black and all-white. Good education can and must be provided for children and youth in these schools; the staff can provide educational experiences which lead children to a greater understanding and acceptance of all of America's societies.⁵ The Task Force believes that this understanding would be more easily developed through integration of student populations.

There are many ways to provide integrated educational experiences.⁶ The school system may use one or a combination of the following options or decide upon others: (a) two-way bussing, (b) exchange programs involving students and teachers, (c) cross-racial experiences sponsored by the schools but outside the regular school program, (d) the redrawing of district lines, or (e) the construction of educational parks.

No matter which means citizens choose, the Task Force believes that the following princi-

ples must serve as a basis for developing an effective sequence of integrated experiences.

The chief purpose of school integration is to give each child the opportunity to have experiences with children from different cultural and racial backgrounds. The decisions to develop integrated programs must be made jointly by the parents of the children involved. School staffs and teachers organizations have a responsibility to inform the parents of the educational value of such experiences. The parents should have a permanent role in developing and assessing the programs and the experiences of their children. The parents of the majority—whether black or white or Spanish-speaking—must not dictate to the minority group parents. Neither should small special interest groups dictate to all the others what should be done. All should work as partners.

A child who is going into an integrated situation must be provided special assistance before he enters it. Children cannot be subjected to a situation in which they might be destroyed as persons psychologically. Children cannot enter situations in which they will be subjected to bigotry, hatred, racism. The educational experiences provided must not reinforce stereotypes but eliminate them.

Before and during the development of integrated experiences, the superintendent and his staff should provide the faculties involved the kinds of experiences which will assist them to examine their own racial attitudes and make them sensitive to children of different races and backgrounds. The personnel specifically involved in such programs must work along with the parents in the planning and development of these experiences.

Desegregation—the destruction of barriers—and integration—the construction of mutual respect—must be accomplished if children are to be offered a complete education and the nation is to enjoy a decrease in intercultural tension.

Conclusion

It is unfortunate that a recipe for good education for the children of the urban crisis cannot be adapted from the educational programs provided in the suburbs with a few minor changes made. But the kind of education students need is not being generally offered children of any geographic or socioeconomic region. The health of the national economy requires that the schools of America prepare students to be self-supporting, to contribute to the national income rather than to the cost of public services. The survival of American democracy requires that schools help students become self-respecting and self-determined individuals. The need for schools that accomplish these things is particularly acute among the poor and the powerless.

The children of the urban crisis have a right to an education as fully funded and carefully planned and carried out as other American students. If they are to have an equal start at the end of their public schooling, their schools must receive more funds and attention than others. But, if they are to compete successfully, if they are to survive, the funds and the thought and imagination must be better spent than in most of our schools at present. In four areas which determine the quality of education—organization, experiences, staffing, financing—the Task Force has examined the requirements of the schools of the urban crisis and designed strategies to bridge the gap between the real and the ideal, the present and the future of urban education in America.

CHAPTER 1—URBAN SCHOOL REORGANIZATION

The process by which the schools of the urban crisis are governed is increasingly unsatisfactory to those groups whom the institution affects most. Overgrown and ponderous, most big-city school systems are slow, inefficient, and inflexible in operation. Every decision or request for action must go

Footnotes at end of article.

through various levels and planes of the hierarchy, through forms and red tape which remove most traces of uniqueness or urgency. Routine supplies may be delivered months, even years, after they are ordered. Attempts at creative teaching that require materials or permission from outside the classroom are likely to be stifled because of rigidly applied rules, since the system makes so little provision for special cases. Unresponsive to staff members, the bureaucracy of most big-city systems is impervious to the demands of parents and can be influenced only with difficulty by the school board or superintendent.

The system of governance no longer goes unchallenged. Because staff members feel decisions are made arbitrarily and rules apply rigidly in disregard of the uniqueness of any individual case, they are frustrated and angered. Students are becoming aware that an education better suited to their needs could be provided if the structure of governments permitted. Parents who see their children miseducated or uneducated are claiming the right of parents in smaller school systems—to govern the schools through a board that represents their interests because they are not competing for representation with more powerful cultural or economic blocs. The form of governance they want is commonly described as "community control"; however, "the rhetoric of control is more widespread than its practice; few parents want to run their schools. But they do want something called *accountability*, where they can look at and assess what the schools are accomplishing."⁷

Many groups agree that the organization of urban school systems must be altered if city children are to receive suitable and sufficient education. But no better pattern has been established. New structures of decision making must be developed for each city according to its particular situation.

In order to reexamine the structure of organization of an urban school system, educators and citizens must begin to clarify (a) the various types of tasks which the schools now perform, (b) the levels at which the tasks can be carried out most efficiently, and (c) the difference between decisions which should be public and those which should be professional. Decisions about school programs and administration should be made at several different levels: the local (an individual school or cluster of schools), the regional (several clusters within a city or crossing metropolitan boundaries), the metropolitan, the state, the multistate, and the national. Although there will, of course, be overlapping areas of responsibility among levels and between the public and the educational staff, the Task Force is concerned with primary responsibility. Clear delineation of roles and responsibilities is absolutely essential for urban school reorganization, in order to prevent duplication of efforts or abdication of responsibility.

Within the broad criteria established by the state and the nation, most decisions about the educational experiences children receive should be made at a level which can involve both the parents and the children most directly. Although it is the right of the parent and the citizen to make the policy and priority decisions about what their children learn, educators and citizens must realize that parents do not exercise this right in a vacuum.

The school staff, consulting with parents and students, is the logical group to make decisions about scheduling, teaching methods, and so forth.⁸ At the same time, there must be a relationship between state and national educational objectives and personal, parental, and community ones. The state, which has a legal right to intrude into any public school system, acts as a check and balance for the

public. The city, state, region, or nation may conduct programs of research, provide special consultants, and disseminate new ideas and developments to the staff and public. Teachers organizations have a role in presenting educational alternatives at each level of decision making.

Educational personnel translate policy into program, idea into action. In the individual school setting, for example, the parents might establish policy and priorities, present these to the staff, and ask them to propose several alternative ways of getting the job done. The parents, then, might decide which of these alternatives best fit into the total scheme of the school's priorities and delegate authority to the staff to carry out the program. In another situation the parents might simply tell the staff to do a particular thing without specifying any particular way. In either case, the public has a responsibility to assess the programs to judge whether they are effectively attaining the goals of the school. It has a further responsibility to demand that the programs be changed if they are not.

While education needs the largest possible financial base, allocation decisions are made most appropriately by public agencies closest to home base. Allocations, then, can be used to align expenditures with the priorities of individual schools and cities. Instead of city-wide procurement of supplies, the school may want to purchase paper, supplies, and paperbacks from a local firm. In this way the school can establish better community relations and, at the same time, obtain needed supplies quickly and efficiently. Placing greater responsibility and authority for spending money within the individual school enables persons who are closest to the children's learning situation to translate feelings into programs, ideas into action. It allows education to be more responsive, more accountable.

One of the greatest problems Americans will face as cities are built and rebuilt is adequate planning for future school facilities to keep pace with jobs and housing and for replacing outdated and condemned buildings. The basis for decisions in this case obviously must be larger than the individual school attendance area. One mammoth problem America now faces is urban sprawl, for "cities" often embrace many independent governing units and often even cross state boundaries. The only way we can deal effectively with this problem will be through metropolitan planning, incorporating these independent governing units into a cohesive group for decision making and action.⁹ This will create another area where educational decisions must be made. Involving parents will be difficult at this level; but as metropolitan governments grow stronger and as multistate bodies develop, it will be absolutely essential to find ways to make these units responsive and accountable to parental concerns.

It is at a more local level, however, that the difficulties of securing accountability are at present being confronted. Proponents of school reorganization have developed or are calling for plans to decentralize the school systems of many of our major cities. This drive for decentralization of schools and for increased parental involvement is one element of a logical step in the development of American democracy. Before the American Revolution, decisions were made by monarchs. Ever since the American people won the right to govern themselves, the basis of decision making has gradually broadened as more and more segments of the population have obtained the right to vote. In 1920, women won the franchise; in the sixties, civil rights activities helped to extend voting rights to more black people; now the young are pressing strongly for the right to vote at the age of 18.

More and more of the people are eligible

to vote for the representatives who make decisions, but the search for more responsive government is far from over. Many people no longer seem to trust their representatives to make policy for them in every area. They are demanding an ever-increasing role in making the decisions themselves: Emphasis is being placed on participatory rather than representative democracy. This shift from indirect to direct responsibility for decisions is the newest development in the continuing attempt of the American people to create a just and workable method of governing themselves.

Several elements in contemporary American life explain partially why this step is being taken now. During the past 20 years, this country has undergone the most rapid and thorough technological and social transformation in the history of man. Today, sheer bigness, expanded population, and increased concentrations of people are contributing to the feeling of alienation man experiences during such periods of rapid change. People are, therefore, reaching out to control and direct their economic, religious, political, and social institutions. They are attempting to make institutions which were developed during an agricultural or industrial period perform their functions in a technological society. This attempt often must involve changes in institutional structures.

The media explosion has contributed in an unprecedented way to the decentralization movement in cities throughout the country. Media are constantly bringing the actions of our representatives and the "products" of our institutions into view, and the average citizen is unsatisfied. The media have brought the institutions so close to us that we can see how "remote" they really are. They have also illustrated how frighteningly inept these institutions are in dealing with the problems that society faces today. They have made us more sophisticated. They have shown the poor and the powerless the riches of America.

The failure of urban schools to educate children from all cultures has made the schools the main arena in which the battle for institutional accountability is being fought. Many of the poor parents now believe that their children are being controlled and sorted by a centralized system which responds only to other elements in the population. They demand to help make policy for the schools which their children attend. Thus the demand for school accountability and for decentralization is intrinsically connected to the movement for participatory democracy and self-determination in this country.

Decentralization

The Task Force on Urban Education defines *decentralization* as a method of distributing authority in such a way as to give parents, citizens, and local school officials greater involvement in or control over the educational decisions which affect children.¹⁰ The Task Force supports and endorses this concept. It believes that new and different efforts must be exerted to create *people-centered schools*, and that decentralization may be the best way to accomplish this in urban areas.¹¹ The education profession and the community together should assess the problems and needs of the children, determine educational programs, establish educational priorities, develop programs and methods of evaluation, and select staff. The Task Force urges that thoughtful planning by all of those involved precede every attempt to implement this concept in order to safeguard the educational standards and the general welfare of students and educators. Individuals and groups concerned about the future of urban children—city and state boards of education, individual teachers and administrators, education organizations, business and community groups—should begin immediately to examine all aspects of decen-

Footnotes at end of article.

tralization to decide whether this method of reorganization is feasible.¹²

The Task Force recommends that all those initiating and developing decentralized school systems closely examine the following questions and issues.¹³

Although neither the NEA nor any other national group can develop one decentralization plan that will be applicable to all of America's major cities, we feel a clear responsibility to raise some of the relevant questions which must be considered. In every city it will be essential for all those involved and affected by decentralization—administrative staffs and teaching personnel, city officials, city boards of education, individual parents, citizens, community groups, and teachers organizations—to examine these and other questions with care and to agree mutually on the important issues. There should be widespread participation and involvement of all those concerned in developing any plans, and every decentralization plan must be designed to make urban schools more responsive and accountable to the people they serve.

A. What size should decentralized school districts be?

One of the major purposes in decentralization is to develop adequate ways of involving parents and citizens in school decision making. All those involved in developing decentralization plans will have to pay particular attention to developing patterns of participation which will allow the schools to respond effectively to the parents of individual children and the citizens of particular communities. As the Task Force has indicated, many decisions about educational programs may be made most appropriately within an individual school no matter what size the district may be.

Ultimately, the size of decentralized school districts should be determined by the needs and demands of particular communities. It will also depend on the definition of the term community: the residents of a geographic area, an ethnic group, people with the same interests and goals, and so forth.

1. There may be a tendency to separate large districts from the city. Districts like Harlem, large enough to be "cities" themselves, may wish to secede from the city structure completely. Within such districts effective community participation would be limited by size, and further decentralization may be necessary. However, a governing board of such a district may be able to be more responsive to the needs of citizens, especially if the system includes a population which is relatively homogeneous.

2. Another alternative is the development of clusters of schools governed by a community board. Such a cluster might include a high school and its feeder elementary and junior high schools; it might involve between 7,000 and 10,000 students.

3. The Morgan Community School in Washington, D.C., suggests still another model—an individual school controlled by a local governing board.

It is possible that within a city some sections of the public are satisfied with the present centralized board and will not press for community-controlled schools. Thus some of the schools might be governed by a central board and others by local boards. It is also possible that several different-sized "districts" may develop within a city. (In Washington, D.C., the Morgan Board governs one school, but the residents of Anacostia are developing a governing unit which would have jurisdiction over 10 schools.)

The size of the districts will be important in determining other structural arrangements. For example, a very large district may be tied directly to the state, circumventing the central board entirely. In other cases, schools may receive some service or direction

from a central board of education while developing governing units within individual schools or within clusters of schools.

B. How will representative lay participation be ensured in decentralized school systems?

Decentralized school plans call for involving parents and citizens as members of advisory councils or community school boards. Several structures of representation on such councils or boards are emerging.

1. The one constant factor in each plan is the presence of a majority of parents on the board. Some plans specify that teen-agers should be involved; others include businessmen, educators, and representatives of community organizations. The possible advantages and disadvantages of involving representatives from each of these groups on the policy-making boards should be weighed carefully.

2. Most plans provide for the election of board members either (a) by the population of a specific geographic area, and/or (b) by the parents of the school children.

3. Some plans (i.e., San Francisco SEED Project) call for the election of individuals to a decision-making committee in a particular school. Those committees then elect some representatives to a coordinating board which establishes policies for a cluster of schools. The clusters could, in turn, elect representatives to participate in citywide planning. This model might present a vehicle to coordinate decisions from the individual school level to the citywide area.

Participation on boards of education has traditionally been restricted to those of our citizens who have both money and time. Consideration might be given to compensating members of local governing boards, to paying for expenses incurred in participating, and to assisting the members to acquire expertise and factual information which will enable them to govern in fact.

C. What powers might community boards or councils have?

The specific powers and authority which are assumed by such boards or councils will be determined by the structural arrangements developed in each city. Some communities are demanding authority for setting priorities for the school program, allocating budget on the basis of these priorities, and hiring and firing personnel. They are seeking such powers within the limits of state law, but with a greater degree of freedom than centralized boards of education now permit.

Lines of authority and responsibility between centralized school boards and community boards and between community boards and educators must be clearly delineated. For example: A community board might have the responsibility for determining program priorities within a school or cluster of schools; a central board might conduct research and evaluation for the community board; faculty members of an individual school might develop several alternatives for implementing a program priority; and the community board might then decide which among the alternatives is most feasible in the light of other priorities. Purchasing of some items might be done more easily by a central board; purchasing of other items might be done more easily by a local board.

Personnel needs and staff deployment should be determined at a local level as much as possible. The major responsibility for hiring and firing personnel might be placed with a governing board which has advice from the administration and faculty. On the other hand, major responsibility might be placed with the administrator assisted by the faculty and an advisory council. Whoever is responsible and accountable for personnel decisions must have the authority to carry out these decisions.

The following example shows how a community board and school staff could work

together to hire personnel: New personnel are interviewed by the principal and representatives of the faculty and by a personnel committee of the board. The principal and faculty representatives examine the person's professional credentials and competence. The board's personnel committee reviews the applicant's views toward the community and the children. If either of the two groups feels the applicant is not suited for working in the particular school, the person is not hired.

Procedures for firing personnel must incorporate a system of due process acceptable to both the public representatives and the professional ones. Basic procedures might be developed at a broader level than the individual school.

If more hiring is done at the individual school level, there may be a more satisfactory initial assignment of personnel. If a person seeks transfer, however, he should receive assistance.

A more centralized agency might be responsible for establishing general procedures in the area of personnel practices and for recruiting personnel.

D. How should decentralized schools and school systems be financed?

Any discussion of the financing of decentralized school districts must take into account the fact that urban school systems currently do not have the funds necessary to educate children adequately. Decentralizing urban schools without providing each district with the resources it needs to conduct programs and pay personnel would be tantamount to criminal negligence.

The base for resources for urban schools must be broader than the city—it must include both the state and the nation. Plans for distributing resources must take into account the extra needs of urban areas and the fact that proportionately greater amounts will be needed by those schools which have large numbers of poorer children.

A decentralized school district, then, will have to depend upon a broader area—city, metropolis, state, nation—for its revenues. However, decisions about how funds will be spent should be made as much as possible within individual schools or school clusters.

E. How might decentralization affect professional negotiations?

In an abstract sense, at least, there is little difference between negotiation in a decentralized school system and most bargaining in private industry. The classic bargaining pattern provides for hammering out a master contract with a nation-wide industry, for example, and submitting it to members for ratification. However, final acceptance at any particular plant of that industry is contingent upon successful local negotiation over relevant local issues, which may vary widely from plant to plant because of local conditions. Many existing master contracts of teacher organizations already provide for a mild form of multi-unit bargaining, by requiring the formation of faculty councils or senates in each building or unit. The purpose of such councils is to resolve local issues that may arise because of unique conditions. For this type of bargaining to succeed, each local board must fully accept the responsibility to bargain with its employees.

Teacher organizations, then, would continue to negotiate. They would, however, have to examine which items could be negotiated at a centralized level and which could be negotiated at a more local level. In general, basic salaries and fringe benefits might be negotiated at a centralized level while decisions relating to educational programs might be made at the more local level. One of the items which teacher organizations might negotiate at the decentralized level is the procedure for involving faculty members in decision making within an individual school.

Negotiating under a decentralized plan would necessarily involve more members of

the teachers organizations. These organizations themselves might become restructured along the same lines of a decentralization plan. They would need to consider and develop ways to coordinate the expressed needs of members in each decentralized district when developing a master contract covering a larger area. In short, they must find ways to be responsive to their own members in the decentralized system.

Conclusion

The Task Force believes that a careful and thoughtful consideration of the above questions will be necessary for all school systems that attempt to reorganize and reform to meet the exigencies of a new and challenging century.¹⁴ The real value of the current surge toward decentralization and reorganization is that it focuses on allowing both parents and educators to be a part of the decision-making process. The realization of this drive toward decentralization and reorganization will provide in urban education the pluralism that we, as Americans, say we cherish. This news system will offer educational alternatives to parents and educators in our cities as well as in our suburbs. It could, in fact, save public education in America from obsolescence.

CHAPTER 2—THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

The number of students who leave urban schools, with or without diplomas, prepared neither for further formal schooling nor for immediate employment has been repeatedly documented. That any students leave any schools in this condition is deplorable; when the proportion rises above 85 percent, as it has done in Harlem, the schools may be regarded as functionally inoperative in preparing students for economic self-sufficiency.¹⁵ Far from equipping students to support themselves in any way at all—let alone giving them a choice of occupations—the schools of the urban crisis do not teach many students even to read or calculate.

Urban students are deprived, not only of useful academic and vocational education possible for others to obtain in the educational system, but of the kind of educational program that develops a child's confidence in his ability and worth—a confidence that is necessary for both survival and productive participation in our civilization.¹⁶

The educational program presently offered the children of the urban crisis is suitable to neither our time nor their situation. Until it is replaced by an appropriate form and content, urban schools will continue to crush their students into the mold of social liabilities. To educate, a school must adapt itself to its environment and to the academic, psychological, and physical needs of its students. Many urban schools are unique only in the degree of their inappropriateness to the student population. It is the enormity of their irrelevance that makes such schools a single, identifiable problem—the most pressing problem—of the American educational institution today.

Education for the time

Emotional Development: The pressures and tensions of the present are great; those of the next few decades may well be greater. Already many Americans do not feel able to deal comfortably with the stresses our civilization presents. To prepare students to function competently, our schools must offer them sufficient knowledge of the processes of emotional response so that they can understand their feelings rather than fear them. The school situation should present the opportunity to practice channeling and expressing feelings in ways that will prevent inner tensions from accumulating and yet keep behavior within the limits set by society. More important, the educational experience must provide students with the mate-

rials for an enduring self-respect on which to rely in times of external stress.

All the elements of the educational experience—staff, curriculum, materials, facilities—should be organized to contribute to the child's feeling that he is valuable both as a member of the human race and as himself—a unique combination of qualities. Those in the schools must neither ignore nor malign nor patronize any child's race, culture, or background. They must not imply that academic or social standing is an accurate standard of the worth of the individual. Rather, the educational experience must encourage each student to value his strengths, while considering his weaknesses to be challenges, not sins or faults.

Career Development: Most children in the schools today will need to work to support themselves as adults. Many will need to seek employment as soon as they complete their public school education. But employment is increasingly scarce for the unskilled; machines perform or may even direct physical labor, and economy requires that human beings perform only the tasks demanding more knowledge and skills. If the schools are not to contribute to the number of unemployed citizens, and thereby to all the social and personal waste and misery attendant on joblessness, they must offer effective programs for career development.

The educational program must first ensure that students possess the basic skills required for survival in our civilization: the ability to read, write, and calculate; to think logically; to make decisions; to work with others; and to deal with stress. Students further need to develop concepts which they can apply to a whole cluster of occupations, in order to move from one specific job to another as requirements and demands shift. It is the responsibility of the school to keep itself constantly informed on occupations that are likely to need more, or fewer, employees in the near future. For example, because of the automation of industry and agriculture, the present trend is toward a concentration of employment in service-oriented, rather than good-producing, occupations. A close relationship with business and industry is essential in vocational programs because students must have access to the latest machinery and techniques; training on obsolete equipment may even prove to be a liability to a prospective employee.

Local business, industry, and government and other service agencies can be valuable sources of assistance to the schools in providing vocational experience; their aid should be sought in the selection of suitable courses, the planning of course content, and the provision of actual working experience. Establishment of work-study programs is desirable for several reasons: Such programs permit students who must begin work immediately after graduation to continue their formal education and prepare themselves for occupations that offer advancement; they provide students the opportunity to observe the practice and working conditions in a variety of occupations; they maintain a close relationship between school and community that enables the school to keep its vocational program realistic; and they provide the student with contacts in the field he intends to enter. Through this last, they provide the schools one means of fulfilling what should be one of their major responsibilities in vocational education: student placement and follow-up. Neglect of this responsibility makes it difficult for the school to determine whether it is, in fact, preparing students to compete in the job market. Yet this is an aspect of its performance that should interest the school most highly, since unemployable students become a burden to themselves and a threat to the society. The relationship between the schools and the employers of the community—and beyond—must begin at the beginning of the student's training and con-

tinue until he is established in his occupation.

Individualized Programs: The schools of the urban crisis must develop programs of individualized instruction. The Task Force defines *individualized instruction* as instruction which creates the school situation most favorable to the development of each child as an independent, self-reliant, self-teaching, creative individual. Individualized instruction is designed to develop the child's personal and academic potential to a greater degree than is possible when learning is prescribed for groups of students as though they were identical. An educational program tailored to fit the needs and abilities of each student provides him more experience of success, thus increasing his self-esteem and his willingness to risk further confrontation with unknown facts and situations. Giving him the length of time, the kind of materials, and the method of approach suited to his own learning style increases the amount he can learn, because his time is not spent grappling with irrelevancies.

In a truly individualized program, the human skill and development of each child are diagnosed. Each child has a program of activities planned with and for him to order to reach specific objectives, and assessment is conducted to see if the activities have assisted the child in meeting those specific objectives. Individualized education is concerned with behavior and how people feel about themselves and others; its objectives are behavioral. Children help determine the objectives they want to attain, and they have different experiences for accomplishing a stated goal. They learn in different environments, and their vicarious experiences are broadened. Children learn from all types of people and mechanisms. They are required to spend only as much time acquiring a given skill as it takes to demonstrate achievement of a desired goal, and then they can establish new goals and concentrate on the attainment of these.

This individualized education program is designed to ensure that no child leaves school without skills enabling him to move into another productive environment. It includes careful and continual diagnosis by both teacher and student of what the student knows, what he thinks he wants to know, how he learns, what he wants to learn, and what he is motivated to learn. It involves counseling about alternatives in learning, recognizing various levels of learning, and examining the degree to which learning has transfer value, is generalized or synthesized.¹⁷

All the educational experience provided in such a program is process-oriented.¹⁸ The child not only learns facts but understands and uses the theory, process, reasoning, and concepts which go into any discipline. Not only do children learn history, they learn how to be historians; they not only read the poetry of Langston Hughes and T. S. Elliot, they learn how to be poets; they not only read and study the novels of Saul Bellow and James Baldwin, they learn how to become novelists. A child does not just study about reason and humanity but incorporates them into his character.

In many areas of learning, particularly where performance goals can be identified specifically—as in typing, spelling, or mathematics—requirements are in terms of achievement rather than time. Flexibility in all subjects and areas of study eliminates the school schedule as we now know it. School need not begin and end at the same time for all children. On some days students might not even attend school. They might go to a museum, the mayor's office, the grocery store, the ball park, the newspaper office, the automobile factory, the police station. They might even take a leave of absence from the school for three months or a year.

Not only instruction, but evaluation can be individualized. Testing is used to determine to what extent each student under-

Footnotes at end of article.

stands what he has studied rather than how many facts he has memorized. Each child is compared with his own standards of performance; class or national standings are not considered indicative of the student's increasing grasp of concepts and ideas. As the school program can be designed to assist the child to learn, so the evaluation program can be structured to inform the student about the nature and extent of his progress.

Plant and Facilities. Many of the schools of the urban crisis were built during the last century and are so unsafe for both children and educators that they should be torn down. These schools lack many basic items which most teachers take for granted: There are not enough desks; many of the windows are broken; blackboards are falling apart; doors will not close; radiators will not work; there are no adequate toilet facilities. These buildings are also simply too small for the number of people they are required to hold.¹⁹

What is worse, structural limitations prohibit the use of new learning techniques—such as large- and small-group instruction, independent study, and the use of new media—thus making individualized instruction impossible. Supplies are equally inadequate. These schools do not even provide enough textbooks for the students.

The Task Force urges that a new and different view be taken of learning facilities for urban students. Facilities for learning may extend much farther than the school yard, and these should be made more accessible to the urban child. School systems do not have to wait for more buildings to be built. They can rent space in stores, housing projects, warehouses, apartment buildings, churches. These structures might offer more flexibility than many of the present inner-city school buildings.

A school building may represent the greatest single investment in a poor city neighborhood or a poor community. School buildings should and will serve many more purposes than they do at present. School systems should keep buildings open during evenings, weekends, and summers. If the schools were open, children who have no place at home to study could use the classrooms and the libraries. Individuals and groups from the community, using the school facilities for their own projects, would begin to feel a sense of participation and ownership toward the school which would reduce the fear and hostility now created by mutual defensiveness and misunderstanding. The inadequacy of many urban school buildings offers the opportunity to exercise a degree of imagination and creativity unnecessary in schools whose flexibility is built in.

Education for the situation

Our country bases its education on a culture, traditions, and a set of values inherited from Western Europe; it has not incorporated the contributions of other groups of people who make up the many societies we call America.²⁰ This basis must be changed. In urban schools the black child and the Spanish-speaking child must be given materials which document their history and their uniqueness. Similarly, the white child, as well as learning about the achievements of his race, must also be offered the perspective that learning about other people and other races provides. The curriculum of the city school must be designed to help the child of the urban crisis come to grips with the grim reality of his daily life and to present him with a future which might be his—rather than cause him to cringe with shame because of the present or despair of ever attaining the future. The curriculum of every school must refrain from reinforcing in children society's tendency to make judgments about the worth of individuals on the basis of wealth, possessions, or race. Rather, judg-

ments of individual worth must be based on the child's own values and experiences as a person and as a member of a particular community. Such an approach to curriculum must be manifested in materials in all fields of study—natural sciences and mathematics as well as literature and the social sciences—which present realistically and fairly the various components of our nation and our world. All-white illustrations and examples in an arithmetic book are as untruthful and as unrealistic as an all-white history of the United States. The curriculum must also be cosmopolitan in outlook, emphasizing the interrelationships among an individual, his community, and his world. It must be relevant to the child's needs and to the needs of society. It must prepare him to perform effectively, economically, socially, occupationally, and psychologically; it must prepare him to do this as an individual, a parent, a member of a group, a citizen of his country and of the world.

Recommendations

Despite the poverty of their educational programs, the schools of the urban crisis present a great challenge, if anyone is willing to accept it: They offer the opportunity for the construction of an entirely new form of education unbounded by the restrictions which a degree of success has placed on other schools. At this point the Task Force suggests some directions in which the educational experience might be developed.

1. School staffs, students, and parents should participate in the definition of the goals and objectives of the schools and review the current programs offered to accomplish these goals.

The broad overall goals of the schools must be further spelled out in terms of expected student behavior, (i.e., operationalized objectives). As partners in this process, staff, students, and parents must decide what they want to happen in the school and examine what actually is happening. The school system and the board of education should provide time in the school calendar for this activity so that it can be carried out on a regular and continuing basis. In the review of the program the following areas should be examined:

The Curriculum: What is being taught?

Instructional Methods: How is the curriculum being taught? How is the school organized?

Materials Used: Are they multi-ethnic? Is there wide use of varying materials?

Learning Problems: What are the major difficulties students are experiencing?

Student Involvement: Are the students allowed/encouraged to make decisions about their own education?

Evaluation of Students, Program, and Staff: Are the methods and procedures adequate and accurate?

School systems should place great emphasis on developing methods of student assessment which focus on the child's progress and not on his ability to meet predetermined group norms. Programs should be evaluated continually to ensure that they are doing what they were designed to do. Every new program should have built-in provisions for funds to ensure that this evaluation takes place.

2. Individualized approaches to learning should be developed, implemented, continually evaluated, and refined.

In each city, boards of education through the superintendent and staff, teachers organizations, and public and student groups should work together to develop a master plan for assuring the highest quality of individual experiences for each child. State departments of education and the U.S. Office of Education must provide financial resources, consultant assistance, and pertinent research and information. The NEA should provide assistance and leadership to those who are attempting to develop such a plan.

3. Schools must develop realistic programs which recognize that education will be a lifelong experience.

Lifelong productivity in the world of work requires periodic retraining, if not continual education. In the life span of an individual much of his education will occur outside of the elementary and secondary school years. It may be logical and beneficial for some youth to become employed as early as possible and then to continue their education under the direction of their employer. Guidance and counseling services should be available to provide placement and follow-up services for students moving into jobs, technical training programs, universities, and colleges. In addition, the school should take leadership in helping agencies and institutions in the community develop rich and varied educational offerings for adults of all ages.

4. High priority must be placed on extending, expanding, and improving programs available for young children.

One way to attend to the needs of young children would be to establish public kindergarten and day-care centers; another solution would be to establish programs for mothers to assist them in providing early educational experiences for their children. Because youngsters develop concepts of race at early ages (i.e., two to four years of age) it is extremely important that contacts be provided outside segregated neighborhoods. This early childhood education should be designed to develop in the youngster an ability to come to grips with himself honestly and to develop a clear perception of other people.

5. The school should provide more assistance to the urban child, directly or through community agencies, to attend to his physical well-being.

Children who are hungry or in need of medical or dental care cannot be expected to learn in the manner desired by parents, teachers, or the community. Consequently, the physical needs of our children must be met. For example, the school lunch program should be provided for all who need it. If medical, dental, and other services are thus to be provided by the school, the patrons must realize that additional staff and facilities will need to be provided.

6. Programs which reflect the true history and accomplishments of Afro-Americans, American Indians, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans should be incorporated into the school program.

These programs must be available to all students, for their importance is as great to children from a white neighborhood as those from any other. Historians and publishers are urged to provide teacher organizations, schools, and colleges with information and materials which will enable them to develop their own programs for all age levels.

7. Students should be expected to share in the responsibility for determining their educational program and to participate in making decisions about their own educational and human growth.

School officials and local teachers organizations should work with students to devise strategies to accomplish shared decision making. Teachers have a unique opportunity to develop leadership skills in young people, but it must not be left to incidental or occasional experiences. Student responsibilities must be broadened in a deliberate and articulate manner throughout the entire elementary and secondary years. One component of such a program might be to have students assist in the education of their peers through paired learning and cross-age tutoring.

8. The school should encourage students to take an active part in shaping their own destinies.

Schools should recognize the unwillingness of young people to accept the errors of the past and respond accordingly to the general

Footnotes at end of article.

desire of students to participate in shaping their destinies. Two of the forces helping to create this change are the surge in black awareness and student activism.

9. The school must work in a cooperative manner with young people and the police and courts to improve their relationship.

The relationship between law enforcement agencies and youth is disintegrating. Teachers and other school staff members should work with the police to help them improve their contacts with young people. Because of the natural gravitation of youth into social clubs or gangs, teachers should be helped to understand the dynamics of the gang and the realities of gang life.

10. Local teacher organizations, urban and suburban, should develop an attack on socioeconomic biases, prejudice, and racism.

"Shortchanged" educators, parents, students, and other citizens must be helped to respect racial, social, ethnic, and religious differences; to appreciate, understand, and accept the rich diversity of American life. Local affiliates should work with boards of education, city officials, and civil rights organizations in their own communities—and with their counterparts in neighboring communities—to develop programs which will provide truly integrated experiences for children.

11. A wider variety of instructional materials should be made available and used by teachers and students.

Utilization of the products of the new instructional technology should be encouraged. These include closed-circuit television, teaching machines, talking typewriters, computer installations, media centers, single-concept film packages, and overhead transparencies. School systems should place greater emphasis on using teacher-developed and student-developed materials. Assistance should be provided to staffs in using or developing new materials, and incentives given for creative use of materials. For example, teachers could be rewarded for preparing materials which would be of use to other teachers in the city. The school system could establish a materials library in each school to facilitate the sharing of materials among teachers. The teachers association could itself establish a materials center and a professional library for its members.

12. Instructional materials used in all areas of the curriculum must accurately reflect the different ethnic, economic, racial, and social backgrounds and attitudes of America's pluralistic composition.

These materials must be positively related to the experiential backgrounds of children. Producers and potential producers of instructional materials must develop materials which reflect the above concerns and cease to create and distribute ones that do not. School systems must purchase only those instructional materials which accurately reflect these concerns; teacher organizations at the local, state, and national levels must insist that only such accurate materials be developed and utilized in the schools. It is essential that the materials produced by the National Education Association and its affiliates also reflect the true diversity of the American heritage.

13. Condemned buildings and educationally inadequate structures now in use should be replaced by facilities which accommodate a wide variety of learning experiences for all members of the community.

All new buildings should incorporate the latest in architectural design and educational technology. These facilities should be open during the evenings, weekends and summers to provide maximum use. They could be used as locations for adult education programs, consumer buying courses, recreational and cultural programs, and community meetings. School systems should make better use of existing facilities which may not be owned by the city but are located

there—museums, colleges and universities, business enterprises, and so forth.

14. Increased attention must be paid to the mobility of urban children across arbitrary school boundaries in our large urban school systems.

Among schools which have a high student turnover, special efforts should be made to coordinate programs and conduct joint social and recreational activities so that children are disoriented as little as possible by the mobility of their families. Administrative regulations might be changed to allow children to remain in a particular school when their families move to another neighborhood near enough to make transportation arrangements practical.

CHAPTER 3—STAFFING

The staff, like the program, of the schools of the urban crisis represents an intensification of the racial, cultural, and educational problems plaguing the rest of the nation. In most inner-city schools there is a serious deficiency of personnel, in both numbers and quality. Many of the teachers in these schools are not fully certified and have had little or no teaching experience. In addition, some of those teachers who have formal credentials and experience are prevented from being effective because of overt or subtle prejudices: They feel that the students are less capable, even less human, than others; or they feel that they are bearers of a higher civilization that will bring the students success and happiness.

These attitudes, of course, are prevalent in our society. Their existence in teachers illustrates how ineffective teacher education institutions have been in eradicating them. For the most part, inner-city educators have been trained in institutions which are middle-class oriented, and they have not had much exposure as part of their training program to persons of different cultural or socioeconomic backgrounds. Even when this exposure occurs through student teaching programs or other preteaching experiences, teachers are not usually helped to interpret, analyze, or understand what they see or think they see.²¹ Furthermore, they are often not made aware of the beauty, strength, and value of other cultures.

The effectiveness of the many experienced, competent, and sensitive teachers and administrators in the schools of the urban crisis is limited because of the conditions under which they must work. Their salaries are in many cases below U.S. Department of Labor standards of reasonable comfort.²² The obsolescence and inappropriateness of the school program, rigidified by the inflexible structure of governance, prevents them from working at a level of competence which they can respect. Inadequate funding saddles them with a dearth of materials and with buildings which often are physically hazardous and which, in any case, make imaginative and vigorous teaching more, not less, difficult.

The schools of the urban crisis must be staffed by a corps of educators who possess sufficient talent and training to offer students an excellent education. To this end, immediate steps must be taken to improve the initial preparation as well as the continued development of educational personnel. It is also imperative that school systems improve conditions of work and develop a climate in which effective teaching-learning can take place.

The educator

Urban schools need educators who are competent, i.e., sensitive, productive, and decisive; educators who demonstrate their belief in the real worth of each child, who respect children of different racial and socioeconomic backgrounds, and who know

and respect the values and customs of these backgrounds. Schools need educators who are themselves secure. Prospective educators and those who are currently in service must be continually provided experience and knowledge that will enable them to be aware of their own emotions and reactions. It is crucially important, furthermore, that educators have opportunities for self-renewal, for relief from the tensions and frustrations that accompany them daily.

An educator should be able to facilitate learning, or assist the child to think logically, as well as to understand and express his inner feelings. He should be able to establish and work comfortably in different kinds of learning situations—small groups and large, within the school setting or outside it. He must recognize that learning takes place all the time, wherever the child is; and that to affect the student positively, the school must work with, not against, the teachers and classrooms of the home and the street. The teacher must be willing and able to use the questions and suggestions of parents to improve his own method of approaching students. Similarly, he must be able to use various kinds of materials—traditional, newly developed, and available in the community or created by students, parents, or other staff members.

It is, therefore, necessary that the teacher be able to understand and make himself understood among the people of the school and community. He must understand the primary language of the students and community and avoid using professional argot, which will mark him as defensive and insecure. He must know how his own words and actions will be interpreted. A sensible and productive idea inaccurately expressed may appear patronizing or defensive and create hostility or disdain in the listener. The educator in the urban school must not be horrified by either the students' language or their experiences and feelings. He should be able to communicate and work not only with students but with other educators, specialists, parents, aides, and administrators. The principal and teachers of an urban school must be able to carry on the important process of communication with the total community in which they work.

To prepare students for the world in which they will live as adults, educators must unceasingly search for new answers to old questions, be thoroughly familiar with their areas of specialization, and keep themselves informed of new developments in the practice of teaching. They must be able to help students inquire rather than memorize. Teaching means assisting students in setting aims and goals, raising questions, developing hypotheses, testing solutions, noticing the people and the world around them. Teaching means encouraging students to solve problems effectively and to examine all hypotheses rigorously.

Educators must also know and understand the learning process. Each teacher should know how children learn. He should recognize that learning is not the same for all. He should know the place of drill and repetition and basic skills in the learning process. His role is to help the students use their own minds, develop their own reasoning powers so that they can differentiate between the relevant and the irrelevant. His goal is to help the students recognize their own insights as different and valuable perceptions even though greater minds might have seen more clearly.

If our educational programs are to provide each student the education that will most benefit him, educators must understand and use a process which includes the elements of (a) diagnosing, (b) planning, and (c) evaluating.²³ The competent educator using this process will recognize the difference between a temporary and a permanent

Footnotes at end of article.

need in a child. He will recognize the difference between what one child needs and what an entire group of children need. He will know what to look for when observing each child: Is the child falling asleep, fighting, whining, angry? He will be able to distinguish between healthy behavior and symptoms of emotional illness. He will observe how a child attacks a problem. He will look, listen, ask questions, and remember what he heard and saw. Once he collects these data, he will organize, analyze, and separate the relevant from the irrelevant, planning possible ways to meet a particular child's needs and problems.

After this necessary diagnosis, he is ready to prescribe; so he sets goals and objectives involving all students individually and as a group; selects and organizes people, materials, and content to meet the goals; and conducts activities. He will also set limits, identify and interpret expectations, and know the purpose of all the activities and their relationship to the goals. The educator will ensure adequate supervision, use materials and activities as creatively as possible, and help the children to help one another. He will know when to stop an activity and when to begin one; he will understand how to make a transition from one activity to another. He will know when the goal of an activity has been achieved because he will know what evidence shows him that it has been achieved.

The competent educator using this three-part process will know exactly what to evaluate. (1) Did the child accomplish the task or activity successfully? (2) Was the activity relevant to the objective? (3) Was the objective appropriate for the child? He will define what is being evaluated and select appropriate criteria for measurement. He will involve the child in self-evaluation, use consultants, observe the behavior of the child, and evaluate his own behavior as a teacher. After all these data, he will interpret the results, knowing what to accept or reject, compare his assessment with that of the child, recognize unrealistic goals, and judge the cause of success or failure as objectively as possible.

The Education of the Educator: If teacher education programs in colleges and universities are to prepare teachers who are capable of developing students into thinking human beings, radical changes are needed in both the content and the organization of present programs.²¹ An individual who wishes to become a teacher must be treated as an individual: His strengths and weaknesses must be diagnosed, and he must receive experiences planned with and for him. Just as behavioral objectives must be developed for each child, they must also be developed for teachers in training. Young men and women who plan to enter teaching must be evaluated on the basis of their possession of certain skills, as well as on how much they know about philosophies and psychologies of learning and teaching, child development, and subject matter fields. They must be far more involved in making vital decisions about their college programs than are today's students. They must have opportunities to decide, choose, make mistakes; thus they will learn how to make wise decisions.

A teacher in the schools of the urban crisis cannot be really effective unless he derives from study and from his own experience sufficient knowledge and understanding of urban sociology, anthropology, and behavioral psychology to have some insight into the values and the goals of his children and their families. He must understand the effect of the environment on the learning styles of students. Educators must never forget that if they treat a child as one who cannot learn anything, it is unlikely that they will ever teach him anything worth learning.

Ways must be found to determine and develop a prospective teacher's ability to understand and accept people of different races and socioeconomic classes. Preparation programs must give every prospective educator the opportunity to work with children of different races and backgrounds and thus to attain a perspective and an openness which will be valuable not only in his teaching but in his life.²²

His program of preparation must focus heavily on the development of teaching behavior and skills. He needs experience in setting objectives, deciding what behavior is appropriate in a given situation, and practicing that behavior in both real and simulated situations. Part of his preparation should deal with developing research skills and theory—the concepts which will enable him to interpret what he sees and does; to analyze, conceptualize, plan, and adapt theory to present situations as well as to future ones. Another part of his preparation should teach him how to work with adults in various roles in the learning process. He needs experience in working with parents, aides, and other teachers to enable him to teach more effectively in concrete situations. He also needs to be familiar with community agencies and how they affect children.

A much closer relationship must be developed between the colleges which prepare teachers and the urban schools in which they will teach.²³ Urban school systems and educators must work with college personnel to ensure the development of courses which will be helpful. College professors must from time to time teach in urban schools in order to become more sensitive to the needs of future teachers. Teacher education must become a continuing process. The lines between selection, initial preparation, induction into the profession, and graduate and continuing education should disappear. Entrance into the profession must be based on an evaluation of an individual's ability to perform specific actions and his potential for improving his abilities. Similarly, judgment of competency must be based on performance, on what one does rather than on what one knows. Since competency is not a static thing, opportunities for an educator's continued growth should be maximized. Educators, too, need career guidance to assist them in planning their professional development.²⁴

The Environment of the Educator: Improvements must be made in the climate and organization of urban schools.

For high morale, teachers need a feeling of achievement, of success in the task they regard as all important. Teachers need professional help when they encounter serious adjustment problems in their classes. They need adequate instructional materials and assistance from administrators and supervisors. They need relief from time-consuming clerical and housekeeping chores that can be performed by others. They need good working conditions, including opportunity for a breathing spell in the course of a long and strenuous day. Above all, they want their superintendents and principals to respect them as people and treat them as fellow-professionals. No amount of lecturing on the importance of teaching means much to the young person who is treated as a hired hand by a petty bureaucrat, regardless of whether the pettiness is shown by a principal, by a supervisor, or by a clerk in the superintendent's office. If we want teachers to feel that they are professionals, they must be treated as professionals.²⁵

Within the school, many different people perform many different tasks. Just as each child is unique, so too is each educator. The child should be the center of the educational program; and each person on the staff—the janitor, the principal, the aides, the secretary, the teacher, the specialist—must be allowed to work in a way in which he can best contribute his unique skills to the education of each individual child.

Educators need more time to teach, plan, learn, make decisions, and talk with colleagues and students. They must spend a far greater part of the school day in planning and learning. It has been said that from 15 to 20 percent of the teacher's time should be spent in *self-learning*.²⁶ That is, he must continually educate himself by studying the insights offered by his classroom teaching and by designing experiences to provide needed insights. For years, of course, lip service has been paid to this belief. If change is to take place in urban schools, however, we cannot continue "business as usual": We must begin by freeing our teachers so they can begin developing and instituting needed improvements. Individual educators must assume a far greater decision-making role in determining what methods of instruction and what resources they will use. Furthermore, they must have the skills and emotional strength necessary to work for improvement of the program and continuous reorganization of the school and school system.

During the coming years, teachers will be demanding higher salaries. The Task Force believes that this is inevitable and fitting. Teachers must be paid more. A competent staff is the most important factor in the education of children. If education is to be accorded high priority in this country, it can no longer be financed by paying educators poorly and then expecting Mr. Chips-like performances. Rising expectations of educators must be taken into account in the staffing of urban schools.

Recommendations

Recruiting, preparing, and retraining competent educational personnel is essential if the schools of the urban crisis are to develop adequate educational programs. School systems, state departments of education, state professional standards commissions, the federal government, the various accrediting agencies, and the universities which train educators should all assume greater responsibilities toward this end. Educators themselves, through their national, state, and local organizations, bear grave responsibility for promoting actions which will ensure that the schools of the urban crisis do secure, support, and retain the kinds of competent personnel they need—skilled and sensitive educators who are committed to providing the kind of education necessary for the survival of urban youth.

The Task Force makes the following recommendations to the above groups:

1. Greater freedom and decision-making responsibility should be placed with teachers and administrators in individual schools throughout the city.

The staffs of these schools should have the opportunity to plan at regular intervals and implement new programs which meet the needs of children in particular schools.

2. Overburdened teachers and administrators should receive more assistance from nonprofessional personnel who are capable of performing many of the tasks which teachers and administrators must now assume.

Introduction of new personnel must, of course, be accompanied by adequate training and continued training programs which involve the professionals as well as the non-professionals. School systems should develop programs which encourage nonprofessional staff members to move into careers in the education profession.

3. Special emphasis should be placed on assisting new and beginning urban teachers.

Beginning teachers should not be asked to assume the same amount or type of responsibility that experienced teachers have, and they should be provided with a great deal more assistance during their first year of teaching. Orientation programs for new and beginning teachers could be held before the beginning of the school year, with follow-up programs held intermittently throughout

Footnotes at end of article.

the year. Such programs might involve experienced teachers as well. The staff should be paid for attending such programs.

4. School systems should sponsor and pay for extensive inservice staff training programs.

These programs should be broad in scope. Principals, teachers, and specialists should decide what kinds of programs they need, and the school systems should provide programs that are designed and initiated to meet those expressed needs. In-service training should be considered a regular part of the educator's job, and school personnel should receive time and remuneration for attendance at such programs. These programs should draw more upon the skills and expertise of the faculty members of individual schools and people with special skills who live in the community, as well as college personnel and other consultants. Many more opportunities must be provided for teachers to visit other schools and cities, attend professional conferences, and do other things which would give them new ideas and strengthen their professional competence.

5. There should be widespread staff involvement in developing staff evaluation techniques. Evaluation should be used to improve rather than to criticize or condemn the teacher's performance.

Schools must provide the time and the resources necessary for staffs to improve their performance. The evaluation techniques used should measure both the educator's teaching skills and his personal relationship with the children and with other staff members.

6. Urban school systems and teacher education institutions should develop closer ties in order to develop more effective preservice training programs in the colleges and inservice training programs in the school systems.

Institutions which prepare undergraduates for careers in education should place a far greater emphasis on selecting and preparing persons who are capable of working in inner-city schools. Their programs should be geared toward providing these persons with the teaching skills and sensitivities they will need to be effective. Opportunities must be presented for them to understand and come into contact with people who live in the inner city. Colleges could establish programs which involve the students in summer jobs in the inner city or participation with an inner-city school staff as aides or assistants. In college programs, emphasis should be placed on a person's ability to perform specific teaching behaviors. The programs themselves must provide for far greater student responsibility and decision-making involvement.

Graduate programs aimed at preparing teachers to work in inner-city school situations should be improved and expanded. The federal government should increase appropriation to the Teacher Corps. School systems and universities should cooperatively develop Master of Arts in Teaching programs to recruit and train capable personnel who have not had undergraduate training in teacher education for educational careers.

7. School systems should initiate programs which will provide incentives and inducements for attracting capable and competent persons to enter urban school systems.

One type of program would be an arrangement whereby the school system hired a beginning teacher, in cooperation with the university developed a special graduate training program tailored to his needs, and paid for the teacher's graduate training. Another program would be the recruitment of returned Peace Corps and VISTA workers, accompanied by special orientation and training programs. There could be programs established which focus on hiring and preparing persons who have college degrees and have been employed in other fields but who now want to enter the teaching profession (especially women who wish to enter teach-

ing after their children have grown up). Another approach would be to send young, attractive, articulate teachers from the school system to recruit additional staff members from colleges and universities.

8. Provisions should be made in retirement and benefit programs and certification laws which will allow competent personnel to move into inner-city school situations without losing status or benefits.

Local and state education associations should examine benefit programs and certification and licensing requirements and should negotiate agreements or establish the legislation necessary to make the required changes. State departments of education and school systems should review existing regulations and change them as necessary.

9. More representatives of ethnic and racial minority groups must be employed in professional and executive staff positions in all phases of education.

State and local education associations must make a special effort to ensure that these representatives serve on appointed or elected governing boards, policy-making groups, committees, and commissions. The NEA, as well as working with its state and local affiliates toward this goal, must also improve its own employment policies and appointment procedures.

10. All segments of the education profession must receive training and experiences which will enable them to work effectively with parent, citizen, and community groups.

Boards of education; local, state, and national teachers organizations; colleges; and state departments of education should establish such programs for their personnel.

11. Persons within each community who are not now involved in the formal educational process but who have special skills—mothers, businessmen, industrialists, retired people, artists, electricians, plumbers, and others—should be included in the on-going educational program.

School systems should encourage and interest their staffs in using these resource persons. The school staff should have the freedom to decide how such personnel can best be used to augment the school program.

CHAPTER 4—FINANCING URBAN EDUCATION

Money—much more money—is needed to provide the children of American cities with the education they must have. Money alone will not solve the problems, but without money most of the problems cannot be solved. Money is needed to make reality of the education programs which the children of the urban crisis deserve. Without sufficient funds—ideas, plans, and possible solutions to problems remain untried or, at best, implemented on a limited and inadequate basis. The goals that have been outlined in the preceding chapters of this report cannot be effectively pursued without a solid foundation of financial support.

Money for urban education must be provided on such a scale and in such a way as to meet recognized needs. The amount of funds must be geared to the purposes they are intended to serve; the purposes should not be adjusted to fit funds readily available. Tailoring educational programs to fit existing funds results in a series of seemingly small educational economies which rapidly compound into educational disaster. The financial needs of schools of the urban crisis are too pressing to receive less than full support.

Nor can money do the job assigned to it unless the needs it must serve are properly understood. Financing programs of secondary importance while neglecting primary needs, funding the obvious costs of a program but overlooking essential auxiliary costs, failing to recognize the need for planning procedures that will ensure effective use of funds—all leave the problems unsolved and waste the money that was allocated to solve them. Effective financing involves procedures both for

acquiring sufficient funds and for directing the funds to the proper purposes.

Therefore, in considering the financing of urban education, it is necessary to give attention both to the needs for which funds must be provided and to the means of providing these funds.

The financial needs of urban education can be divided into two broad categories: remedies for problems of the past and responses to the challenge of the future. The foremost need for funds is to correct the deficiencies of the past and upgrade the regular educational program to the level of the best practices of contemporary education. In addition, it is necessary to develop new types of programs and apply new approaches and techniques to meet the special needs created by recent changes in the urban community. Providing funds adequate to the total financial need of urban education requires utilization of all three sources of financial support—federal, state, and local—in an appropriate and equitable manner. Suitable procedures need to be used for securing the input of sufficient funds into urban school systems and for securing the application of these funds to the specific needs of various communities within urban school systems.

Remedies for problems of the past

The major financial need of the schools of the urban crisis is a massive injection of funds to raise the regular educational program to a satisfactory level. There are certain things which any school system must provide if it is to offer an educational program to students: teachers, classrooms, equipment and supplies, pupil transportation, and other such basic services. Schools of the urban crisis must have the funds to provide these for the number and kind of students they have today, in accordance with today's educational standards, and at today's prices. However, years of neglect have produced a situation in which the schools of the urban crisis have fallen behind.²⁰ Pressure to economize, the temptation to postpone solving problems in the mistaken belief that time would solve them, and failure to foresee future developments have resulted in a gradual decline which now leaves the regular educational program of the city schools below minimum acceptable standards. To make up for this lapse, a great deal of money is needed, and it is needed at once. Even small changes will be costly, and important changes will be more costly; but not to change would be disastrous. The problem is not one that can be solved gradually—by putting in small amounts over a period of time. Unless the schools of the urban crisis receive an infusion of funds sufficient to catch up to where they should be, they will fall farther and farther behind. Without such a first step, other measures to finance the education of city children will be futile.

Once the accumulated deficiencies of the past have been remedied, the urban schools must have the means to maintain a regular educational program at a desirable level. Unless the funds are forthcoming to provide the essential elements of the educational program, the urban schools will again begin to fall behind and the pattern of decline will repeat itself. The most crucial of these essential elements is the teacher. To recruit and retain qualified teachers in urban schools, funds must be available to offer competitive salaries. To realize the objectives of reduced class size and individualized instruction, city schools must have enough money to employ enough teachers for their pupils.

Funds must also be available to maintain suitable school facilities. At present many urban school buildings are inadequate: some because of structural unsoundness; others because, although structurally sound, they are unsuited to the types of programs which urban pupils need today. City schools must

Footnotes at end of article.

have the means to replace such outdated facilities and to add new facilities when and where they are needed.

Urban schools must also have the funds to provide pupil transportation services necessitated by the changed physical and social make-up of the cities, which has created dangers to the safety of children on their way to and from school and has produced an environment of cultural isolation inimical to the best education. All these pupil services will require, on a continuing basis, the input of more funds than are currently being expended for such aspects of urban education.

However, in spite of present deficiencies, not all the needs of urban education have been neglected. Ideas and possible solutions do exist. Experimental and enrichment programs have been developed, and some have been put into operation on a limited basis. Frequently, however, lack of resources has prevented their full and effective implementation. One major obstacle to the success of such programs is the tendency to sacrifice existing programs for the sake of adding new ones. Experimental programs which are already in operation and show promise of success should receive continued financing and not be forced out of existence by the funding of new and more favored, but as yet untried and unproven, experiments.

Another financial problem of experimental programs is failure to fund the total cost of the program.²¹ A successful educational program requires a curriculum, sufficient space in a school building, appropriate staff, and supplies. If funds are provided for curriculum and supplies but not for the building and staff, a school that is already overcrowded and understaffed will not be able to implement the program. In funding experimental programs, it is particularly important to recognize the initial costs of preparing for and launching a new program. A new program cannot be introduced into a school overnight and begin functioning immediately. The present staff may not be trained to operate the new program, and other arrangements may be needed before it can be started. Time and money should be allowed to provide for these preparations in advance of initiating the program.

It is also important to recognize the need for maintaining experimental programs at a level beyond the regular program of the schools. Experimental programs often begin well, but in succeeding years the funds devoted to them are not increased sufficiently to permit them to continue in the status of experimental programs. When rising costs require an increase in the funds devoted to the regular program, a comparable increase in funds for the experimental program is frequently denied. Thus the distance between the experimental and the regular program begins to narrow and eventually reaches a point where the experimental program does not have the resources to do anything more than or different from the regular school program.

In addition, funds are needed to apply successful experiments on a wider basis so that their benefits will reach more children. The purpose of an experimental program is as a preliminary test. If the program is never implemented beyond the preliminary small-scale test, the purpose of the experiment is defeated and the majority of the pupils for whom it was intended never benefit from it. Increased funds need to be devoted to experimental programs of proven value so that they can be expanded to include greater numbers of children.

Responses to the challenge of the future

Although additional funds can do much to improve urban education within the framework of existing programs, much more is needed to provide for the special needs of

the inner-city community and its children. Socioeconomic conditions in the inner city make it necessary for the school to go outside the limits of the regular educational program and provide additional services without which education cannot accomplish its ends. Many needs which in communities with more money and more leisure are met by citizens and families at their own expense must be financed from public funds for residents of inner-city areas. Funds for city schools must be sufficient to provide for extending the school day, school week, and school year to compensate for lack of educational and recreational opportunities with suitable supervision for children during out-of-school hours. Similarly, more funds are needed to expand school services to include younger and older age groups through providing day care for pre-school-age children and developing the school as a community center for the adults of the community. Auxiliary services, such as health and nutritional programs for children whose parents cannot afford to provide these adequately, are other needs that should be met by the inner-city school system.

Other new areas of operation important to urban school systems also require financing. Among the most important are research and staff development. The need for educational programs developed at the local level to meet the specific needs of the urban community requires an extensive research operation staffed with qualified personnel to provide scientific analysis and evaluation. The demands on teachers and other professional staff members to implement new programs and respond to special needs of urban children make it necessary for the school system to provide special training to equip them for these tasks. Urban school systems should be undertaking extensive work in both these areas and need to receive funds specifically earmarked for these purposes.

Municipal overburden

The special and extensive needs of urban education described in the preceding chapters demand a greatly increased input of funds by local, state, and federal governments. City school districts alone do not have sufficient resources to effect the necessary changes and take on the new responsibilities they must meet. Not only do cities have extraordinary needs in the area of education, but the proportion of resources that they can devote to education is restricted by the need for other public services created by the concentration of population. The conditions of urban life require provision of extensive police and fire protection, water and sewage systems, and other services at public expense. In addition, the changing composition of the urban population has increased the need for welfare assistance provided at city expense. All these public services consume municipal revenue and limit the local funds available for education.²²

The special financial needs of cities should be recognized in providing state and federal aid to urban education. Just as sparsely populated areas have difficulty in amassing enough resources to provide an adequate educational program, so population density in cities creates financial problems which inhibit the development of an adequate educational program. It is necessary to compensate for both types of limitations and to distribute funds so as to achieve an optimum relationship between the extent of population and the amount of resources for an area. To achieve this, the higher cost of sparsity and density should be recognized in a double-ended approach to educational costs which will give appropriate weight to the special financial problems produced by the population density of urban areas.

State distribution formulas

Present formulas for the distribution of state funds to local school districts do not take account of special urban needs.²³ These

formulas are based on two factors: the educational need of the local district and the financial ability of the local district. Traditionally, need has been measured in terms of the number of children in the district and ability in terms of the assessed valuation per pupil enrolled in schools. These measures do not respond adequately to the urban situation as it exists today.

In considering the need of urban school districts, the number of pupils alone does not reflect the magnitude of the educational task to be fulfilled. It is necessary also to consider the cost of educating the kind of pupils who are located in urban areas. The concentration of children of lower socioeconomic background and oppressed minorities in the central cities has created an urban population which is more costly to educate. These children have special educational needs which require the extensive development of special programs at considerable expense to the school district. Under these conditions, more money must be expended per child to reach the same level of educational achievement that can be attained at less expense in communities of higher socioeconomic status.

Consideration should also be given to the geographical distribution of pupils in urban areas. This factor has traditionally been considered in the cost of educating pupils in rural areas where transportation to centralized school facilities is necessary. The comparable, though different, kind of needs created by the geographical location of urban pupils should receive similar consideration in the allotment of state funds.

In regard to financial ability, the assessed valuation per pupil does not properly reflect the problem of municipal overburden. A measure is needed that will give due weight to the financial demands on local resources created by population density. This might be done by calculating financial ability as assessed valuation on a per capita basis or per weighted measure of local government service need.

A revision of state distribution formulas is necessary to reflect these considerations. The need factor should be developed to include the kind of pupils to be educated and the geographical distribution of pupils in urban areas as well as the number of pupils. The ability factor should be altered to respond to municipal overburden.

Federal aid to urban education

The financial needs of urban education should not be regarded as a situation to be met exclusively or even primarily by the resources of state and local governments. Urban education is not just a problem of the cities, or even of the states. It is a national problem, confined to no one locality or region of the country. Although urban problems have been most noticeable in the older cities of the Northeast and Middle West, similar situations are developing in other parts of the country as a result of urbanization on a national scale. Not only is the financial problem of urban education national in scope, but it is also of such magnitude and seriousness that only the resources of the federal government are adequate to meet it satisfactorily. Without extensive federal contributions, the efforts of state and local governments to meet the needs of education in the cities will be unequal to the task.

It is necessary for the federal government to assume a full share of the responsibility for providing education to the children of the nation's cities and to bear at least one-third of the financial burdens which urban education needs impose. Existing federal programs providing funds for specific purposes are not an adequate vehicle for this task. The entire urban educational program needs to be undergirded with the resources of the federal government. Once such basic support is provided, categorical aids can be used effectively to meet specific problems; but without a solid financial foundation for the total edu-

Footnotes at end of article.

national program, specific aid programs cannot reasonably be expected to have the desired impact.

To provide the needed support, a substantial increase will have to be made in the federal expenditure for education. This expense cannot be overlooked or curtailed without an adverse effect on an already adverse situation. Urban education represents one of the nation's most pressing financial needs. If other demands on the federal budget preclude the allocation of sufficient funds for this purpose, the federal income tax surcharge should be extended, or even increased, to provide the necessary revenues.

Federal funds are needed not only in greater quantity but also on a basis that will permit their effective application to the educational needs of the local community. Although common urban characteristics create a similarity of urban education needs throughout the country in general terms, there exists no exact uniformity among the cities in regard to the educational programs best suited to their purposes. Decision making about specific expenditures is most effectively made at the local or community level, and inappropriate restrictions imposed by the federal government on the use of federal funds hinder rather than help the cause of urban education. Such limitations should not be attached to new funds allocated to urban school districts.

Similarly, limitations on existing federal programs for specific purposes which create bottlenecks and interfere with the implementation of these programs need to be revised. Funds should be made available to finance the total cost of such programs so that the inability to meet certain cost items locally will not inhibit participation by schools which need the program. One way of meeting this problem would be the addition of a percentage overhead to funds provided under such programs which the local district could apply to specific impediments to implementation.

Since decisions about expenditures should be made at the local level, the local school district must also have time to plan for the wise use of funds it receives from the state and federal governments. Funds from different sources need to be coordinated and a total budget developed that will make the most effective use of all money. Appropriation of federal funds, therefore, needs to be made far enough in advance of local budgeting that the local district will have time for this planning.

Local financial operations

Perhaps the most important step in the financing process is the application of funds to meet needs. To ensure the development of effective programs adapted to the needs of specific urban communities, decisions about the use of funds should be made by those who know and understand the specific situation best. There is no single blueprint for success in urban education which can be dictated from outside the immediate situation. Local school systems should have the authority and take the responsibility for developing programs directed to the children in the area. For example, it might be discovered that the chief impediment to educational achievement by pupils in certain schools was rapid pupil turnover and that the best way to help these pupils would be an arrangement to keep them with the same teachers; this could involve developing a transportation program and making suitable administrative arrangements. School systems should have enough flexibility in handling their funds to be able to work out original programs like this to serve the needs of their pupils.

An effective means of ensuring that school funds are going where they are needed and assuring and reassuring citizens and taxpayers that their money is being used wisely is the development of a local program plan-

ning/budgeting system (PP/BS). Such systems focus upon the needs to be met by programs and relate expenditures directly to the teaching-learning situation.²⁴ The development of a PP/BS requires the knowledge and expertise of different kinds of local school system personnel: the classroom teacher, who has direct contact with student needs and is responsible for the ultimate implementation of educational programs, research and analytical personnel with specialized knowledge of curriculum, and financial managers. This combination of specialized talents provides two-way communication between teachers working with pupils in the classroom and the central administration and puts the financial operations of the school system in direct touch with pupil needs.

Within the large and complex structure that is an urban school system, decisions about expenditure need to be made at the appropriate level so that the financial operation of the schools will bear a constructive relationship to the communities they serve. One way in which urban schools can participate in the life of the community and establish better community relations is through the purchase of supplies from community businesses. However, the advantages of mass purchasing and competitive bidding on a systemwide basis should not be forfeited in pursuit of this goal. One way of reconciling these aims would be to have contracts made on a competitive systemwide basis with the actual disbursement of the actual disbursement of the allotted funds and purchases made at the option of the local school to businessmen in its community.

Budgetary operations must also be directed to the needs of the local community; parents and citizens must be assured that their schools are responding to their needs. Although centralized coordination of financial operations is necessary, the principle of decision making by those who know the situation best should be maintained within the school system. An urban school district is too large and includes within its boundaries too many different schools and different types of communities for all budget decisions to be made effectively by a somewhat remote central authority. It is the local school building and its professional staff that should serve as the center of budgetary planning and execution. This will secure the last link in the chain of transmitting the needed amount of money to the benefit of the individual pupils in the schools.

Recommendations

1. More funds are needed to finance urban education programs.

Tax systems of federal, state, and local governments should share equally the cost of financing urban education.

No one tax should bear a disproportionate share of the cost: property, sales, and income taxes should be utilized in an equitable manner.

2. The federal government should be a full partner in the continuing support of education. Without federal funds, state and local resources will be insufficient to meet these pressing needs.

The federal share should be increased to equal one-third of the total revenues for education.

Federal funds should be provided for the support of the general educational program, without which categorical aid is not effective.

Categorical aids should be provided for special urban programs.

The priority of urban education needs is such as to call for a federal income tax surcharge for education.

3. State distribution formulas should be revised to take account of (a) special urban needs not generally recognized and (b) the reduced ability to support schools because

of the increased requirement for public services created by the concentration of large numbers of people in urban areas.

4. Massive amounts of money should be made available for compensatory adjustment to meet the accumulated problems of past neglect and to raise the regular educational program of urban schools at least to the level of acceptable practice.

5. To maintain the regular educational program of cities on a par with the best practice in the nation, adequate resources should be made available for—

The upgrading of professional salaries.

Increasing the number of professional and paraprofessional staff members.

The replacement of structurally unsound or educationally inadequate (even if structurally sound) buildings and facilities.

Transportation adapted to the special needs of pupils in metropolitan areas.

6. Increased funds should be made available for the expansion of existing experimental programs.

Existing programs developed by local city school districts to meet the special needs of pupils should be eligible for categorical federal and state aid aimed at such target populations.

Provisions for experimental programs should take account of the total cost of the program, including facilities, staff, curriculum, and supplies, and not be limited to one aspect of the cost.

The extra cost of experimental programs should continue to be recognized after the initial funding.

Funds should be made available for the extension of proven experiments to more children and schools.

7. Funds available to urban schools should be sufficient to permit local school systems to develop extensions of the school program necessary to meet the special needs of pupils and citizens in the urban community, including the following:

Extension of the school day, school week, and school year.

Development of the school to include day-care centers for preschool-age children and to serve as community centers for adults.

Health and nutritional programs.

8. Specific aid should be provided so that local school systems can develop adequate services for research and staff development programs without which urban education cannot meet the challenge of rapid change.

9. Appropriation of state and federal funds should be made sufficiently in advance of budgeting by local school districts so that they can plan for efficient use of funds.

10. Funding of urban educational programs should be flexible, permitting the application of resources to the areas of greatest need as analyzed and determined at the local and community level.

The use of state and federal funds should be determined by the local school district.

A program planning/budgeting system should be developed on a local basis, utilizing the cooperative talents of classroom teachers, local research and analytical personnel, and financial managers.

Within limits of the principles of mass purchasing and competitive bidding, steps should be taken to facilitate the purchase of supplies and services from community businesses.

The local school building and its staff should be the unit for the analysis, planning and evaluation of programs and for the development and execution of budget.

CHAPTER 5—URBAN EDUCATION: CHALLENGE TO THE NEA

The problems of urban America are the problems of every citizen in this country, of every member of the National Education Association. The NEA has great ability—and equally great responsibility—to do all it can immediately to improve the conditions of education in urban areas. In light of this,

Footnotes at end of article.

the Task Force on Urban Education makes the following recommendation: The National Education Association should establish a Special Project on Urban Education.

The NEA has already demonstrated its concern for the quality of education provided the poor and the powerless by such actions as the establishment of its Center for Human Relations. Now in accordance with the high priority it has assigned urban education, it should allocate staff and resources commensurate with the degree of emergency which now exists in urban areas. This Project should be staffed with knowledgeable persons who are sensitive to the problems identified in this report. We suggest that the Project (a) report directly to the executive secretary or to his deputy, (b) be organized to fulfill a facilitating function for the NEA and to provide external assistance to local associations and other groups, and (c) have the ability to respond when asked for assistance.

The Special Project should work with all NEA units and departments, as well as outside agencies, to attack head-on the problems of education of children and youth in big cities; develop where feasible and when requested programs with state and local associations and other groups to illustrate what can be done to improve teacher education, staffing patterns, curriculum, instructional approaches, parent-citizen involvement in decision making, and other elements in the operation of the schools; work as closely as possible with NEA's urban and metropolitan area affiliates on requests to provide appropriate tools, materials, guidelines, and other forms of assistance in dealing more effectively with problems of urban education.

We recommend that the Special Project design an ideal innercity school and put it into operation.³⁵ Planning of the school should involve both authorities on urban education and the community where the school is located. The staff should be selected from among volunteers on the basis of standards of competence in urban education. The Project could seek funding for the model school from the federal government and/or a private foundation and could develop ancillary projects in cooperation with colleges and universities.

This Project might also help affiliates in urban areas develop proposals for legislation to improve urban education. It might further (a) maintain contact with resources that could be used to solve various specific problems in urban education and mobilize these to provide information and assistance both to NEA affiliates and to other groups as needed, (b) assist the NEA Staff Development Academy to develop in-service programs which will help NEA become more sensitive to and aware of the problems of urban schools, and (c) work with NEA's Office of Communications and Public Relations to make the public and the profession aware of the problems and promises of urban education.

FOOTNOTES

¹ National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968, pp. 236-41.

² Grier, William H., and Cobbs, Price M. Black Rage. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

³ See Southern Regional Council. Lawlessness and Disorder: Fourteen Years of Failure, in Southern School Desegregation. Atlanta, Ga.: the Council, 1968; and U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

⁴ See Udall, Stewart. 1976: Agenda for Tomorrow. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968; Faltermayer, Edmund K. Redoing America: A Nationwide Report on How To Make Our Cities and Suburbs Livable. New York: Harper & Row, 1968; Advisory Com-

mission on Intergovernmental Relations. Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968; and Graubard, Stephen R., editor. "The Conscience of the City." Daedalus 97: 1091-1430; Fall 1968.

⁵ Miel, Alice, and Keister, Edwin, Jr. The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia: What Schools Don't Teach About Human Differences and What Can Be Done About It. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1967.

⁶ See Halpern, Ray. "Tactics for Integration." Saturday Review 51:47-49, 66; December 21, 1968.

⁷ Canty, Donald. One Year Later: An Assessment of the Nation's Response to the Crisis Described by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, D.C.: Urban America, Inc., and the Urban Coalition, 1969, p. 35.

⁸ See National Education Association. Schools for the Sixties. A Report of the Project on Instruction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963. This volume offers a wealth of information on all aspects of decision making. The NEA's Center for the Study of Instruction is working currently on a companion volume, Schools for the Seventies.

⁹ See Havighurst, Robert J. "Metropolitanism and the Schools." Urban Review 3: 7-9; November 1968; and Eldredge, H. Wentworth. Taming Megalopolis: What Is and What Could Be. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1967.

¹⁰ This is a definition, not of *decentralization* in its strict sense, which describes an administrative device, but of *decentralization* as it has been used in recent discussions of the distribution of authority and as it is used in this publication.

¹¹ See Fantini, Mario D. "Alternatives for Urban School Reform." Harvard Educational Review 38: 173-75; Winter 1968.

¹² See Council of Chief State School Officers. State and Local Responsibilities for Education. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1968, p. 90. The list of books and articles on decentralization is extensive. The Task Force refers the reader to the comprehensive Bibliography on Decentralization published by the Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. See Bundy, McGeorge. Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System for New York City. New York: Mayor's Advisory Panel, 1967. The Economic Studies Program of the Brookings Institution held a Conference on the Community School in December 1968. The papers, prepared by leading educators throughout the country, will be published shortly by the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

¹³ Examination of these questions and issues is the sole action recommendation of this chapter, as the Task Force believes it is the relevant and necessary response to the difficulties of urban school reorganization.

¹⁴ Examination of the preceding questions and issues is the sole action recommendation of this chapter, as the Task Force believes it is the relevant and necessary response to the difficulties of urban school reorganization.

¹⁵ National Education Association, Task Force on Human Rights. Report. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1968, p. 37. (Adapted from Clark, Kenneth. Dark Ghetto. New York: Harper & Row, 1965, p. 121.)

¹⁶ Cheek, Donald, vice-president, Lincoln University, Oxford, Pa. Testimony before the Task Force on Urban Education, Washington, D.C., October 12, 1968.

¹⁷ Edelfelt, Roy A. "A Possible Dream: A New Education and New Models of Teachers." The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teaching Roles. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1968, p. 115.

See Committee for Economic Development. Innovation in Education: New Directions for

the American School. New York: the Committee, 1968; and Goodlad, John I. The Changing School Curriculum. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966.

¹⁸ See Frazier, Alexander, editor. Educating the Children of the Poor. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a department of the National Education Association, 1968, 41 pp.

¹⁹ National Education Association, Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. Baltimore, Maryland: Change and Contrast—The Children and the Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1967, p. 42.

²⁰ National Education Association, Task Force on Human Rights. Op.cit. pp. 40-43.

²¹ Smith, B. Othanel, in collaboration with Saul B., and Pearl, Arthur. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

²² Rice, Arthur H., Jr. "Where the Action Is." Today's Education: NEA Journal 57:75-82; September 1968.

²³ Drawn from "Teacher Preparation for Early Childhood Education: A New Appraisal." Paper prepared by an ACEI-EKNE-TEPS Ad Hoc Joint Committee on the Preparation of Nursery and Kindergarten Teachers. Washington, D.C., June 26, 1968, pp. 7-9 (Mimeo.)

²⁴ Smith, B. Othanel. Op. cit.

²⁵ See Taylor, Harold. The World and the American Teacher. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968, pp. 292-305.

²⁶ See National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. A White Paper: Recommendations of the Student NEA Executive Committee on Priorities and Programs for 1968-1969. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1968.

²⁷ Koontz, Elizabeth D. A Consumer's Hopes and Dreams for Teacher Education. The Tenth Charles W. Hunt Lecture. (Presented at the twenty-first annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, Ill., February 26, 1969.) Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1969.

²⁸ Rivlin, Harry N. Teachers for Our Big City Schools. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1955, p. 30.

²⁹ Passow, A. Harry. Toward Creating a Model School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C., Public Schools. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1967, p. 5.

³⁰ Campbell, Alan K. "Inequities of School Finance." Saturday Review 52: 44-48; January 11, 1969.

³¹ See Fairfax, Jean. (Chairman, Committee on School Lunch Participation.) Their Daily Bread: A National School Lunch Program. Atlanta, Ga.: Church Women United, National Board of the YWCA, National Council of Catholic Women, National Council of Jewish Women, and National Council of Negro Women, 1968.

³² McLoone, Eugene P. "Modernizing State School Finance Programs: Six Selected Areas." Interdependence in School Finance: The City, the State, the Nation. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1968.

³³ National School Boards Association. State School Finance Laws Handbook. Proceedings of the 1968 Workshop, Detroit, Michigan, March 28-31, 1968.

³⁴ Burkhead, Jesse, with Fox, Thomas G., and Holland, John W. Input and Output in Large City High Schools. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1967. Ch. 6, pp. 87-107.

³⁵ This assigns the Project specific responsibility for implementing a recommendation of the Task Force on Human Rights which appears on page 72 of its Report of 1968, published by the National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

TAKE A MODEST STEP

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a public-spirited leadership move being made by one of America's largest companies which, I think, should hearten those of us who believe in both the free enterprise system and helping those in need.

I am referring to a new program called "take a modest step" which has been instituted by Olivetti Underwood Corp. The program, announced just a few weeks ago by Gianluigi Gabetti, president of the firm, appeals to the company's 6,000 employees throughout the United States to individually and voluntarily take it upon themselves to try to help alleviate urban ills in this country.

In a talk to 500 company management personnel, Mr. Gabetti urged them, and all Olivetti employees:

Enter some doorway in human life in the community where that life can be heartened and improved and to reach out to the underprivileged, the minorities, the lost, the lonely who make up what has come to be called the urban crisis in America.

The program depends on individual personal motivation and can take place privately or through already established organizations, such as churches, or other groups, which have been formed to tackle contemporary social and environmental problems. As stated by Mr. Gabetti:

We must lead the way in confronting community problems that must be solved if all of us are to survive as decent, healthy, hopeful human beings in our time.

Certainly this type of leadership effort in an area so critical today deserves the applause and support of all of us concerned with the welfare and progress of our Nation and its people. I am pleased to say that this company, although related to Olivetti of Italy, contributes significantly to the economic welfare and the balance of payments of this country through heavy investment in manufacturing, marketing, and servicing facilities in the United States.

The following editorial from the Coatesville, Pa., Record of Friday, May 23, is an example of the comments being made throughout the country on this noteworthy program:

TAKE A MODEST STEP

One of the most heartening stories we've come across in weeks was an account of a new concept in applied good citizenship to be carried out, on a voluntary basis, by employees of an American corporation.

The Olivetti Underwood Corporation is a large and progressive organization numbering some 6,000 employees, with many offices throughout the country. Olivetti President Gianluigi Gabetti recently announced a community action program to be undertaken by company employees in cities where Olivetti has offices.

Urging Olivetti Underwood people "to enter some doorway in human life in the community where that life can be heartened and improved," Gabetti emphasized the need for reaching out to "the underprivileged, the minorities, the lost, the lonely who make

up what has come to be called the urban crisis in America."

The unusual aspect of the program lies in its being launched through completely * * * hours and unpaid service. It can take place in a community organization to which an employe already belongs, in newer organizations formed to tackle contemporary social and environmental problems, or in individual service to a neighbor.

The program, called "Take a Modest Step," carries awards for meaningful work. These will, however, be non-monetary. "How can we put a price tag that means anything on an award to a person who will really work at this?" Gabetti asked.

"There is a shortage of simplicity about us," Gabetti continued. "We make a giant, incredible leap to the moon, but we appear to have forgotten how to cross the streets to a neighbor in need. Certainly this must change, and those of us who can must be the instruments of change, effected through simple, direct approaches to others."

We applaud this kind of thoughtful leadership from business leaders. They seem to understand that kind acts, helpful service to others, and genuine concern for the unfortunate carry rich and lasting satisfactions for those who are willing to work selflessly. We hope other corporation heads will see the worth of the kind of program Olivetti Underwood is sponsoring.

CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD UNCOVERS HIDDEN MIRV CONTRACT IN PENTAGON

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) is responsible for uncovering a contract signed by the Pentagon with General Electric for the production of MIRV's—multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles. The contract was signed despite the administration's consideration of a moratorium on the building of such weapons as part of an arms agreement with Russia. The signing of the \$87 million contract, on the same day that the President announced his consideration of not deploying such weapons is but another in a series of indices of the vast and steadily increasing influence of the military-industrial complex on our foreign policy, our Government, and ultimately on all of our lives.

We can thank Mr. MOORHEAD for bringing this contract into the open before it is too late to prevent the construction of the MIRV's. The following editorial from the Monday, June 30, 1969, Detroit Free Press commends our colleague for his detective skills and amplifies the question to which we all seek an answer—"Just who is conducting our foreign policy, the President or the Pentagon?"

The editorial follows:

EIGHTY-SEVEN MILLION DOLLAR MISSILES HIDDEN IN THE PENTAGON

Rep. William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania could do worse than to ask President Nixon one simple question: "Who the hell is conducting foreign policy, the President, with the advice and consent of Congress, or the Pentagon?"

Moorhead, a member of the Joint Eco-

nomics Committee studying defense spending, has discovered that the Pentagon, without a word to anyone, signed an \$87 million contract with General Electric to build 68 MIRV's, the multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles. GE builds what the Pentagon calls the "bus" for the nuclear warheads.

What's more, the Pentagon signed the contract on June 20, the same day that President Nixon said in his news conference that he was considering a MIRV moratorium as part of an arms control agreement with Russia. And it was in the same week that the resolution was introduced, signed by 41 members of the Senate, calling for a moratorium. Mr. Nixon called the resolution a "very constructive proposal."

The Pentagon, without question, is guilty of the "willful concealment" Moorhead charged. It made no mention of the contract in its press release, and did not even report it to the Commerce Department which issues a daily list of contracts in excess of \$25,000.

When pressed, the Pentagon admitted that Moorhead had his facts straight.

What's more, the Pentagon had slipped the appropriation measure through Congress. When the Appropriations and Armed Services committees went over the budget, there was no mention of MIRV. It was one line—"Missile procurement—Air Force."

Unless this contract is stopped and stopped fast, any MIRV moratorium will be down the drain. Russia will of necessity, have to conclude that we are MIRVing all our Minuteman missiles, which will at least triple our offensive striking power.

A MIRVed Minuteman will carry three or more warheads, each with the power of nearly one megaton, or one million tons of TNT.

Russia, looking at us with the same jaundiced view we take of them, will be forced to MIRV its own SS9 missiles, increase its ABM deployment, and this in turn with typical Pentagon logic, will compel us to escalate again.

The first stage alone will cost an estimated \$11 billion. And the more missiles one nation has, the greater the likelihood that some general is going to decide they ought to be used.

Then the question becomes: If one nation is going to use them, why shouldn't we be first? The time to stop it is now.

TIME FOR U.S. ACTION IN THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, daily the headlines in our Nation's newspapers announce continuing Arab attacks and further aggressions against our true friends in the important Middle East—the State of Israel. We read of warlike preparations being made by Egypt and other Arab countries which gives credence to the often proclaimed intention of Nasser to drive Israel into the sea.

It is needless for me, Mr. Speaker, to allude to the well-known fact that our world is clearly divided between free world and the Communist slave world. We quite naturally want peace and desire that nations shall live amicably together; however, such ideal cannot be achieved when the flames that are being lit in the Middle East are being fueled with Russian guns and ammunition supplied to Egypt and other Arab countries.

It is also unfortunate that some Americans, both white and black extremists, are assisting in making the already tense situation become more explosive. In this connection, I read a very illuminating article in the Northwest Star of Pikesville, Baltimore County, Md., dated June 5, 1969 which sheds light on the situation. This is the area's only independent community paper published for families in Baltimore's lively northwestern suburb.

Because of the importance of the subject and also of the national interest in this matter, I submit this informative article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN WHITE AND BLACK EXTREMISTS HELP TO FUEL THE MIDDLE EAST FLAMES

The anti-war sentiments in the United States are growing. Yet armed conflicts to settle international differences have become a way of life, regardless of the supposed civilization of the human races. While attempts are being made to douse the danger in Korea, the seemingly endless jungle warfare involving half-a-million of our boys in South Vietnam goes on and on and on. And in Paris they are sparring with diarrheal abandon while each week several hundred more young Americans are buried and maimed.

There are minor brush fires in Nigeria, Sudan, India and Siberia. But they seem remote at this time at least. However, the continuing 21-year-old conflict in the Middle East is anything but remote. Israel, a new country that came into being through a majority United Nations vote, and with the decided blessings of the United States, is continuing to be the center of a world-wide time fuse.

The United States has international commitments that it seems honor-bound to sustain—and salvage. When the French lost their shirts and their pride at Dien Bien Phu, they handed the hot potato to Uncle Sam (or Sugar, or Sucker). We picked it up. We're still trying to dump it after a decade. Is then Israel any less important?

If our Big Brother attitude is official, it would seem that our concern for a country like Israel should be much greater. As Americans we admire progress, industriousness, directness, aggressiveness, self-reliance. This Israel has displayed with abandon. It has a thoroughly Europeanized (rather than Oriental or Asiatic) way of life and philosophy—just like Americans have. It has ties to America not only because of its 2½ million Jews to the 6 million Jews of the U.S., but because it has exhibited its bootstraps, pioneer determination—a thoroughly familiar reflection of our own American traditions.

By contrast, the Arab attitudes, philosophy, rhetoric and logic is completely alien to our way of life and thinking. They speak in parables and analogies. They say "we will kill them" and mean that they want to overwhelm them. They threaten genocide but mean to eliminate a thousand soldiers. They say that they shoot down the Israeli air force, and mean that they downed two planes and crippled a third. King Hussein's two-faced diplomacy is typical—not at all surprising. He recently came to this country to plead for peace—yet was the first to start 3 wars in 21 years; first to lend defacto encouragement to El Fatah terrorists!

Life is cheap and achievement for most Arabs is a foreign term to be avoided. But they do have oil. And we do have American capital invested in Arab oil wells and pipe lines.

COMMUNIST LEANINGS

Clearly, the Arabs in the Middle East have aligned themselves with the Russians, and more recently, with Maoist China. In the United States and in the Western hemisphere, Arab students have formed organizations in alliance with Communist and

Trotskyite bands, with Black Panthers and Mohammed X followers. They are collecting funds to perpetuate Middle East unrest and terror—and their very associates spell out who their friends are: the Russian-supported and China-supported communists on the one side, and the far-right Nazi-fringe on the other.

Arab ideology is probably counter to everything the United States stands for and aims for. Our stand in Korea and Vietnam has been far less pussyfooting than in the Middle East, and it is an enigma to be sure. Peace in Israel can mean much to many people—and the Israelis have proven it by their own progress and by the way their commercial, agricultural and industrial missions are helping underdeveloped countries all through Africa. They can, and offered, to do the same for the underdeveloped Arab areas adjacent to Israel.

Yet stupid pride has prevented the Arab countries from accepting Israel's help. Meanwhile, here in our own country, subversive, Anti-American groups marshal minds and money to perpetuate the strife in the Middle East.

Here are excerpts from an in-depth study by the Anti-Defamation League that point to facts and figures of this growing problem within our shores:

Supporters include the 10,000-member Organization of Arab Students, groups on the Communist "old left," New Left radicals and some black extremist and revolutionary organizations.

El Fatah, which has claimed "credit," directly or through subsidiary organizations, for terrorist acts both in Israel and against Israel jetliners at Athens and Zurich airports, bases its American operations in the offices of the Palestine Liberation Organization at 801 Second Ave., New York. El Fatah merged with the PLO in Cairo early this year.

The office is directed by Saadat Hassan, a long-time Arab propagandist in the U.S.

Until recently, "Free Palestine," El Fatah monthly, was available only in England and France. Now subscriptions to the English-language edition are available through a Washington, D.C. post office box number. (Spanish and German editions are planned.)

Activities of the Fatah guerrillas have received substantial and favorable treatment, according to the ADL, in "The Black Panther," official publication of the Black Panther Party, and "Muhammad Speaks," organ of the Black Muslim movement led by Elijah Muhammad. "The Black Conscience," published in Detroit by the Organization for African American Education, carried an article in its first issue, dated April-May 1968, that glorified El Fatah and denounced Israel. The article had been reprinted from the "Militant," organ of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party.

Pro-Fatah positions also have been taken repeatedly by other extremist elements, the ADL said, notably by: Youth Against War and Fascism, youth arm of the pro-Peking Workers World Party; the Committee to Support Middle East Liberation; and the U.S. Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front, a pro-Viet Cong group—all of whom picketed the U.S. mission to the UN this February in support of El Fatah. Other extremist supporters of El Fatah include: the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party—formed in the early 1960s by Communist Party dissidents—whose "World Revolution" quarterly published the first international communique issued by El Fatah; the Militant Labor Forum, and arm of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, which sponsored a pro-Arab, pro-Fatah program at party headquarters in Philadelphia in March. The main speaker was Charles Massoud, a member of the Organization of Arab Students at the University of Pennsylvania.

There have been recent indications, the league said, that Students for a Democratic Society, strongest of the student New Left

organizations, may be moving toward "acceptance of old-line, anti-Zionist Arab propaganda, overlaid with support for the new Third World-vs-colonialism line of Arab revolutionaries—and toward a pro-Fatah position."

It is said that two recent issues of "New Left Notes," the official weekly published by S.D.S., presented a long series headlined "History of Middle East liberation struggle."

In addition to Fatah activities in the U. S. the ADL is concerned, Forster said, with reports of Fatah mobilization elsewhere around the world. England, where "Free Palestine," the Fatah publication, began to appear last June; and France, where Fatah propagandists have been gaining support in the French student left, are among the European locations of efforts on behalf of Fatah that the League is watching, he said.

OUR PRIORITIES

The explosive Middle East situation is a fight not only between Israelis and Arabs, between medievalism vs modernism, Eastern and Western ideologies, but between the two prime protagonists: America and Russia. Israel has often been referred to as the "bastion of Democracy in the Middle East", but rarely of late have we heard this fact brought out unequivocally. We have pushed billions of made-in-U.S.A. dollars into pest-holes in East and Southeast Asia, squandered more billions in nursing former enemies back to national health, but have lavished precious little on Israel, simply because American bonds-for-Israel investors, Jewish contributions, and Israeli self-help combined to make charity needless.

From where we stand, it is a matter of priorities. It seems in the interest of the United States to take a firm and honest stand in favor of our friends who pay for their purchases and look to America for technical, political and moral guidance—and not encourage those who falsely accuse us of shooting down their planes, of who spitefully cut off oil from American-financed wells, and who praise the killer of a U.S. Senator as a Fatah hero!

MANY PEOPLE COMPLAIN THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS IS DETERIORATING RAPIDLY

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an article from the Wall Street Journal which illustrates dissatisfaction among consumers over the malfunctioning of new appliances and other products.

The article correctly reports upon the consumer crisis in this Nation, pinpointing the cause of the problem—the inadequate control by a number of manufacturers. The problems with poorly made consumer products, as uncovered by the Wall Street Journal, range from simple kites to color televisions.

In too many cases, purchasers of a defective product are unable to have it repaired or replaced without a lot of effort, and in many cases, the payment of a substantial service charge.

To correct this situation, I have introduced legislation designed to provide consumers the protection they need. It establishes a minimum 1-year warranty period, and requires that if the product

fails during that period, the retailer must either repair or replace it quickly, and at no cost to the buyer.

The article, "Caveat Emptor—Many People Complain the Quality of Products is Deteriorating Rapidly," from the Wall Street Journal follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 26, 1969]

CAVEAT EMPTOR—MANY PEOPLE COMPLAIN THE QUALITY OF PRODUCTS IS DETERIORATING RAPIDLY—FREQUENT CHANGES IN DESIGN, PRICE RIVALRY ARE FACTORS; KITES, SHOES, TV'S CRITICIZED—"PEOPLE EXPECT TOO MUCH"

Roofs leak. Shirts shrink. Toys maim. Toasters don't toast. Mowers don't mow. Kites don't fly. Radios emit no sounds, and television sets and cameras yield no pictures.

Isn't anything well made these days?

Yes, some things are. A man at Consumers Union, the publisher of Consumer Reports magazine, says that refrigerators are better than ever, for instance, and that wringer washing machines are becoming much safer. But he agrees that shoddy goods abound, and Wall Street Journal reporters' talks with Americans from coast to coast indicate that quality of merchandise is worse than ever.

Price is no factor. Expensive goods fall apart or fail to work or have missing parts with the same regularity as cheap goods, buyers say. What's more, they complain that it's often a long, hard fight—sometimes a long, hard, costly fight—to get the merchandise repaired or replaced. They say salesmen and factory representatives have become masters of doubletalk and artists of the runaround.

For their part, sellers and manufacturers see things differently. Most companies contacted say their complaints are actually declining (though most Better Business Bureaus report the opposite), and they say that many of the complaints they do get are due to stupid customers. "Customer knowledge isn't as good as it should be. People don't read instructions. They just try to plug things in and make them work," maintains L. G. Borgeson, a vice president of RCA Service Co.

A BUZZ, A BLURR AND A HISS

But Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Tillman of Memphis aren't dumb, and they say it isn't their fault that the Magnavox television set hasn't worked right since they bought it three years ago. They paid \$1,200 for their console, but Mrs. Tillman says the world of color hasn't been so wonderful for them.

"The longest we've gone without a service call is three months," she says. The problem: "When you turned the set on, it sounded like a buzzer at a basketball game. You could see the picture, but it was like the times in a movie when the picture just flips up and down. We had to keep it unplugged, because it hissed whenever it was plugged in, even if it was off."

The people at Scott Appliances Inc., where the Tillmans bought the set, refused to replace it, Mrs. Tillman says, and so finally the Tillmans hired a lawyer this spring. No suit was filed, but the lawyer did get some action. Three weeks ago Magnavox replaced everything in the set except the speakers. Mrs. Tillman isn't completely happy—she says the speakers were a major problem—but so far she has no more complaints "So far, it's been working fine," she says. "But I haven't really played it much. We've been out of town."

A spokesman at Scott Appliances won't comment on Mrs. Tillman's case, except to say that Scott stands behind its products even though "it's a headache and a cost to us." A spokesman at Magnavox in Skokie, Ill., says he is aware of the Tillman case. He doesn't explain the Tillman's long wait for replacement parts, but he says, "We try to show interest in a customer's inquiry."

WHY ARE THINGS SO SHODDY?

It isn't difficult to find people like the Tillmans who have complaints. Not so long ago, eight employees in a small Chicago office of CNA Financial Corp. were comparing notes on new purchases they had recently made. The most common thread: Six of them had bought defective goods. The Consumer Reports man to the contrary, the finish on a \$425 GE refrigerator was peeling. A \$400 Admiral color TV set required a two-week factory overhaul. A \$20 pair of women's shoes ripped at the seam during the first wearing. The chain fell off a \$32 training bike. A Roper dishwasher was installed incorrectly and had a defective timer. And a Roper gas range had a defective pilot light.

Why does this happen? Morris Kaplan, technical director of Consumers Union, says there are a couple of reasons for quality deterioration. First of all, he says, there is simply less quality control at many factories. He blames this in part on "the annual model change" in appliances and other goods. "The drive to get the new model out will frequently make it impossible for the manufacturer to do anything in the way of quality control," he says.

A second reason for poor quality is tough price competition, Mr. Kaplan says. "Makers try to reduce quality as much as possible to reduce price," he says. As an example, he cites black-and-white television sets, which recently have come down in price but "precious few" of which now have horizontal control knobs or knobs to adjust brightness levels.

Mr. Kaplan, a 58-year-old man who has been at Consumers Union for 23 years, says it is very difficult to generalize and say that products are shoddy now than in the past. In some areas, quality has improved, he asserts. But he maintains that those products that are bad seem worse than ever, and he says that among bad products a greater percentage of the output is faulty now than in the past.

A NEW PHENOMENON

He says, for instance, that Consumers Union bought 25 or so instant-load, automatic-exposure cameras not so long ago. They cost \$30 to \$70, he says, and they included brands made by 15 to 20 manufacturers. "One half of them as received were not operable or became inoperable shortly after we got them," he says. Similarly, he says, the organization recently bought 15 or so hi-fi tape recorders costing several hundred dollars each, and discovered that one third of them were faulty.

"This is a new phenomenon—so many bad items," says Mr. Kaplan.

Mr. Kaplan will reel off a list of products that he says are better than ever. Clothes washers have improved, he says, and he maintains that the durable press innovation has made clothing better. But he also will list what he considers bad products. "Frozen fish has been lousy for a long time and is still lousy," he says, "the quality is abominable."

Mrs. Michael J. Espok of Irwin, Pa., isn't too concerned about frozen fish, but you won't find her singing the praises of GE irons or K-Mart discount stores. Last Feb. 13, Mr. Espok bought his wife a GE steam iron, which K-Mart had marked down to \$8.97 from its regular price of \$11.97. After a week of use, says Mrs. Espok, "all the water ran out the bottom and spotted my clothes."

She called a local GE service center, where a "very nice" man told her to take it back to K-Mart. She did. But K-Mart refused to take it back, since it had been sold more than 10 days before. "He told us to take it back to GE," says Mrs. Espok. Mrs. Espok finally did mail it to GE, and four weeks later she received a replacement, which she says is working fine. But she still isn't happy. She was

without an iron for a month, and she had to make a special trip to the K-Mart.

The manager of the K-Mart store now says the store should have taken back the iron. "There was a slight misunderstanding," he says. "If she had come to me, we would have exchanged it. GE probably should have taken it, too." Mrs. Espok says the man she talked to at K-Mart had a bad attitude. "My husband never swears," she says, "but he said, 'We'll never buy another — thing at K-Mart again.'"

Though General Electric replaced the iron, a GE service representative can't get too excited about Mrs. Espok's complaint. "It's a cheap iron. People expect too much from them," he says.

ONE IN A MILLION? OR 74 OF 100

But expensive things aren't faultless. A Boston salesman says his Brooks Brothers suit began to deteriorate two weeks after he bought it. The store took it back and gave him credit. Similarly a woman says that she bought a skirt at posh I. Magnin in Los Angeles and that after two hours it became completely wrinkled. "It looked like I'd slept in it. The belt became completely shriveled," she said. The store returned her money.

Another Los Angeles store, when asked about a customer's complaint about a bedspread, confirms the problem but says "this kind of thing is really one in a million." Perhaps, but other statistics indicate the ratio is a bit different. In the May issue of Consumer Reports, for example, the magazine discloses results of a survey of 90,000 owners of color TV sets. Seventy-four per cent of the color sets reported on "had required repairs of some sort," the magazine says. Most of the sets were three years old or less. The article also says that 6% of the sets bought in 1968 had to have their picture tubes replaced before the year was out.

If the magazine "had a dime for every complaint we've received about color TV . . . well, we could afford another color set. But we wouldn't be anxious to take on the headaches that seem to come with color," the article states.

TV sets have lots of parts, and it's possible to understand how they can break down. You'd think kites would be different, but William Ryder of Findlay, Ohio, says that isn't the case. He plunked down a dollar not so long ago for a plastic kite shaped like a bat. The first time he and his five-year-old son tried the kite, the keel, to which the string is attached, tore off and the kite plummeted earthward.

Back to the toy store, where he got another one free. Another try, another torn-off keel, and another kite crash. Back to the toy store for a third one, which he tried in gentler breezes. When the keel began to tear away, he patched it with plastic tape—and it's been flying great ever since.

A spokesman for the kite maker, Gayla Industries of Houston, says Mr. Ryder probably didn't read the directions, which admonish users not to fly the kite in high winds or cold weather, both common to Ohio. And he adds, "You expect kites to break up sometimes." He says, however, that complaints have declined while sales have quadrupled.

PROBLEMS WITH A PACEMAKER

A much more serious complaint comes from some doctors who implant pacemakers in patients to regulate their heartbeats. For a while, some pacemakers made by the Electrodyne subsidiary of Becton, Dickinson & Co. were inferior, some doctors allege.

"The problem was that the pacemaker, which was supposed to operate for 18 to 24 months, would stop in three or four months," says a Texas doctor. "The patient would then have to undergo surgery for us to replace the defective instrument, and sometimes the new one we put in would stop after two or three days." The new operation would cost the

patient \$3,000 to \$4,000, this doctor says, not to mention the pain and suffering.

An official of Electrodyne concedes the company had trouble with its pacemakers, but he says that that is "ancient history" now and that it's been "well over a year" since the company received complaints about the instruments. The Texas doctor says he and his colleagues complained repeatedly before anything was done. The Electrodyne official replies: "If something is wrong with a piece of equipment, that does not mean we can immediately correct it. We took immediate action to find what was causing the problem. We found it and corrected it."

There was little the heart patients could do, of course, but submit to a new operation. In other areas, though, consumers have found ways to get back at the manufacturers or sellers. Many, like Mr. Espok, the dissatisfied K-Mart shopper, simply refuse to shop any more at the store where they bought the faulty merchandise. Many complain to Consumers Union or to Better Business Bureaus in hopes of giving the offender a bad name. And many just start word-of-mouth campaigns against the stores or products.

An Iowa grandfather, for instance, who has been arguing for years with Sears-Roebuck about what he says is a leaky roof the retailer put on his house, signs all of his frequent letters to his children this way:

"Love, and don't buy anything at Sears."

THE BEST WAY IS: LET THEM TALK

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "The Best Way Is: Let Them Talk" was the title of a very penetrating column in the Boston Globe recently. It reminded us all of the importance of free and open discussion of views on the student crisis. Sometimes it is very hard to hear the plea for unpleasant views to be presented. But Mr. Healy of the Globe makes clear that the only way for a democratic society to deal with the diverse views of its members is to permit all of those views to be presented to succeed or fail on their merits. I offer the full text for consideration by my colleagues who I know are concerned about the problems of our universities and young people today:

[From the Boston Globe, June 13, 1969]

THE BEST WAY IS: LET THEM TALK

In the end the good tradition at Harvard prevailed. The Students for Democratic Society had their say and were unconvincing.

This was the important lesson that some in the Harvard administration took a long time learning.

The main body of the students were not asked to make a choice between an SDS body denied free speech and an administration that denied that speech.

Instead, they were, at the commencement exercises, served up a speech which the Harvard Crimson called "a long harangue explaining the SDS demands."

They were allowed to make their own judgments on the substance of that speech and its presentation.

It was also significant that the SDS was given the podium as a result of the suggestion by the class marshals.

It was 8:45 a.m., and Pres. Pusey was meeting with the corporation in University Hall,

where traditionally the corporation gives its approval to the awarding of degrees. The marshals told Pusey that if he did not let the SDS member speak the group would seize the microphone and someone would speak anyway.

Pusey told them they had been elected by their class and that they represented their class. He would take the matter up with the corporation.

How easy or difficult was the decision to allow the SDS member to speak is impossible to say, but it was not until about five minutes before the ceremony began and two thirds of the class were seated that the decision was made, according to one reliable report.

It appeared not to come easily. It did come, and that is what was important.

The struggle at Harvard for the last two months, as at other universities throughout the nation, has not been between the administrations and the SDS. The real struggle is for that large body of students who are just as concerned about the role of the university, the faculty and the role the Defense Department plays in the universities as are the SDS members.

The easiest thing in the world to say is that the SDS members do not speak for the student body. The fact is there is great sympathy for many positions taken on the campuses by the SDS. The main body is equally concerned about the final disposition of the Vietnam war and the problems of the city. The only real difference is that they do not haul deans down flights of stairs to make their points. Nor do many approve of this kind of manners.

Just because the main student body is not totally in accord with the actions of SDS does not automatically mean that they oppose the SDS on the issues.

Given a polarized situation, as they were given in April when the main student body had to make a choice between the administration and the SDS, they will take the SDS nearly every time.

That's the lesson for the Harvard administration and, for that matter, every college administration these days.

Those were not hollow words spoken by Yale chaplain William Sloane Coffin and Katherine Kaufer, a senior, at the Radcliffe commencement on Wednesday.

They said it well: "Why, even as Rome burns, far from criticizing Nero for fiddling, no end of American scholars are busy examining his fiddle," Rev. Mr. Coffin declared.

That is what the cry of relevancy on the campus is all about these days.

THE GREATEST DREAM—A WALK ON THE MOON—PART I

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is now only 9 days before man's most ambitious leap into the future, the mission of Apollo 11. But, for centuries, visionaries, from Lucian of Samosata to Jules Verne, have dreamed and written of interplanetary travel. Each day, from now until the blastoff from Cape Kennedy on July 16, the New York Daily News will present an article by its superlative science editor, Mark Bloom, tracing the history, sometimes funny, sometimes tragic, of the fantastic achievement leading up to a walk on the moon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I in-

clude the first article of this fascinating series which could appropriately be called "Blastoff Minus 9":

[From the New York Daily News, July 7, 1969]

THE GREAT DREAM—IT ALL STARTED IN 190 A.D.

(By Mark Bloom)

There is no one among you, gentlemen, who has not gazed long and carefully on the moon, or at least who has not heard of those who have, said J. P. (Impey) Barbicane, president of the Baltimore Gun Club, a century ago.

"Do not be surprised if I have to say a few words tonight regarding the queen of the starry sky.

"For to us is perhaps reserved the glory of being the Columbases of another new world. Have confidence in me, and second me by all means in your power, and I shall lead you to its conquest, which we shall annex to all the other states and territories that form the totality of our glorious union.

"Three cheers for the moon, cried the gun club in one voice, and the wild hurrahs almost blew the roof off."

And so, with Barbicane's impassioned speech to the gun club, preparation began for America's first manned voyage to the moon.

This was Jules Verne's account of the epic lunar voyage of the Columbiad, carrying Barbicane, Capt. Joshua D. McNicholl of Philadelphia and a Frenchman, Michel Ardan (upon whom the President of the United States conferred the title Citizen of the United States of America).

Incredibly, the three-man crew of the Columbiad blasted off from Tampa, just 100 miles to the west of what is now Cape Kennedy. Also, there was consideration of using Galveston Bay area, about 30 miles from what is now the Manned Spacecraft Center, as a launch site.

It was, in short, an astounding preview of the Apollo project, right down to a U.S. Navy vessel, the Susquehanna, recovering the crew after splashdown in the Pacific.

But Verne was far from the first to write about such journeys—or dream of them. Believed to be the first was "True History," written by a Syrian-born Greek satirist named Lucian of Samosata (125–190 A.D.).

Marjorie Hope Nicholson, whose "Voyages to the Moon" is the most complete compilation of these early fictionalized accounts of lunar travel, notes that Lucian's voyager made the trip "by mere chance" and "there is no stirring here of the modern scientific imagination."

In this first voyage, "a most violent whirlwind arose, and carried the (sailing) ship above 3,000 stadia, lifting it up above the water, from whence it did not let us down again into the seas but kept us suspended in midair."

After "True History," Lucian wrote another tale of celestial travel, called Icaromenippus.

Menippus, the hero, wearing two wings, one of an eagle and the other a vulture, launched himself from the top of Mount Olympus.

Not content with simply reaching the moon, he used it as a base to travel to the stars and to heaven—a three-day trip from the moon.

For many centuries the tales of flight above the earth remained in the same vein, helped by such literary devices as having devils conveniently anesthetize the celestial travelers so they would not remember too many details, details which were beyond the writers' imagination.

As it remained through Verne and even H. G. Wells, the big problem lay with launch power; there was nothing in the fertile imaginations of these authors which could have actually overcome the earth's gravity.

Verne used a cannon. Wells, in his "The First Men in the Moon," used an anti-gravity substance called Cavorite. But they were of the modern ilk; most before them were relegated to demons, flying horses and great birds.

At the close of the 16th century, Lodovico Ariosto published "Orlando Furioso," a hero who traveled to the moon aboard a chariot drawn by four red horses and came upon a moon "where stately cities, towns and castles rise."

But in 1610 there was an event which changed the tone of science fiction, just as it changed the thinking of the world of science. Galileo turned the newly invented telescope toward the heavens, and became the first man to see the lunar landscape as it is—a terrestrial body.

"It is a most beautiful and delightful sight to behold the body of the moon," he wrote noting that the moon, like the earth, "is everywhere varied by lofty mountains and deep valleys."

From these views, it was logical to suppose that since the moon looked something like the earth, perhaps it was populated.

About this time, an early version of the space race emerged, a theme which was to pop up repeatedly in literature until Russia's Sputnik 1 in 1957 launched the competition in realistic terms.

Before he died in 1630, Johannes Kepler, a German scientist, suggested that as soon as men learned to fly, a German colony might be set up on the moon. British scientist John Wilkins was annoyed by Kepler's "over-partial affection" for his countrymen.

In "Discovery of a New World on the Moon," Wilkins wrote in 1638 that "it is not altogether improbable that some other may be successful in this attempt." In other words, if any flag flew over the moon, it would be the Union Jack.

In later fictionalized accounts of lunar travel, Spanish, Italian, Dutch and many other flags flew on the moon. The American flag first reached lunar orbit with Verne, a Frenchman.

Kepler realized that if life existed on the moon, it could not be earthly because of the difference in environment. His heroes found creatures of a "serpentine nature" which were sub-civilized.

His description of moon-dwellers living mostly under the surface to escape the extremes in temperature was a popular theme in science fiction, carried forth through Wells' "The First Men in the Moon" (1901).

The first to use rocket power for a trip to the moon was the possessors of history's most famous nose, the redoubtable Savinien de Cyrano de Bergerac, a part-time science fiction writer.

Cyrano believed what, to a large extent, is true; that the earth and the moon are a double planet system. As Cyrano described it in "Voyage to the Moon," published in 1649, "the moon is a world like ours, to which this of ours serves likewise for a moon."

For the next century and a half, trips to the moon remained popular in literature, but there was little new in the way of inventiveness.

In 1827, however, Joseph Atterlay published "A Voyage to the Moon with Some Account of the Manners and Customs of the People of Morosofia and other Lunarians." Distinctive about this work was the advent of the "anti-gravity" concept for propulsion, moving away from demons and great birds.

Less than a decade later, Edgar Allan Poe wrote "Hans Pfall," a hero who flew to the moon by balloon to escape creditors on the earth.

The same year, the moon was the focus of one of the great hoaxes of journalism history—the New York Sun's "exclusive" reports of British astronomer Sir John Herschel's incredible discovery of life on the moon.

Herschel at the time was the world's best known astronomer, and was conveniently in South Africa when the Sun, in a circulation stunt devised by its editor, Richard Adams Locke, blazed forth about Herschel's "observations" through a giant, new telescope.

By the time Herschel could be reached in South Africa for his denial, both sides of the Atlantic had totally swallowed Locke's articles about a thriving lunar civilization populated by "bat-woman" and "bat-men."

"The account of the wonderful discoveries in the moon," declared the New York Times in an editorial, "are all probable and plausible, and have an air of intense verisimilitude."

The next great step in science fiction were the works of Jules Verne in the latter half of the 1800s, and H. G. Wells in the early part of this century.

But then, modern rocket theory was beginning to be developed, and travel to the moon—Buck Rogers, Flash Gordon and Dick Tracy notwithstanding—began edging faster and faster toward fact.

For many years now, science fiction has been delving into the deeper corners of the solar system, and out into the far reaches of the universe. Man's bent toward tempting his fellow man's curiosity shows no signs of waning.

As the 16th century English poet Edmund Spenser put it:

*"Yet he at last contending to excell
"The reach of men, through flight into fond
mischief fell."*

PRIDE IN AMERICA—IN NEW MEXICO

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, while visiting my constituents in New Mexico last week during the Independence Day recess, I had the pleasure of participating in a most interesting and meaningful "pride in America" program in Artesia, N. Mex. Organized by the community leadership, and participated in by the entire community citizenship, the program consisted of a downtown parade with the marching military 62d Army Band from Fort Bliss, Boy Scout and Girl Scout troop units, various civic club groups, merchants' and clubs' floats, decorated bicycles, antique, old, and new automobiles, church groups, and many, many just plain good all-American citizens carrying American flags and proudly marching and demonstrating their love and appreciation for our country, our constitutional principles of individual initiative, freedom, and our pride in America.

I could not help but stand a little straighter, and a little taller, with a proud gleam in my eyes from a happy tear or two, and a lump in my throat as I listened to the band playing and the folks singing the "Star Spangled Banner." It was a glorious, heart-warming sight as I looked into the face of America: wide-eyed youngsters, barefooted tanned, happy, one with a melting popsicle dripping down his arm off his elbow on to his tanned little tummy; another with a big, friendly mongrel dog playfully jumping and yelping in time and tune

with "the gang"; a thoughtful young mother with a baby in her arms and a little son holding on to her dress with one hand and waving a tiny flag with the other; an elderly, gray-haired farmer, his face wrinkled and worn with time, his back bent from his labor and toil, and a far away look in his eyes reflecting the memory of a son who gave his life in a far-off land for a country and a family he loved; an oil field worker, tanned and soiled, intently watching and thinking, from his pickup truck; a white-haired grandmother, gleaming, humming a thankful hymn as she watches from her front porch rocking chair, tapping her cane to the beat of the marching band; a service station attendant with the gasoline hose in his left hand, his right hand over his heart, standing at rapt attention as the color guard marches past; a small-town merchant with his apron tucked up to the side, and a prayer of grateful appreciation reflected on his face; a veteran with a square-set jaw, his right hand raised in a sharp salute; clean, alert, well-mannered, neatly dressed young people, high school and college, proud of their country, grateful for their opportunity, confident of their future and cognizant of their responsibility to themselves, their parents and their country; people from all walks of life, every race, color, and creed, all religious faiths, and different political parties, with one strong common denominator—a deep love, respect, and appreciation for the flag of the greatest Nation ever known in the history of mankind, the United States of America.

This pride in America program presented by the citizens of Artesia, N. Mex., stressing our love and respect for our country and the good in America, should be adopted and presented by every single community in America. It revives the spirit and instills the pride of every individual in himself, his ancestors, and this great country.

I sincerely express my heartfelt appreciation and grateful thanks to the fine citizens of Artesia, N. Mex., particularly to Program Chairman Joe Fenn, Parade Marshal John Simons, Mayor Glen Clem, Chamber of Commerce President Paul Frost, Chamber Manager Harold Baer, Master of Ceremonies Ron Eubank, First Baptist Minister Rev. J. Wayland Edwards, Mr. Tom Brown, KSVP Radio Manager Dave Button, Mrs. Phillip Royal, ENMU Student Leader Rick Brown, and many, many others for their thoughtful, dedicated leadership and work in making this great program such a meaningful success.

Undoubtedly, the most appropriate climax that could have been presented for such a memorable occasion, was a thought-provoking, challenging, and informative address, most eloquently delivered by a distinguished New Mexico citizen, Mr. Billie Holder, president and publisher of the Alamogordo Daily News, Alamogordo, N. Mex. Mr. Holder—a respected, highly recognized community leader, newsman, author, businessman, and world traveler—very appropriately described "what's right" with America and laid down an important challenge to all Americans, in his keynote speech, "A Little More Backbone—A Little Less

Wishbone." I insert his speech at this point in the RECORD:

A LITTLE MORE BACKBONE—A LITTLE LESS WISHBONE

(By Mr. Billie Holder)

Thanks for the invitation, makes my heart big, with pride, seeing a parade, bands playing, flags waving, makes me proud to be an American—Nostalgia for days of the past—"Good Old Days."

Many people have said during recent years, that America faces trying, vexing and troublesome times. It's true. But I can't recall a time in history, nor can I find in recorded history a time when the world didn't have troubles, troubles comparable to those of today. Even the vote to adopt the Declaration of Independence by a fledgling Congress was imperiled . . . and the vote was delayed from the date of preparation of that document for four days in order that some political maneuvering to muster support for this great document could be done. We have had our enemies within our own ranks, people without the faith it takes to be free, without the courage to stand up and be heard, without the dedication it takes to maintain a free nation, since the very outset of this nation. But, thank God, the innovators, the men of courage have thus far won out, and America has taken her place as the leader of the world, the greatest nation ever seen on the face of this earth. I have never seen a time when I wasn't proud to be called an American, when I wanted to remain silent, and I have been in countries of this world where Americans were unpopular, and at times when they were unwanted in that part of the world.

I was in Russia when newspapers showed large, glaring pictures of race riots in America. It was about the only news their newspapers carried. They tried to use this information to embarrass us during interviews, but I was proud to explain that America is a big country, 200 million people, with races of people from all over the globe, who have lived together and have gotten along for nearly 200 years, admittedly with some mistakes and with some tensions that come to the front with regularity, and we will continue to get along. Our troubles will be fought out. Our mistakes will be rectified. We will continue to forge our nation into ONE nation, and we will do it with pride.

The big difference, I pointed out, is that our troubles are open, they are recorded on the cameras of the television networks, they are dally pictured and recorded in the newspapers of the world. The world, everyone, knows of our troubles. And it simply isn't that way in Russia, nor in other Iron Curtain Countries of the world.

Don't let anyone tell you they don't have troubles in Communist countries, because they do. They have racial problems. They treat some of their citizens brutally. They don't tolerate dissenters. I've seen some of the treatment, and yet, their news media do not show these facts to the world. They simply are not allowed to.

We do face troubles, and problems. We've seen some of the problems grow into festering sores, dangerous ones, and they seem to be contagious. I am referring to race riots, campus demonstrations, an increase in crime, and the lot. I do not need to mention them all. You know, too, and you are aware that we have seen a great deal of our American solidarity fractured, cracked, and many people wondering what the future holds for America. The timetable outlined in the Communist Manifesto regarding America is progressing right on schedule, so many Americans are wondering just what can be done. "Can we cope with the problems?" they ask.

We have people on the far left, seeking to destroy. We have people on the far right seeking to excite America. They would have you believe we are a nation falling to pieces.

Despite these troubles, and despite the mistakes we've made, I still see America as the greatest country on the face of this globe, still able to cope with her problems, still able to lead men to believe in individual freedom, and to halt the spread of the communist octopus that is trying to engulf the world.

Ever since my return from a Study Mission behind the Iron Curtain, where we visited every Iron Curtain Country in Europe except Albania, I have been saying to audiences, You are the luckiest people in the world. And it's true. You are the most fortunate civilization in the world, simply because you were born in America. You had nothing to do with it, but you are American citizens, you are free, and freedom is the most precious thing in the world to much of the world's population. I have had many, many young people ask me, in Europe and in Asia, ask me how they could come to America. They want to be a part of this great land of ours. And yet, we have far too little appreciation for what has been handed to us, given to us in most cases without a struggle on our part, and what is yet so precious we don't know its true value.

People in many of the world's countries seek freedom. They don't have it, and in many cases they've fought for it. Some have lost the battles. Some have spilled their blood and sacrificed, but they don't have that freedom which we take so much for granted and fail to have proper appreciation for.

You are lucky because you are free. . . .

You are lucky because you have plenty of food, and more than half of the world's population go to bed hungry every night. I've seen thousands of little children in Asia, begging for crumbs, or just something to eat.

You are lucky because you have a home. . . .

You are lucky because you have ample clothing. . . .

You are lucky because you have job opportunities. . . . you can be anything you want to be, and find a vocation that will take you to the top. You can because you have the opportunities offered only in America, be anything you want to be. You can be on top, if you want to badly enough.

You are lucky because you can vote.

I sponsored a young man who I met in Czechoslovakia, to come to the United States. It was a visit I made to his home that caused him months of persecution, months of heartache, months of beatings and questioning sessions. I had been watched as I attempted to tell a cab driver where to take me in Prague. When I did finally communicate, I was reported—as a foreign visitor in the home of a Czech citizen. He had the courage to escape, to risk death if he were caught, or a sentence in a prison camp which would be worse than death. . . . he risked the gunfire of border guards to escape to Italy where he contacted me. He is now in Los Angeles, where he is happy, working, earning more in a week than he could make in his native land in two months time. In fact, he earned \$70 per month and was at the top of the scale over there. He went to work in America for \$3 per hour doing the same kind of work. He's making more than that now, and is in a supervisory capacity. He is going to be an American citizen by choice. He will be a proud American. He appreciates freedom.

What is America? What is it about this land that causes a tear to well up within when we hear bands playing? When we stand at attention at appearance of our Flag? What is it that causes us to sing, to the top of our voices, "God Bless America," or the "Star Spangled Banner?" What is it that prompts men to want to fight to keep this country of ours free, unfettered, uninvaded, a composite of mankind? What is it? Let me turn poetic, and read to you something I ran across recently. I don't know who wrote it, but it's beautiful. Here it is:

"I am a nation. I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the nation. I am 202 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me. I am Nathan Hale, and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the 'shot heard around the world.' I am Washington, Jefferson and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys and Davey Crockett. I am Lee and Grant, Abe Lincoln. I remember the Alamo, the Malne and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called, I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rocks of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea and in the steaming jungle of Vietnam. I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coal fields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the Monitor and the Merrimac. I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific. My arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii—three million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than five million farms, I am forest, fields, mountain, and desert. I am quiet villages, and cities that never sleep. You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his bread loaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the calendar turns. I am Babe Ruth, and the World Series, I am 130,000 schools and colleges and 320,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, a roar of a crowd in a stadium and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper, and a letter to a Congressman. I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein, and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers and the Wright Brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster and Jonas Salk. I am Longfellow, Harlett Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Thomas Paine. Yes, I am the nation and these are the things I am. I was conceived in freedom, and God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days. May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world. This is my wish, my goal, my prayer, in this year of 1969—193 years after I was born."

Isn't it beautiful?

That is a word picture of America . . . and surely there is more.

Is it worth keeping? Is it worth preserving? Is it worth fighting for?

Of course it is!

Now, let me make some observations. I would be deceitful if I were to attempt to lead you to believe all is sweetness and light . . . that America is doing fine.

One of the most distressing things I see in our country today is the lessening of our moral values, the sag in our faith, the diminishing influence of our churches, the failure of this generation of parents to teach our youngsters about God, and the failure to impress upon them the values of prayer.

I think I understand these things. I think I can see why this is happening to us. I can see our generation as a victim of a great economic depression. I can see this generation as one relieved and pleased to see the war years of World War II because it then became possible to get a job . . . a job that paid money, that made it possible for us to begin earning something. I know the depths of economic depression. I know the anguish of parents who dedicated themselves to care for their children in a manner better than

their parents were able to do for them. I know what need is.

I believe the great depression produced a generation of parents who wanted their children to have the better things of life which they couldn't share in. They didn't want their children to have to work as hard as they did. In other words, they said: "I am going to deprive my children of the very things that made a man out of me." They didn't teach them to work, nor the value of learning to work. They didn't teach them to appreciate love, they didn't make them mind, and therefore didn't teach them respect for authority, and the cycle goes on and on.

They didn't teach them the value of honesty, integrity, of a clean record, of cleanliness and neatness of appearance.

I think the *time is late*, and that it is high time we began to show some examples. We can begin to change some of our own habits.

We can quit *taking* the kids to Sunday School, and letting them out of the car so we can go back home to finish reading the comics, or to work on the lawn, or to head out for the mountains, or to the fishing holes or camp grounds.

We can't teach our children there's value in Sunday School when we don't ever go.

We can't teach our children there's value in prayer, if you never pray.

We can't teach our children there's any value in faith in God, if we never attend a worship service.

We need to *lead* the way. One of the very basic foundations of this country is a faith in God, a need to worship. Our freedom is freedom to worship, not freedom from worship.

Another distressing thing that appears on the American scene is our constant search for easier ways to do things. We have automated machinery, we have instant coffee, frozen foods, drip-dry clothes and even artificial insemination. Americans, it seems, strive to do everything the easiest possible way—without work, without hard thought, without hard exertion of any kind.

Living of life itself cannot be made painlessly easy. We're not that lazy. Human relationships and problems are too complex, too varied, too personal, too urgent and indeed, too human to be subjected to instant, drip-dry, automated solutions.

Too many of us won't accept this truth. Too many of us seek the easy way. Too many of us seek the popular way, the least painful way of running our lives. In short, too many of us have replaced the traditional American backbone with a modern American wishbone.

It is my contention that America as a nation, and freedom as a practicality, cannot long endure without the traditional backbone which permits endurance. It is my contention further that this backbone must be encouraged and fused with leadership which is unfettered by the great social and economic restrictions of modern life, without the laziness of retirement—which seems to be the goal of life for so many people.

We must have the backbone to be dedicated Americans.

Who has ever promised that the life of a free man would be an easy one?

Who has ever promised that a good citizen can be of benefit to his country in retirement, living in ease, taking life easy, not bothering to assume the responsibilities of citizenship? We have no reason to complain about what public officials do if we make no effort to see that right, honesty and integrity prevail in public life.

We must have the backbone to teach our children to pray, to cultivate some callouses on their knees, to have some moral dignity, to learn to have respect for others.

We must have the backbone to meet the challenges of those who would destroy our democratic way of life. We must face them,

and make them understand their rights cease when they infringe upon the rights of others. Their rights end where the rights of others begin.

We must have the backbone to pull our families back together into an identifiable group of people who enjoy being with one another, to have conversation, to listen, to suggest, to discuss—to enjoy!

We must have the backbone to feel sympathy for those peoples around the world who do not have enough to eat, to share with them, to teach them how to produce food from their own land. . . .

We must have the backbone to go to the rescue and lend assistance to those countries of the world endangered by communism.

We must have the backbone to become involved in local politics, in local issues, and to do so as enlightened citizens, knowing the issues and speaking out for right.

We must have the backbone to clean up the newsstands, and protest the sale of pornography and other filth that is being circulated. By protest, I do not mean to march on the stores, burn them down and create havoc. I mean talk to the man, let him know that you don't like the situation, and refuse to patronize him as long as he sells such filthy literature.

We must have the backbone to follow the service of public officials, and express our sentiment to them. We must let them know when we think they're wrong. We must write to our legislators, giving our views. And when they do act contrary to the public interest, relieve them of their job when voting time comes.

We must have the backbone to write to our law enforcement officials—local, state and in fact to the United States Attorney General when necessary, insisting on fair enforcement of the laws of this land.

We must have the backbone to write letters, by the thousands, to NASA, in Houston, supporting the reading of Scripture from our astronauts. Did you know a move, with considerable support, is underway asking that our men be publicly censured for having read from the Bible last Christmas day while they were circling the globe, in orbit? And they have other plans, too.

We must have the backbone to write to our governor protesting the use of filth and pornography as material to teach our youth on the campus of the University of New Mexico.

We must have the backbone to teach our youth to have pride in our country . . . to teach them to support our government, "My Country . . . right or wrong," and then have the backbone to right the wrongs.

We must have the backbone to teach respect for our flag . . . a backbone that develops a tingle of pride when we see the flag, to salute it, and to look upon it as a Grand Old Flag, A High Flying Flag.

We must throw aside the wishbone . . . develop the backbone, to be good citizens and to carry the light of freedom before the people of the world. . . .

FREEDOM BECOMES ILLEGAL ILL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the educators in 42 school systems in my State directly affected by the Federal court's denial of freedom of choice in schools met and adopted a resolution.

Because the educators are interested in quality education—instead of sociological or philosophical programs to appease the Supreme Court—they feel that freedom

of choice in the only workable plan to maintain an educational system.

To comply with HEW and the Court decree outlawing freedom will also destroy education.

Our Louisiana educators appeal to this body to adopt specific legislation maintaining freedom of choice—which is redundant since individual freedom is already secured by the U.S. Constitution, but ignored by the Court.

The Court's highhanded action must be considered not only as a denial of the people's freedom but a repudiation of the constitutional protection of these rights as well.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution adopted by the Louisiana School Board Association on June 30, following my remarks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, a large representative number of school board members and superintendents from all over Louisiana who have worked with various HEW teams and considered carefully various alternatives to Freedom of Choice, met for a joint discussion of their common problem, and

Whereas, all of the educators and school board members present were unanimously of the opinion that Freedom of Choice is the only feasible educationally sound, and administratively workable method of disestablishing the local system while maintaining and improving quality education throughout our State for all children, both Negro and white, and

Whereas, they were also of the opinion that zoning and/or pairing plans such as proposed by HEW are totally unworkable, educationally unsound and will destroy all progress in race relations made under Freedom of Choice and ultimately destroy public education, and

Whereas, freedom of Choice most nearly embraces constitutional and democratic principles, particularly as taught to our children for better than 150 years, and

Whereas, no provision of any of the Civil Rights Acts passed by the Congress of the United States prohibits Freedom of Choice as a plan of desegregation, and

Whereas, certain provisions of suggested HEW plans appear to run directly contrary to certain provisions of the Civil Rights Acts prohibiting "busing" and the deliberate "assignment of students to overcome racial imbalance", and

Whereas, all present indications foretell an immediate traumatic disruption of our educational system which will adversely affect every parent, every child and every teacher, whether Negro or white, now

Therefore be it resolved, That every possible effort be made by the Congress of the United States to adopt specific legislation which will maintain Freedom of Choice as an acceptable plan of desegregation of schools, and

Be it further resolved, That all interested citizens including every affected parent or teacher, be requested to contact immediately, by telephone or telegram, their Congressmen and Senators and the President of the United States to urge and implore their help.

TEN YEARS AFTER THE SEAWAY DREAM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 7, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has written an excellent

editorial marking the 10th anniversary of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which I would like to place in the RECORD today. It follows:

TEN YEARS AFTER THE SEAWAY DREAM

When Britain's Queen Elizabeth came to Chicago in June, 1959, to mark the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway there was much optimistic talk about its effects on Chicago's future. Almost every city on the Great Lakes expected to become a port of the first magnitude.

The extravagant hopes were not realized immediately, and in recent years not much attention has been paid to the seaway by city planners and civic boosters. On the 10th anniversary of its opening, however, it should be noted that it has been a better than fair success and that its future is promising.

For one thing, the money spent on it—about a billion dollars, including power developments—was a bargain. The United States treasury supplied 131 million dollars for this country's share of the construction costs charged to navigation. These sums do not seem so large nowadays, especially when they are compared with the billion-dollar

cost of the projected development of the Arkansas river. Unlike other American waterways, the seaway is required by law to pay for its operational costs and the debt charged to navigation. Income from tolls has been sufficient to meet operating expenses, but interest charges have been earned in only one year [1966] and the total debt has risen to 143 million dollars. Earnings declined in 1967 and 1968, primarily because of strikes.

One great benefit of the seaway has been the opening of iron ore deposits in Quebec and Labrador to midwest steel mills. Iron ore accounted for 37 per cent of the total traffic on the international section last year. About 85 per cent of all traffic consisted of bulk cargoes.

The disappointment of the seaway has been the failure to develop larger volumes of general merchandise cargo. This has resulted from the failure of the lake cities to provide adequate port facilities and to go after the general cargo business.

Chicago, which had more to gain than any other port, has been conspicuous in its failure to take advantage of its opportunities. Instead of consolidating port facilities into a single operation, it has two operating agencies—the city, which runs Navy pier, and

the Chicago regional port district, which runs Calumet harbor.

Chicago also has failed to promote port business adequately, it has lagged in building container handling facilities, and it has neglected to develop equitable import-export rail and truck freight rates between the port and midwest importing and exporting companies.

In an editorial on April 27, 1959, when the first ships began moving thru the new seaway. The Tribune noted:

"Chicago has the largest, richest, and most diversified hinterland of any lake port. It is the only lake port with a major waterway [the Illinois-Mississippi system] leading into the hinterland. But the great growth in commerce expected from the seaway is not going to come overnight, and much of it is not going to come at all if Chicago fails to take the steps necessary to meet powerful competition. . . .

"If the Chicago area is to get all the benefits it should from the seaway, no time or energy can be wasted in squabbling between the various public and private port interests, or between the public officials charged with port developments."

The same advice is applicable today.

SENATE—Tuesday, July 8, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may there fall upon us now a great sense of Thy presence and Thy power. Deliver the Members of this body from all personal worries and anxieties that they may give themselves wholly to the crucial issues of the day. Teach us how to speak, how to listen, how to wait, and how to work, holding ever before us the vision of the higher way and the more perfect order for which men strive, that we may be worthy workmen in Thy kingdom—for Thine alone is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

The best time to strengthen our unemployment insurance system is during a period of relatively full employment.

The Secretary of Labor is sending to the Congress today proposed legislation to extend unemployment insurance to 4,800,000 workers not now covered; to end the shortsighted restrictions that stand in the way of needed retraining efforts; and to add a Federal program automatically extending the duration of

benefits in periods of high unemployment.

There are three principles to be considered as we move to make the unemployment insurance system responsive to our times.

Unemployment insurance is an earned benefit. When a man covered by unemployment insurance is working, the employer pays a tax on his wages to insure against the day when the employee may be between jobs. That insurance is like a mandatory fringe benefit; it is insurance bought in the employee's behalf, and the worker therefore is entitled to the benefits he receives when he is unemployed. Accordingly, there is no demeaning of human dignity, no feeling of being "on the dole," when the insured worker receives benefits due.

Unemployment insurance is one of the foremost examples of creative Federal-State partnership. Although the system was created by Federal law, most decisions about the nature of the program are left to the States, which administer the system with State employees. This makes the system far more flexible and attuned to local needs and special circumstances of local economies.

Unemployment insurance is an economic stabilizer. If, for example, the economy were ever to slow and unemployment were to rise, this program automatically would act to sustain personal income. This would help prevent a downturn from gathering momentum resulting from declines in purchasing power. When employment is at a high level, and greater stimulation of consumer demand is unwanted, relatively little money flows into the economy from unemployment insurance.

With these principles in mind, I am making these recommendations for both Federal and State action:

1. We should act together to extend unemployment protection to more employees, including many highly vulnerable to layoffs who are not now covered.

2. The States should make certain that workers throughout the United States receive enough money for a long enough period of time to sustain them while they seek new jobs.

3. We should end the restrictions imposed by almost half the States on payments to unemployed workers undergoing retraining and, instead, follow the lead of those States which encourage retraining.

4. We should better protect the investment made on behalf of the insured by seeing to it that the funds are paid only to those who should receive them.

5. We should increase the responsiveness of the system to major changes in national economic conditions.

6. We should strengthen the financing of the system which presently discriminates against the low-wage worker and the steady employer.

1. PROTECTING MORE EMPLOYEES

Over 57 million workers are protected by unemployment insurance. However, almost 17 million are not covered; more than half of these are employees of State and local governments. The last extension of coverage was enacted during the Eisenhower Administration, when 6 million additional workers were included; there is a clear social need today to cover as many more employees as we can.

I propose that an additional 4.8 million workers be covered by unemployment insurance. These include:

- 1,600,000 workers in *small firms* with less than four employees;
- 400,000 on large farms employing four or more workers in each of 20 weeks;
- 200,000 in *agricultural processing* activities;
- 1,800,000 in *non-profit organizations*;
- 600,000 in *State hospitals* and *universities*;
- 200,000 salesmen, delivery tradesmen, and others who are not currently defined as employees.