

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1969

Col. Ray M. Cole, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Michael C. McCarthy, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Jessup D. Lowe, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Donald A. Gaylord, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Vernon R. Turner, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Edgar H. Underwood, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force, Medical.
 Col. Coleman O. Williams, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Leslie J. Westberg, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. George K. Sykes, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Wendell L. Bevan, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William P. Comstock, ██████████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Richard C. Catledge, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Madison M. McBrayer, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William H. Holt, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. James H. Watkins, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Warren D. Johnson, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Paul C. Watson, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Maxwell W. Steel, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force, Medical.
 Col. Jack K. Gamble, ██████████, Regular Air Force.

Col. William C. Fullilove, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Charles E. Yeager, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Harold R. Vague, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Paul G. Galentine, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Foster L. Smith, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Thomas P. Coleman, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Homer K. Hansen, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Peter R. DeLonga, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Clifford W. Hargrove, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Samuel M. Thomasson, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert E. Huyser, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William J. Evans, █████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Thomas W. Morgan, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William R. Goade, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Charles I. Bennett, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Otis E. Winn, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Woodrow A. Abbott, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. James R. Pugh, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert P. Lukeman, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. James L. Price, ██████████, Regular Air Force.

Col. John W. Roberts, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Brian S. Gunderson, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Geoffrey Cheadle, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Floyd H. Trigdon, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Devol Brett, █████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Paul F. Patch, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Harold E. Collins, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Benjamin N. Bellis, █████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Salvador E. Felices, ██████████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Richard G. Cross, Jr., ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Lew Allen, Jr., ██████████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Martin G. Colladay, ██████████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Charles C. Pattillo, ██████████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Billie J. McGarvey, ██████████, Regular Air Force.
 Col. James D. Hughes, █████ (Lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. James R. Allen, █████ (major, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Robert E. Pursey, ██████████ (major, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MAN OF THE SOUTH

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year a "Man of the South" is honored by Col. Hubert F. Lee in his *Dixie Business* magazine, published in Atlanta, Ga. Colonel Lee has just celebrated his 40th anniversary as editor and founder of this fine publication.

The award this year goes to Solon Brinton Turman, Man of the South for 1968, for his outstanding accomplishments in the shipping industry, and for his many contributions to the South and the entire Nation.

I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an announcement of Mr. Turman's selection for this honor, as well as a biographical article by Colonel Lee, and I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOLON B. TURMAN, NEW ORLEANS SHIPPING EXECUTIVE, IS MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1968

Solon Brinton Turman, of New Orleans, a leader of the United States Shipping industry, has been named Man of the South for 1968, it was announced today by Colonel Hubert F. Lee, Editor and Publisher of *Dixie Business*, of Atlanta, which has sponsored the selection since 1946.

Colonel Lee pointed out that the award is made to the man selected from the 200

American business leaders who have been named to the South's Hall of Fame, and the decision is based on an annual poll.

Letters, ballots, petitions and resolutions urging Mr. Turman's selection were received, Colonel Lee said, from throughout the United States and from countries around the world. The flood of votes in Mr. Turman's behalf started pouring in shortly after the nominees were announced.

Mr. Turman, a Director and Chairman of the Executive Committee of Lykes Corporation and Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., is the senior ranking member of the Lykes family which founded the vast Lykes enterprises that have contributed greatly to the development of the south.

Mr. Turman this year observes his 50th anniversary with the Lykes organization. In addition to his active role in the Lykes world-wide shipping operation, he is also active in the many other Lykes interests which include cattle ranches in Florida and Texas; meat packing plants in Florida and Georgia, citrus groves and citrus concentrate plants in Florida; insurance companies in Florida, Georgia and North Carolina, banking in Florida and electronic firms in Louisiana, Florida and Georgia.

In addition to his active role in the many Lykes businesses, Mr. Turman also serves as a Director of the Hibernia National Bank in New Orleans; Chairman of the Board of Gulf and South American Steamship Co., Inc., member of The Business Council, and only recently concluded a 24-year term as Director of the Illinois Central Railroad.

A native of Florida and a resident of New Orleans since 1930, Mr. Turman is the son of the late Solon B. Turman and the late Miss Tillie Lykes. He attended Virginia Military Institute and the University of Virginia and his career with the Lykes enterprises dates back to 1919.

He became a Director of Lykes in 1925; a Vice President in 1930; Executive Vice President in 1943, and served as President from 1951 until 1962 when he was elected Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, a post he held until 1967 when he elected to step down.

In world business circles, he is recognized as one of the foremost authorities on shipping and he has served his company, his southland and his nation with distinction, making major contributions to all three.

In 1949, he received the French Medal of Commercial Merit and in 1952 was made an honorary member of the Louisiana Chapter of Beta Gamma Sigma, the nation's leading national honorary scholastic fraternity. In 1957 he was named Louisiana's Maritime Man of the Year, and in 1961 he won twin honors as the recipient of the American Legion's American Merchant Marine Achievement Award, presented to him by the late President John F. Kennedy, and the same year was given the Vice Admiral Jerry Land Medal, the highest honor paid to a non-technical person by the American Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.

The individual's responsible for Mr. Turman winning the Man of the South honor, and Colonel Lee, "reads like a Who's Who" in American and international business. All of them had one thing in common—Solon Turman earned the honor for his distinguished service to the South over a lifetime."

SOUTH'S HALL OF FAME FOR THE LIVING
(By Hubert F. Lee)

With the publication of this issue of *Dixie Business*, another Southerner joins the ranks of the "Hall of Fame for the Living," the honor group from which the "Man of the South" is named each year.

He is Solon Turman, of New Orleans, a member of the internationally-known Lykes

family of Florida and truly one of the outstanding leaders of international commerce during a period of many years.

Mr. Turman is Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., perhaps the best known of all the vast Lykes holdings in shipping, cattle, citrus, meat packing, insurance, banking and electronics.

Solon Turman is the son of the late Miss Tillie Lykes, whose seven brothers founded the Lykes shipping empire at the turn of the century. Turman joined the venturesome Lykes brothers just as soon as he left school in 1919, and he has devoted a lifetime to the South and particularly to one of the most aggressive roles in behalf of the American Merchant Marine.

His uncle, the late Joseph T. Lykes, Sr., was honored as the "Man of the South" for 1960 at a dinner in Tampa, Florida, December 7, 1960. Mr. Lykes was named to the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living" honor group in 1952.

In keeping with Lykes family and Lykes company policy, Mr. Turman underwent an extensive training program and learned shipping from the bottom up, and he earned every promotion he ever received. Greater responsibility became his with the passing of each year and he assumed the presidency of the world-wide Lykes organization in 1951.

He played a major role in steering the Lykes shipping team through World War II, when it contributed a principal share to the allied success.

He was again in a major role putting together a tough-to-beat postwar organization that saw the Lykes colors rise to the top of the industry.

He was at the helm as the company plunged into the nation's greatest single shipbuilding venture—complete replacement of the Lykes fleet at a cost in excess of a half billion dollars—now reaching another important phase with 33 new ships contributing a major share to the U.S. balance of payments, to the nation's efforts in Southeast Asia and to the strength of the great American Merchant Marine.

In 1967, Solon Turman elected to step down as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Lykes. He continues to play a vital role in the Lykes operations and holds numerous other top level positions with other Lykes companies. He is also a director of the Illinois Central Railroad and the Hibernia National Bank of New Orleans.

In 1957 he was Louisiana's "Maritime Man of the Year."

In 1961 the American Legion gave him their "American Merchant Marine Achievement Award."

In the same year he was given the Admiral Jerry Land Medal, the highest honor bestowed on a non-technical person by the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.

I see a marked difference in the careers of men who own a company and build it into greatness and "management men" who are responsible to a board of directors.

None of the Horatio Alger figures I have known have worked harder and burned the midnight oil longer than the Solon Turmans during the half century I have been a writer.

Solon Turman and his late uncles, the seven Lykes brothers, are in the same class with James B. "Buck" Duke, Robert Dollar, Thomas A. Edison, Alexander Graham Bell, John H. Patterson, Cyrus H. McCormick, Henry Ford, Daniel Guggenheim, J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller and stalwarts of the old school.

This honor by Dixie Business—modest though it may be—is given only to those who have earned it. Great men like Solon Turman.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THOMASITE TEACHER HONORED BY PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this House last year approved H.R. 970 to extend our greetings to the Congress of the Philippines in commemoration of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers.

More than 66 years ago these volunteer American teachers are credited with establishing public education in the Philippines.

The last known survivor of this original group of 508 teachers is Mr. Henry H. Balch, who later distinguished himself in the Foreign Service of our Nation.

Mr. Balch, a 91-year-old resident of Huntsville in the Eighth Congressional District of Alabama came to Washington recently to receive honors from the Philippine Government for his service to the young people of the Philippines.

He was presented the Sikatuna Award—the highest civilian decoration the Philippine Government can give—for his work among the people of these islands.

So that all of my colleagues can know of the high regard which these Thomasite teachers are held by the people of the Philippines, I wish to include as part of my remarks the remarks by Ambassador Salvador P. Lopez on the presentation of the Order of Sikatuna to Mr. Henry Balch and the citation of the President of the Philippines.

The remarks follow:

TRIBUTE TO THE THOMASITES

(Remarks by Ambassador Salvador P. Lopez on the presentation of the Order of Sikatuna to Mr. Henry Balch)

In the Sikatuna Award, the highest civilian decoration that the Philippine Government can give, on Mr. Henry H. Balch, we honor him for his years of service to the youth of the Philippines at a critical time in our history. In particular, we honor him for what he did for the young people of Tayabas and the love he bore them.

Through him, we honor the Thomasites—that hardy band of pioneers who dared to venture into strange land, to live and work among a people whom their nation had just subdued in war.

And in honoring them, we pay tribute to America, to the American record of education in the Philippines. It is a record unsurpassed in the annals of colonialism, a shining record which we consider to be the most valuable legacy bequeathed to us by American rule.

For the work of Henry Balch and the Thomasites represented the best side of the American character—its altruism, its dedication, its humanity. And the public school system which they established throughout the country was the most beneficial and the most effective expression of American colonial policy in the Philippines. It is to the work of Henry Balch and the Thomasites and of those who followed them that we largely owe that part of our culture which is distinctively American, those qualities which, for good or ill, will remain stamped on the Filipino soul for a long time to come. It is these elements which constitute to this day the strongest bond between our two nations.

It is for this, no less than for the many personal ties which they established during their years of service in the Philippines, that

Henry Balch and the rest of the Thomasites will always be remembered in our country. As for the Americans of today, they too owe a debt of gratitude to the Thomasites, who were in truth the first Peace Corps volunteers in American history.

The citation reads as follows:

CITATION

The President of the Philippines hereby confers the Order of Sikatuna (Rank of Datu) upon Mr. Henry Balch of Huntsville, Alabama, U.S.A., for his wholehearted response to the call of service as evidenced by his voluntary enlistment in the group of teachers who came to the Philippines from America to bring for the first time to this country the beneficences of popular education;

For his generosity of spirit, open mind, and compassionate approach to the work at hand, which characterized the adventure-in-teaching that the Thomasites found in the Philippines;

For the genuine gift of knowledge he has brought to his students which laid the basis for the wider education of the generations of Filipinos who came after;

For his own quick and deep acceptance of the Filipinos and the Philippines, to this day a people and country that enjoy a special place in his memories and in his heart;

This award is given to Henry Balch, teacher, benefactor, friend and brother to the Filipinos.

Done in the City of Manila on this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-eight.

By the President:

F. E. MARCOS.

PHILADELPHIA SHOWS WAY TO EASE NEGROES' PLIGHT

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week, Bruce Biossart wrote a commentary on the persistent though not always glamorous efforts of Philadelphia toward lessening its urban problems. As he intimates, many of the steps taken are not giant steps, but the march goes forward and is headed in the right direction.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Biossart's article, "Philadelphia Shows Way To Ease Negroes' Plight," which appeared in the Hazleton Standard Speaker of January 22, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PHILADELPHIA SHOWS WAY TO EASE NEGROES' PLIGHT

WASHINGTON.—Cracks of hopeful daylight can be found here and there in a troubled urban racial situation which many observers of the nation's black community insist on painting in hopelessly gloomy tones.

These small bits of optimism appear at a fortuitous moment, for investigative disclosures of fraud and inefficiency in the massive New York City poverty-welfare complex are seen as having struck a hard blow against such programs—despite the argument that they ease tensions in the seething ghetto communities.

Fortunately for the nation, through all the tumult and the shouting from black militants on the one hand and rightist whites who would repress blacks on the other, a hardy band of both whites and blacks keeps

hacking away pragmatically at real problems and helping to produce at least partial answers.

Typical of this band is Andrew Freeman of Philadelphia's Urban League, a soft-spoken but highly determined man who for years has been fighting for practical gains for the black community and getting some of them, while his more militant brethren have been shouting for the millennium tomorrow and achieving virtually nothing.

Measured on the scale of practical advances, Freeman saw 1968 in Philadelphia as a year of more promise than a quick tour of the black ghetto might suggest. And he says he is "very optimistic" that 1969 will be a good deal better.

In the employment field, it may shake some of those who believe that federally sponsored programs are inevitably doomed to failure to hear that on-the-job training efforts under U.S. Department of Labor guidance have been the most successful in Philadelphia.

Figures for 1968 are not yet complete, but may well exceed 1967. Nearly 3,000 blacks trained under this program were at work—and the so-called "job retention" rate ranged impressively between 85 and 93 per cent.

Most disappointing in 1968 was the failure to arouse a proper sense of urgency among the potential employers of black trainees. The phenomenon is curious, since several years ago this reporter, examining the Philadelphia economic scene, found hopeful stirrings among many top industrialists.

Another extremely difficult problem is the often crushing indifference of hard core unemployed blacks to the job appeals made. The discipline of regular work is painfully foreign to men with a long history of idleness and its freedom—empty though that may be.

Nevertheless, men like Freeman never give up fighting for the small victories on the job, school and housing fronts which, when pieced together over the years, mark real advances.

Notwithstanding earlier discouragements, he is confident more business employers are going to get the message in 1969 and hire black trainees or help train them as they work. The National Alliance of Businessmen has made job pledges which may be fulfilled better this year than last. The Urban Coalition, not too productive in Philadelphia so far, is still eyed hopefully.

Pragmatic black leaders are impressed by Mark Shedd, city school superintendent, whom they put down as a concerned man. This does not mean the city has made huge strides toward solving its racial school problems. As in other urban centers, tensions erupt in violence from time to time: busing is protested by irate whites, and integration on a big scale is still heavily opposed by them.

The school system needs more money, more community support. It is still judged poor overall, and worse rather than better in black sectors. Yet a note of hope is being struck.

Even housing prospects look more promising. A 1968 U.S. law providing subsidies that will allow one per cent mortgage charges for low-income buyers opens up a market for blighted but basically sound dwellings which can be reconditioned. Poor blacks may be buying.

BROCKTON ART CENTER-FULLER MEMORIAL

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of

Representatives the formal opening of the magnificent new Brockton Art Center-Fuller Memorial, which took place on January 15, 1969. This art center was made possible through the generosity of the late Myron L. Fuller, who established trust funds for the museum and by the donations of land, funds, and effort to interested Brockton and South Shore persons.

Among the distinguished guests at the opening of the Brockton Art Center were: Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Fuller, Mr. and Mrs. Myron F. Fuller, Miss Alice Aksarlian of Buenos Aires, Argentina, Mr. and Mrs. James S. Ames III of North Easton, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bernat, Dr. and Mrs. Gerard Burke of Brockton, who represented Congressman James A. Burke, Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Campanelli, Mr. and Mrs. Walter C. Dunbar Jr., of South Easton, Mr. Kevin P. Gillette, Mrs. Mason Dix Harris, Mr. Robert W. Higgins, Mr. and Mrs. E. Bradford Keith, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard S. Lazarus, Mr. and Mrs. Paul N. Lampos, Mr. and Mrs. Edward E. Lyons of Hanover, Mrs. Daniel J. McEachern, Mr. and Mrs. John Merian, Mr. and Mrs. Richard J. O'Connell, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Trower, and Attorney John Clark Wheatley.

I include the enclosed news items which cover the art center opening:

[From the Brockton (Mass.) Enterprise, Jan. 16, 1969]

THE BROCKTON ART CENTER-FULLER MEMORIAL

An important and historic event has been taking place this week in the history of this city and area—the opening of the Brockton Art Center-Fuller Memorial.

We are living in an age where culture is playing more and more of a part in our lives, as it should.

Now, with this handsome and splendidly equipped art center ready for use, this area is fortunate to be able to share in its many and varied programs.

When plans were first made for building the art center, those involved in the project knew they had a task on their hands.

But they were, and are, a dedicated group and their dedication paid off.

We congratulate them.

This city and area can be proud that it has the only art museum on the South Shore, made possible by a bequest in the will of the late Myron Fuller and others who contributed financially and with generous measures of their time and talents.

PRESS CORPS PREVIEWS BROCKTON ART CENTER

The beautiful and spacious Brockton Art Center-Fuller Memorial was unveiled for the first time Tuesday night at a press preview for local and Boston newspaper writers and radio and television broadcasters. The opening exhibition, entitled "Three Centuries of New England Art," of rare and priceless loan items from New England museums was warmly received by the group.

Out-of-town guests were brought to this city in a colorful London double-decker bus which provided rush hour drivers on the Southeast Expressway with a novel sight.

The spacious galleries of the new center, adjacent to Upper Porter Pond on Oak St., were acclaimed by all of the visitors. The center, in addition to three galleries, includes three studios for art classes, a library-lounge, tearoom, two administrative areas, three storage rooms, a carpenter shop and a receiving area.

The main gallery will serve alternately as a lecture hall and an exhibition gallery.

The center was made possible under the trust funds established by the late Myron L. Fuller, internationally known geologist and

hydrologist, and son of Albert H. Fuller, founder of the Enterprise-Times.

Land for the center was donated by Paul Lampos, president of Wood-Hu Kitchens; Edward Bernat, vice president of Garland Knitting Mills; Campanelli Brothers of Braintree and the Enterprise Publishing Co., while a generous gift from Isaac S. Kibrick was used for site development and the lagoon was donated by Max Coffman, president of Mammoth Marsh.

Land for the center was exchanged with the D. W. Field Park through the co-operation of city and state officials.

Members of the Board of Trustees were on hand to greet the visitors, including Kenneth E. Sampson, chairman; Merton B. Tarlow, treasurer; Charles A. Fuller and Edwin A. Nelson, with the fifth member, Isaac S. Kibrick, being on vacation. Also present were committee chairmen: Bernard S. Lazarus, charter membership, finance and personnel; Ann G. McEachern, school planning; Dorothy H. Trower, Ladies' Committee, and Ralph E. Trower, publicity.

Pointing out the features of the museum was Edouard DuBuron, director, and Marlene A. Thayer, secretary, along with Paul L. Bacon, business manager. Music during the evening was provided in the main gallery-auditorium by Miss Doris H. Tirrell at the organ and Walter R. Lendt at the concert grand. Both instruments are being loaned to the art center by the Baldwin Piano and Organ Studios of Brockton.

Guests were treated to cocktails and a light buffet served in the ground-level foyer, adjacent to the gallery-auditorium. Assisting with guide and hostess duties were members of the Ladies' Committee including:

Mrs. Frank Cross and Mrs. Robert Earle, both of Sharon, co-chairmen; Miss Edith Sprague, Randolph; Mrs. Norman Smith, Holbrook; Mrs. John Farmer, Pembroke; Mrs. John A. Colocousis and Mrs. George Tasho, Brockton; Mrs. Achor B. Campbell, Jr., and Mrs. John Blomstrom, both of Stoughton; Mrs. Thomas Strange Whitman; Mrs. Lawrence Huller, Brockton.

The museum was designed by J. Timothy Anderson and Associates, Inc., and constructed by Eaton and Associates, Inc. A brochure on the pictures being displayed and on the museum was presented to each guest.

The museum will open its doors to the public on Friday from 10 A.M. to 10 P.M. The building will be open weekdays from 10 A.M. to 5 P.M. and Sundays from 1:30 to 5:30 P.M. after the opening day.

A series of special events has been planned, the first of which will be a lecture Feb. 5.

PLANS FINALIZED BY TRUSTEES FOR OPENING OF ART CENTER

Meeting this week at the new Brockton Art Center-Fuller Memorial, members of the Board of Trustees put the finishing touches to plans for the long-awaited formal opening of the South Shore's only art museum on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

The meeting was held in the museum library, where a bright, cheery fire burned in the fireplace. Outside, visible through the large glass windows, children skated on Upper Porter's Pond, which borders the museum on the east.

Chairman of the trustees, Kenneth E. Sampson, presided, and members were delighted with the museum's handsome new publication, the creation of Ralph E. Trower, publicity director. The book is, in fact, a catalog of all paintings and art pieces to be part of the first exhibit, with commentaries by Charles Morgan of Amherst and Bartlett Hayes of Andover, both distinguished art authorities.

The magnificent exhibit which the museum will house for the opening consists of New England art from New England museums from the 18th, 19th and 20th Centuries. Collections are now being hung in the sev-

eral galleries where guests will be greeted at the openings next week.

On Tuesday evening, from 5 to 7, there will be a press preview, to which members of the communications media from the South Shore and Boston are invited. Boston guests will make the trip to Brockton aboard a London bus which has been chartered for the occasion.

The museum's formal black tie opening is planned for Wednesday evening from 8 to 11 for charter members, heads of museums and state and city officials.

Then, on Thursday evening, a special opening will be held for those holding regular museum membership, as well as many of the living artists whose works are presented in the exhibit. This evening, from 8 to 11, is informal.

On Friday evening, the museum will be open to the general public with visitors to be asked for a non-member admission fee of \$1.

On all evenings champagne will be served along with finger delicacies. Background music will be provided on Baldwin organ and concert grand piano by Miss Doris Tirrell and Walter Lendh.

Tentative hours during which the museum will be open are Tuesdays through Fridays, 10 A.M. to 5 P.M.; Sundays, 1 to 6 P.M. The museum will be closed on Mondays.

ART CENTER OPENING IS HELD

(By Bettina Kyper)

The formal opening Wednesday evening of the magnificent new Brockton Art Center-Fuller Memorial was a glittering affair with an assembly of charter members from the South Shore enjoying the exhibit of priceless New England Art from the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries in the four galleries and in the spacious foyers.

Situated on a picturesque 18-acre site on Oak St., adjacent to Upper Porter Pond, the two-level museum complex is of traditional New England design on the outside, while the interior is one of the most functionally modern museums creating a subtle blending of the old and the new.

It is through the generosity of the late Myron L. Fuller who established Trust Funds for the museum, and by the donations of lands, funds and effort of interested Brockton and South Shore persons that the museum was made possible.

Mr. Fuller was brother of the late Charles L. Fuller, Daily Enterprise publisher, and uncle of the present co-publishers. Albert W. Fuller and Charles A. Fuller, Mr. and Mrs. Albert W. Fuller were unable to attend the museum opening because of Mr. Fuller's illness.

The first art exhibit consists mainly of regional canvases and sculpture loaned by the Addison Gallery of American Art, Phillips Academy; Amherst College, Bowdoin College Museum of Art, Chrysler Museum, Colby College Art Museum, DeCordova Museum, Fitchburg Art Museum, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Massachusetts Historical Society.

Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield; New Britain Museum of American Art; Portland Museum of Art; Rhode Island Historical Society, Rose Art Museum, Brandeis University; Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, Windsor, Vt.; Smith College Museum of Art, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown; University of New Hampshire, Scudder Gallery; Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Conn.; Worcester Art Museum and Yale University Art Gallery.

Artists represented are: Albert Alcalay, Washington Allston, David Aronson, Milton Avery, Joseph Badger, Edward Mitchell Bannister, Herbert Barnett, Harris Barron, Ros Barron, Leonard Baskin, George Bellows, Joseph Blackburn, Hyman Bloom, Varujan Boghosian, Horace Bundy, Joseph Goodhue

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Chandler, Frederick Edwin Church, James Goodwin Clonney, George H. Cohen, Charles Octavius Cole, John Singleton Copley, Gardner Cox, Jan Cox, Joseph DeMartini, Alfred Duca, Asher B. Durand.

Also, Ralph Earl, Robert Engman, Robert Eshoo, Robert Fiske, Erastus Salisbury Field, Howard Gibbs, Kahli Gibran, Sante Graziani, John Greenwood, Ernst Halberstadt, Robert Hamilton, Chester Harding, William Hart, Marsden Hartley, Childe Hassam, John Johnson Head, Fanny Hillsmith, Winslow Homer.

Edward Hopper, William Morris Hunt, Jim Huntington, Eastman Johnson, Rockwell Kent, Gyorgy Kepes, Karl Knaths, Lawrence Kupferman, John La Farge, Fitz Hugh Lane, John Laurent, Jack Levine, William Manning, John Marin, George Marinko, Michael Mazur, Richard Merkin, Bassadella Mirko, Robert S. Neuman, Kenneth Noland, Maxfield Parrish, Gabor Peterdi, Marianne Pineda.

Also, Arthur Polonsky, Maurice Prendergast, William M. Prior, John Quidor, Augustus Saint-Gaudens, John Singer Sargent, Edward Savage, Henry Schnakenberg, William Sharp, Mitchell Siporin, John Smibert, Maurice Sterne, Donald Stoltzenberg, Gilbert Stuart, Jane Stuart, Edmund C. Tarbell, Abbott Handerson Thayer, Harold Tovish, Hugh Townley, John Trumbull, Dwight W. Tryon, Jack Wolfe and Kari Zerbe.

Arrangements for the selections of three centuries of New England art were made by Edouard Du Buron, director of the Brockton Art Center.

A red carpet provided a touch of warm welcome for the guests as they entered the museum crossing over the entry bridge.

The lovely gowns of the ladies in a melange of color became more vivid against the stark white of the gallery walls. The ladies showed varying preferences in evening clothes from the long formals, the short semiformal, mini-skirt formals, theater suits, coat and dress ensembles and the very fashionable formal pants suits.

Background music created a pleasant atmosphere in the main gallery-auditorium played by Miss Doris H. Tirrell at the organ and Walter R. Lendh at the piano. Both instruments were loaned to the museum by the Baldwin Piano and Organ Studies of Brockton.

In this main gallery were the contemporary art works which seemed to pique the curiosity of many guests as they viewed the collection with both interest and challenge.

This gallery, which will serve both as a lecture hall and exhibition area, has a functional stage platform draped with black and gold curtains.

As guests moved through the museum's spacious areas—main galleries, art class studios, library-lounge, tearoom, where a fire burned cheerfully in the fireplace; the completely equipped kitchen, the administration areas, and the several connecting foyer passages—they sipped champagne served from buffet tables set with fresh flowers and lighted candles.

Mrs. Ralph E. Trower, general chairman of the museum's Ladies' Committee, was hostess for Wednesday evening's opening. Her assistants included Mrs. John R. Wheatley, Mrs. Merton B. Tarlow, Mrs. Manuel Alter, Mrs. E. Bradford Keith, Mrs. George O. Jenkins, Mrs. Wayne E. Clark, Mrs. John S. Chase, Mrs. Simon Gellich, Mrs. Alfred L. Duncombe, Mrs. A. Sladen Reynolds, Mrs. Edward E. Lyons, Mrs. Myron F. Fuller, Mrs. Charles N. Fuller, Mrs. Daniel J. McEachern, Mrs. Edward Kirby and Mrs. Fred Armor.

Also assisting the guests during the evening were members of Stonehill College's Key Club, who volunteered their services for the first time for an affair off the college campus.

Tonight the museum will be open to an invitation affair for those holding regular memberships. On Friday, there will be a public opening from 10 in the morning until 10 in the evening.

The museum, at the present time, has a membership of approximately 1,600 members, to whom all facilities and programs are available. The first post-opening event at the museum is planned for Feb. 5 when Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr., director of the Addison Gallery of American Art at Phillips Andover Academy, will lecture on "The Cow and the Electronic Eye—Three Centuries of Artistic Symbols in New England."

There is much more to come, including the opening of the art class school, for which arrangements are now nearly completed.

Thus Brockton's new art center, a cultural contribution to the community and the South Shore's only art museum, becomes a reality, to serve and inform and to encourage and develop knowledge and appreciation of the fine arts.

BLACK BRAIN DRAIN

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article from the winter 1968 issue of Columbia Forum:

BLACK BRAIN DRAIN

(By Vincent Harding)¹

A basic component of the malaise now experienced in the black urban north is the conviction in the ghettos that they are scheduled for increasingly traumatic visits from the white economic, political, and academic establishments. Many black community organizers, intellectuals, and revolutionaries share the conviction that these intrusions may (whatever their possibly benign intentions) have the effect of robbing the black communities of those painfully developed strengths which grew there in spite of—sometimes because of—America's shameful treatment. Indeed these incursions have already begun, in a form frighteningly reminiscent of some of the most questionable actions on the overseas "development" scene.

The political forces are competing with both business and academe for the most vigorous, creative black leaders, resulting in a "brain drain" no less significant than the one we see internationally, and causing many sober black persons to believe that the same institutions that helped for more than a century to create, maintain, and degrade the northern black urban world are now turning to rape it of all that is distinctive, all that holds potential power for the realization of new black humanity. That this is done in the name of liberalism does not lessen the shock or blunt the bitter edge.

The view from the south is distressingly similar. For when we look at the world of the southern Negro campuses (a fascinating variant of the black northern ghetto) it is starkly evident that the basic elements of our black suspicion and fear are no different. It appears that the same white academic institutions that helped to create the often tragic shortcomings of the black colleges have entered into and are speedily intensifying what may be a deadly relationship to us. We have already gone through—and generally rejected—the stage of being "adopted" by patronizing, white, northern "big brothers." Now, the most evident manifestations of the

¹ Vincent Harding, who received an M.A. degree from the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University and a Ph.D. degree in history from the University of Chicago, is chairman of the department of history at Spelman College in Atlanta, Georgia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1969

struggle and suspicion appear to be in the realm of competition for students and faculty personnel. Here, a process which has been developing since 1954, was heightened by the urban explosions of 1964-67, and finally brought to some kind of apogee by the death of Martin Luther King Jr.

Now, every black Ph.D. who has had his name mentioned twice, or who has published in the slightest review is besieged by northern, as well as southern, white institutions—most often in response to the militant, urgent, and often threatening demands of their black students. So black faculty members, especially those in the arts and social sciences (and this is where I am centering my concern) are being mercilessly tempted by offers of greatly increased salaries, prestige, and opportunities for research and publication. Many of the faculty persons who appear most attractive to the white schools are the very ones whose strengths are most urgently needed here at "home" in the southern black institutions.

In the realm of student recruiting, the same general situation prevails. Northern white schools in search of black types visit not only Harlem, Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, Los Angeles, and many other northern communities; they now move relentlessly through Raleigh, Charleston, Atlanta, Birmingham, and New Orleans as well. Their goal, of course, is to get the best black students they can find (this is not meant to deny the existence of those few so-called "high-risk" experiments, of course). In essence, this means that they enter the heartland of the black schools' potential resources, and are able to offer excellent students more money, more prestige of a certain kind, and promises of better graduate school and placement opportunities. So the process of cultural decimation continues apace, and its cloak is "integration."

What shall we do at such an impasse? I should like to suggest four rather concrete, if modest, proposals which may offer some first steps beyond the destructiveness that appears to be the present tendency in the relations between black and white institutions of higher learning:

1. Where faculty recruitment is concerned, we simply do not have now a sufficient supply of black faculty persons at the minimum level of competence to supply the demands of black and white institutions. (To speak of "minimum level" is, of course, to say nothing of the black-conscious, articulate, militant, scholar-teachers demanded by the various Afro-American student groups on white campuses!)

Therefore, all purposes might be served in a more logical and less internecine manner if in this strange interregnum white institutions established more visiting professorships in Afro-American studies and attempted less outright recruitment of black faculty from the black schools. Such professorships might require the faculty person to be present for a semester or a year. He would be asked to teach no more than one course and to deliver a number of public lectures. He could do whatever consulting he was gifted and inclined to do on subjects of curriculum or other matters.

In this way, the black faculty presence could be made available. Until there are more such persons, it would surely be taken, but at the same time it would provide the visitor a greater opportunity for research and writing than is usually available on black campuses. Depending, of course, on his personality, he could—even in a limited way—render invaluable service to the black students as well as to the larger campus. Perhaps of greatest importance is the fact that the black professor's services could be secured without forcing his own institution to suffer a permanent loss.

2. On undergraduate student recruitment policy it should be possible to work out an arrangement between a black and a white institution to this effect: With funds ob-

tained by the white school for financial aid, black students anywhere could be approached by individuals or a team that represented the two schools. They would be told that the money could be used for their expenses to attend—for instance—Carleton or Clark. Moreover, the agreement could include the stipulation that they spend a year as exchange students at the partner institution of the one chosen.

Here again, black-conscious students—like their faculty counterparts—would be relieved of some of the pressure presented by substantial sums of money appearing in white hands. Besides, both institutions would gain (to a limited degree in the second school's case) from the presence of the attractive prospects on their campuses.

3. To alleviate the financial poverty of black schools, a percentage of all moneys raised for work with black students on white campuses might be given to the United Negro College Fund. Probably more helpful, however, would be to contribute to the creation of an autonomous black educational foundation, one substantially funded for creative work on the black campuses.

4. Finally, as it is apparent that one of the basic problems all schools face is the shortage of persons trained at the graduate level in the area of greatest demand by black students—Afro-American studies—it is imperative that we work cooperatively to fill that gap. In spite of the attempts now being made to do this in a variety of most unlikely places, much logic seems to reside in the thought that black institutions, if properly funded and organized, could probably do this best, especially where traditions, libraries, and faculties seem at least adequate.

In the Atlanta University Center, for example, there are six black institutions with more than two dozen scholars among their faculties whose training, experience, and teaching in the field of Afro-American life and culture are significant. The Slaughter Collection of Negro Literature, the outstanding Georgia State Archives, and the recently inaugurated Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library combine to present unusual library and archival resources. Nor is one properly able to estimate the importance of the tradition and legacy left by such scholars as W. E. B. Dubois, E. Franklin Frazier, Rayford Logan, E. S. Braithwaite, and Ira Reid.

It is against this background of past and present resources (to say nothing of current student concern) that we in Atlanta are now in the process of creating an Institute for Advanced Afro-American Studies. This center would train scores of new persons in the field within the next decade and would make serious programs and curriculum resources available for the retooling of persons already teaching—from nursery school to the graduate level. The Institute will need financial support in the millions of dollars, and some of that should come from the northern institutions, which have been so long discovering the academic reality (and respectability) of Afro-American studies, and which are now demanding instant experts—with publications to match—largely to save their own lives.

The Institute proposes to help produce the authorities, not instantaneously, but with passionate and responsible care. Cooperative alliances of various kinds should therefore be possible—on terms which must, of course, assure our integrity. Here is a signal opportunity. Many Afro-Americans are plagued by serious doubts concerning the capacity of American higher education to escape the contempt of history. They wonder whether it is needed too deeply imitative of the larger society to find new paths. There are doubts about whether the current rage for things black will last—even beyond the next inauguration. Often, on a more personal level, we speculate on how much the pressures toward capitulation, co-optation, and cynicism will mount among those of us who share the

black heritage. Sometimes in the midst of these doubts we are afraid.

These brief proposals are made as a movement against the stream of fear, not as a blind act of faith in American educational institutions, but as an expression of that critical hope and ultimate commitment to a new humanity which alone make life bearable—at least for me—in this strange and threatening land.

INTERPOL

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the people of this country have a misimpression of the structure, goals, and functions of IPCO-Interpol. Recently Mr. James Pomeroy Hendrick, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury—for enforcement—and Vice President of Interpol, addressed the 631st graduating class of the Treasury Law Enforcement School. Mr. Hendrick's speech corrects the public misimpression and puts into proper focus a subject which should be one of continuing concern to every thoughtful person. Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote here-with the text of Mr. Hendrick's speech:

REMARKS OF JAMES POMEROY HENDRICK BEFORE THE 631ST GRADUATION CLASS OF THE TREASURY LAW ENFORCEMENT SCHOOL

The other night I saw the beginning of a movie replayed on TV. Scene: A mountain high up in the Alps. Down the steep slope sped a skier, performing his traverses and parallel turns with unusual verve and grace. One heard in the distance a crack, as if a small branch of a tree had been broken. Then suddenly the skier fell. How could so expert a man be so clumsy? But no—it was a fall, something had hit him. He was lying inert. Now the camera zooms back up the mountain. We see a heavy-jowled man in military uniform caressing his telescopic sight rifle. "One more Interpol agent dead!" he growls in a thick foreign accent. "Decadent capitalistic stooges! My country will get rid of them all!"

So starts the movie and so go the impressions of many people in regard to this extraordinary organization, the International Criminal Police Organization, familiarly known as Interpol (a name which, by the way, has been registered as a trademark by the Organization in the United States and a number of other member countries).

A FALSE IMPRESSION

Actually the movie gave a completely false impression of what Interpol is about. Interpol deals with law enforcement when it involves crossing international borders—a robber, a counterfeiter, a rapist, or what have you, who after committing his crime flees from one country to another. But Interpol never involves itself in political, military, religious or racial matters. These activities are forbidden by its constitution.

INTERPOL'S MISSION

Interpol concerns itself only with normal, everyday crime, and it is pledged to action always in conformity with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whose twentieth anniversary we have recently celebrated. It is concerned with apprehension of criminals, exchange of information, identification, arrest, extradition. In addition, it also works in the field of crime prevention. It puts out literature on counterfeits, automobile thefts, and any number of other subjects designed to facilitate the law enforcement

officer in his task of dissuading potential criminals from breaking the law before they actually do so. It also holds symposiums on these and other subjects.

There is such a symposium going on right now on technical methods of tracking down criminals. Treasury's Dr. Maynard Pro, from the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Laboratory, is in Paris at this moment advising other member country experts of the extraordinary progress made by the United States in neutron activation. This technique makes possible conviction of a safecracker by proving that dust on the floor by the safe in question is the same as that on his trouser knees, gathered there when he knelt to do his work. And by proving further that such dust could not have come from any other place in the world.

HISTORY

A word about the Organization's history. The idea of Interpol arose in 1914 when a number of police officers, magistrates and lawyers met in Monaco to lay the foundations for international police cooperation. Here was established an International Criminal Police Congress. A few months later World War I broke out and the plan was shelved.

In 1923 the International Criminal Police Congress met again, this time in Vienna. Delegates from some 20 countries approved creation of an International Criminal Police Commission. Its headquarters was established in Vienna and a satisfactory start made with operations limited to Europe. But again hostilities brought a stop to the activity with the advent of World War II.

In 1946 high ranking enforcement officers met in Brussels to breathe new life into the temporarily discontinued Commission. At this meeting the Organization's constitution was revised and headquarters set up in Paris. This time there were only 19 member countries represented, but in contrast to the past they came from all parts of the world.

By 1956 the membership had increased to 55 countries. A meeting was held in Vienna; here significant regulatory changes were agreed to which have remained for the most part unchanged.

ORGANIZATION—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Since grown to more than 100 members, from Algeria to Zambia, Interpol is directed by a General Assembly, meeting once a year to discuss matters of crime and of organization.

The 1968 Assembly recently held in Iran took up, among other substantive matters: Recent developments in juvenile delinquency, disaster victim identification, international currency counterfeiting, forged bills of lading, police planning, international drug traffic, and protection of works of art.

Among organizational subjects considered, in addition to budget, elections and appointments, was a United States plan, which was unanimously approved, for better auditing procedures.

Held each year in a different country (the last Washington meeting was in 1960), the Assembly provides an unrivaled opportunity for top echelon enforcement officers throughout the world to exchange views and to become well acquainted so that when problems arise involving two countries the officer in each will know just whom he is dealing with.

RESOLUTIONS—MARIJUANA

General Assembly resolutions are passed which often carry great weight in the international enforcement community and with the public at large.

The year before, for example, a strong resolution on the dangers of marijuanna was drafted by then United States Commissioner of Narcotics Henry L. Giordano. Passed at a time when public debate raged over the question whether marijuanna was not safer for one's daughter than drinking a cocktail, the resolution, which expressed law enforcement men's unanimous opposition to this

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

permissive idea, did much to bring sanity to popular understanding of the subject.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Handling problems which must be treated in greater detail or greater depth than may be possible in the General Assembly is an Executive Committee presently formed of three members each from Africa, the Americas, Asia and Europe, together with a President, at this time a European. Ordinarily the Committee meets twice a year. The newly elected President, Mr. Paul Dickopf, is the head of the German Federal Criminal Police Office. I had the opportunity recently to visit Mr. Dickopf's headquarters in Wiesbaden and can attest to the efficiency and sympathetic intelligence with which Mr. Dickopf's operation is conducted.

THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

While the governing policies of Interpol are established by the General Assembly and the Executive Committee, the day-to-day operations are handled by an Executive Secretariat. This consists of a Secretary General together with officers who exercise various functions, including the operation of a worldwide communications system dealing with international police work (126,000 cables in 1967), a central record of international criminals, 1,000,000 cards, 40,000 criminals), a research center, a section dealing with reports to General Assemblies, major international organizations and scientific bodies, and one which produces an International Criminal Police Review. Many documents are published by the Secretariat dealing with criminals who have left home base, recidivists, or those most sought after, and dealing with the subject of international crime. In addition, a publication or counterpart currency is widely circulated to banks and financial institutions, surely the most helpful publication of its kind that exists today.

HEADQUARTERS

The headquarters of the Organization was recently moved from an ancient building in Paris to a relatively small American-style office building in the environs of Paris at St. Cloud. Any of you who have been to Paris will know how rare indeed are new buildings in that beautiful city. The Interpol building is an extraordinary exception—extraordinary not only because it is new but also because the architecture, completely modern, nonetheless fits in with the surrounding countryside in a manner entirely pleasing to the eye.

One feature of the new building which is of interest to visitors is the Crime Museum on the ground floor. Here are typical exhibits of smugglers' tricks—the false bottomed suitcase, the hollow heel of a shoe; and of ordinary and extraordinary weapons, jimmies and tools of all sorts used in robberies, hold-ups and murders.

THE "CARBINE" WILLIAMS SINGLE ACTION COLT

Most impressive of all from our standpoint is a beautifully carved Colt single-action revolver which was given to Interpol a year ago by Mr. Samuel Pryor, one of our General Assembly delegates. The revolver had been owned by one of America's great criminals, "Carbine" Williams. The adjective "great" is used advisedly.

While serving a 20-year term in prison for—and this is ironic—the killing of one of our Treasury agents during the Prohibition era, Williams had the imagination, energy and courage to draw up plans for an unusual rifle adopting the hitherto unknown principle of a floating chamber. Pardoned after his plans became known to a sympathetic warden, Williams explained the working of the weapon to the United States Army Chief of Ordnance, and this became the M-1 carbine used throughout World War II by our armed forces. Though he would accept no compensation for this extremely significant invention, he later worked up for commercial

firms many new developments in the art. Independently wealthy as a result, Williams today is a leading and respected citizen of North Carolina.

FINANCES

From the financial standpoint Interpol represents something to which all international organizations, and indeed all domestic corporations and all house-holders, aspire, most of them in vain.

It has a modest budget which it does not exceed.

Moreover, its new building was completed on schedule and cost less than the amount budgeted.

Due credit for these accomplishments must be given to the extremely efficient and effective Secretary General, Jean Népote.

The over-all budget for the coming year is some 2.3 million Swiss francs, roughly \$530,000. The United States share of this is \$28,500 or approximately 5.4 percent. We, together with other developed countries such as the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Italy, pay a larger share than do the developing countries. Nonetheless the United States percentage for Interpol is almost the lowest percentage figure for its contribution to any international organization. We pay 30 percent or over of the dues for the United Nations, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO and WHO. For many inter-American organizations our contribution is over 60 percent.

A considerable number of the employees of the Organization are borrowed from the French police force, with the Organization paying only a relatively small amount for the work they do. The over-all annual expense for 102 employees, including those loaned from the French police, is 1,142,500 Swiss francs, which works out at an average of some 11,000 Swiss francs or approximately \$2,500 per employee. No one can say that this is not an economically run organization!

THE NATIONAL CENTRAL BUREAUS

The recipients of the day-to-day inquiries and releases put out by the Organization, and the transmitters of information back to the Organization or to other members, are the National Central Bureaus. Each country has one. They function in conjunction with the Executive Secretariat as a permanent and truly worldwide network of international cooperation. The United States National Central Bureau, established in 1958, when our Congress voted adherence to Interpol, is in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

COOPERATION WITH SCOTLAND YARD

On a recent trip to London, I was able to talk with the Scotland Yard men who form the United Kingdom National Central Bureau. They were delighted that only a few days before my arrival they asked our office in Washington if arrangements could be made for a particular United States citizen to come to London to testify as a witness in a case which was unexpectedly being called for trial within only two days' time. To their delight, our telegraphed reply advised that the potential witness would be on a plane going to London that very night, and the reply went out within two hours.

SOME SPECIFIC CASES

I would like to conclude by giving a few examples of what Interpol actually accomplishes in specific cases. Of necessity, names and certain details have been fictionalized because certain aspects of the cases are still pending.

A BRONX MURDER

A hoodlum named "Mickey the Mite" Mannheimer had been observed on the scene of a killing in the Bronx with a smoking revolver in his hand. Before the police could arrest him he got away, but not before he had been identified by Joey Angulo, a known and trusted informant in narcotic cases.

Weeks had elapsed with no sign of Mickey the Mite. The only lead police could develop was a Bronx girl named Gretchen who lived

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1969

in the apartment above Mickey. Mickey and Gretchen had been known to have been what is called "very good friends"—although this had not interfered with Gretchen's carrying on her profession, which was the world's oldest.

Gretchen was German and her parents lived in the old country. Acting on a hunch, the Assistant District Attorney in charge of the investigation called our Treasury man. We sent a cable at once to Paul Dickopf, head of the Bundeskriminalamt (Federal Criminal Police Office) in Weisbaden. Dickopf's men started asking questions in Hamburg where it was believed the parents could be found. It didn't take long. Mickey the Mite was found with the parents. He is now back in New York. He is awaiting trial on a charge of first degree murder.

BANKS DEFRAUDED

Another case: Three months ago a rather thin man with aquiline nose and heavy eyeglasses walked into the main American office of Banco di Roma e Ferrara. He presented a draft drawn on its Rome office for \$60,000 together with a letter from a senior officer of the Bank of America and a passport purporting to establish that his name was Giovanni Semplice of 4001 Deep Valley Avenue. Relying on the letter and the passport, the draft was cashed. The next day the same man repeated the performance at the Farmers and Mechanics Bank—another \$60,000. Later on the same day, he tried it out on the Citizens First National Union Bank, again with success. In due course the banks discovered the Rome office had no funds on deposit to support the drafts and the Bank of America's officer's letter was a forgery. Fingerprints were lifted from one of the papers presented, but FBI latent print files were negative on them. Once more our Treasury man was called on. Over to the INTERPOL Bureau in Rome went the prints and a description; back came the identification and not long after Semplice (whose name turned out to be Durante, well known to the Carabinieri with a criminal record long as his arm) was apprehended in Ferrara. The man is now awaiting trial.

SENIOR CITIZENS DEFRAUDED

One more: For eight years the police in Los Angeles had been on the lookout for a man known to them under the names of Johnson, Henderson, Smithson, Jackson, and Williamson. The name always varied, except for a "son" at the end. The reason the police wanted this man was always the same. In each case, a personalized form letter was widely circulated through the mails to persons in the retirement age bracket offering each lucky recipient an exclusive franchise for the sale of Coty perfumes within a large and carefully designated territory for a mere \$6,000, only \$100 down. It was surprising how many innocents accepted and surprising how Mr. _____ son could never be found after the checks had been sent and cashed.

Notice of the fraud was sent to us by the Los Angeles police and we gave a description to Interpol Paris which in turn circularized it to the member countries. Scotland Yard reported a Wrightson recently and hurriedly departed from Manchester after a franchise offer. This news also was circularized to the Interpol membership. Two months later, the New Zealand police noted an advertisement in a small local paper inviting inquiries on a franchise for Ivor Johnson bicycles. It was signed by a Mr. Bankson. The new Zealand police had read the Interpol notices. Mr. Bankson was traced. He is now safe behind bars in Wellington. He would rather be there than in Los Angeles but who knows whether he'll always be able to stay away.

WEAPON TO COMBAT INTERNATIONAL CRIME

Soon we are going to see introduction of the new jumbo-sized planes, carrying over double the number of passengers, and at reduced rates. More and more the criminal elements will use them. More and more crime

will become international. In seeking to control it, the enforcement officer must use every legal weapon in his arsenal. Among these weapons few if any can be more useful than ICPO-Interpol.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL J. KREBS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEW JERSEY STATE OFFICE OF CONSUMER PROTECTION, BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1969, ON THE SUBJECT OF NEW CAR WARRANTIES

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in our country today, one of the strongest voices for consumer protection is that of former Representative Paul J. Krebs who now serves with great distinction as executive director of the New Jersey State Office of Consumer Protection.

On January 9, 1969, Mr. Krebs continued to show his concern for the consumer and his determination to leave no stone unturned in his quest for more and better consumer protection legislation. Mr. Krebs testified before the Federal Trade Commission on the subject of new car warranties.

Because of the high interest in consumer protection I am including Mr. Krebs' testimony in the Record and urge all of my colleagues in the House to review this thought-provoking presentation:

TESTIMONY OF PAUL J. KREBS

Gentlemen, I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the consumers of New Jersey. As the Director of a functional State Agency concerned with the problems and protection of the consumer, I frequently appear before State and Federal bodies in order to document the consumer's problems. I usually use case histories in order to do so.

In preparation for my testimony here today, I asked my staff to select new car warranty cases that would clearly picture our experience in this area. Our staff members each had at least a dozen cases to cite. We discussed these almost 200 current cases. We also reviewed the reports of your own and other staffs as well as recent articles in the newspapers and magazines and testimony gathered at other hearings in this field.

It soon became evident that the problems were all too well known. Every car buyer, every organization concerned with the industry and every portion of the news media had its horror stories to tell. To come here and tell our own would still provide no answers to the two basic questions: Should the government do something to end the situation? What should and could be done?

Our own case histories document the Federal Trade Commission's Staff Report. We will, of course, be happy to make them available to you. In our testimony today, however, we would prefer to briefly state some of the problems and then offer our suggestions for what the Federal Government should and could do about them. First, the problems:

THE PROBLEMS

The express warranty of the new car manufacturer is designed to limit his liability—not to protect the buyer. It is the manufacturer's advertising that has made it seem

otherwise to the consumer. So-called liberalization of the warranty has been a coverup for increased production schedules which render careful assembly and close inspection impossible. It has also been the fodder for a propaganda battle between manufacturers designed to convince the buyer that one product is superior to another.

What must be remembered is that while warranty competition between manufacturers may cause a consumer to choose one automobile over another, the fact remains that the need of the average American for a car forces him to make that choice. What the consumer needs is not merely a more understandable warranty but protection against an industry-wide system that gives him no recourse against giant manufacturers whose product is frequently defective and unsafe.

What we will propose therefore is a government-enforced transmutation of the express warranty from a limitation of the manufacturers' liability to the safeguard of the consumer that the manufacturers' advertising has made it seem.

Other warranty problems are all corollaries of the central problem. The complaints heard most frequently are:

1. The language of the manufacturers' express warranty is so vague and legalistic that the consumer has no understanding of what is actually covered by the warranty.

2. The manufacturer issuing the express warranty is also the sole judge and jury of whether or not his warranty should apply. It seems to the average consumer that the manufacturer almost always resolves the matter in his own favor. The manufacturer is, of course, in a greatly superior position to that of the consumer and is more able to deal with such problems as he.

3. The consumers' only recourse when the manufacturer fails to make needed repairs is to start a long and expensive court battle. Such a court battle not only involves time and expense but places the individual consumer in the position of having to do battle with his greatly more resourceful superior.

4. Defects are not corrected after repeated returns to the dealer; or the car is so defective many, many repairs of differing kinds must be made.

5. The manufacturer only has to replace parts even when the defect has caused the entire automobile to become useless or dangerous.

The consumer appears not to be alone in his problems with the giant manufacturers of the automobile industry. The franchised dealer, too, has his problems. Most common amongst dealer complaints are (1) that they cannot get the parts needed for repair; (2) that the manufacturer allows little time or money for making an automobile ready for delivery and (3) that they are inadequately compensated for warranty repairs.

A SUGGESTED SOLUTION

The solution that we propose hinges on two main points. The first is the concept of implied warranty of merchantability and fitness for use. The second is that the consumer needs and deserves the aid of a government agency in dealing with his problems with the automobile manufacturer. In this testimony, we suggest that the Federal Trade Commission be that government agency. We do so in order to be consistent with our previous testimony. If you will recall, we appeared before you in December to recommend the establishment of a Federal Department of Consumer Affairs. We recommended further that the Federal Trade Commission be incorporated into that Federal Department of Consumer Affairs. Since at this time, there has not yet been established such a department, we are suggesting that the powers which would ordinarily be delegated to the Secretary of such a department be delegated instead to the Federal Trade Commission.

As I am sure you are all well aware, the Uniform Commercial Code which has been adopted by many of the states contains the concept of the implied warranty of merchantability. Unfortunately, this concept as embodied in state law has been of relatively little aid to the consumer in his dealings with the automobile manufacturers. The major problem has been the need to undergo lengthy and costly legal proceedings in order to establish your position under this law. Too, some states have held that the manufacturers' express warranty may be used in lieu of the implied warranty of merchantability. It is this first problem that we would address ourselves to. The purpose of the implied warranty of merchantability is the protection of the buyer from unsafe and defective products. The purpose of a manufacturer's express warranty, on the other hand, is the limitation of the manufacturer's liability for defects. It is our understanding that the implied warranty and the express warranty are actually mutually exclusive. We are happy to note that several court decisions, most notably in Florida and Tennessee, have ruled that the manufacturers' express warranty may not be in lieu of the implied warranty.

The heart of our proposed solution is a Federal statute imposing and enforcing a broadened concept of the implied warranty of merchantability on new automobiles sold in interstate commerce. This statute should provide that the manufacturer may not exclude himself from this implied warranty either through his express warranty or by using the words "as is." We propose that it be left to the Federal Trade Commission to establish regulations for the administration of this provision.

We recommend further that the act contain language such as the following: "The act, use or employment by any person of any deception, fraud, false pretense, false promise, misrepresentation, or the knowing, concealment, suppression, or omission, in connection with the sale or advertisement of any automobile sold in interstate commerce or with the subsequent performance of such person as aforesaid is declared to be an unlawful practice."

Similar language in the New Jersey statutes has been interpreted as pertaining to a warranty or guarantee. It is held that a warranty is a promise of performance that is relied upon by the purchaser when determining whether or not to buy. If such promise is not fulfilled (subsequent performance), the seller is found to be in violation of the statute. We recommend that the Federal Trade Commission be given the authority to enforce this statute administratively and to impose penalties for violation of the statute. We would suggest a penalty of \$1,000 for a first offense and \$5,000 for subsequent offenses.

We recommend further that the Federal Trade Commission be empowered to establish regional bodies for compulsory arbitration of warranty disputes. This will prevent the present situation wherein the manufacturer issuing the warranty is the sole judge and jury of whether that warranty shall apply. The purpose of this recommendation is to provide the American automobile purchaser with a federal administrative agency to which he can bring his new car warranty problems and to enable him to deal with the automobile manufacturer as if he were an equal and not an inferior. The regional bodies should be empowered to hear any case in which the consumer believes the manufacturer is unlawfully denying liability. Specifically excluded, however, should be those cases where the consumer is seeking compensation for injuries or other loss sustained by reason of defective or unsafe products.

At the present time, the manufacturers limit their liability to the replacement of defective parts. We would recommend that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

this limitation be circumvented by the regional arbitration bodies in those cases where the product appears to have been in such unsafe or defective condition as to prevent satisfactory repair. It should be left to the discretion of the arbitration agency to set standards for the number of repeated attempts at repair which may be reasonably and conscientiously required by the manufacturer before such replacement is granted to the consumer.

We wish at this time to address ourselves to some of the problems which we described as corollary to the central problem of providing the consumer with protection against this system. Number one in our discussion of those problems was the language and wording of the manufacturers' express warranty. We have carefully studied the provisions of a bill introduced by Senators Carl Hayden and Warren Magnuson on December 6, 1967, under bill No. S. 2727. We should like to recommend to you Section 4 of that bill which prescribes warranty standards. You will note that the Hayden-Magnuson Bill leaves much to the discretion of the regulatory agency, which was in that case the Commerce Department. We, of course, are recommending that the administration of these warranty standards be placed in the hands of the Federal Trade Commission. I am sure that it is not necessary for me to read the language of this section of S. 2727 but I should like to call your special attention to that portion which includes provision for the adjustment and settlement of warranty cases by arbitration.

The second and third problems delineated in our listing of corollary situations are the manufacturers' judgment of his own warranty and the consumers' limited recourse to lengthy legal proceedings. We believe that these two corollary problems will be answered by the establishment of the regional arbitration bodies.

Numbers four and five in our list were the problems of defects not being corrected after repeated returns to the dealer and manufacturer liability limited to replacement of defective parts. This too we would feel is answered by the powers given to the regional arbitration agencies.

The last section of the act must deal with the problems of the franchised dealers who frequently are as powerless as the consumer in their dealings with the automobile manufacturer. We would recommend that the dealer be considered a consumer in two specified limited situations: to wit: (1) the situation wherein the dealer is unable to serve his customer by obtaining adequate materials and compensation for labor in preparing an automobile for initial delivery, (2) the situation wherein the dealer cannot obtain the proper materials or receive adequate compensation for labor required in warranty repairs. In these limited factual patterns, the dealer will have the same recourse as that afforded to the consumer through the regional arbitration bodies.

What we have attempted to do in our proposal is to consider the new car warranty problem in its broadest possible aspect. The express new car warranty of the automobile manufacturers is an industry-wide system which affects not only the consumer but the franchised dealer as well. To base recommendations for new legislation on the premise and philosophy of the express warranty would be to render limited aid to the consumer himself. The entire concept of new car warranties is what needs correction. We feel this correction can be accomplished only through the imposition and enforcement of a broadened implied warranty of merchantability concept. We have not denied to the manufacturer his option for specific, express warranties. We have only prevented him from limiting his liability in such a manner as to render harm to the public good. The manufacturers may continue their advertising battle to attract the attention of the

prospective buyer; but with the safeguards of this legislation, each buyer would have the comforting knowledge that at least a minimum of protection against unsafe and defective automobiles will be afforded to him through the aid of government agencies.

Not only have we changed the concept of warranty but, in certain specific situations, we have changed the concept of dealer from one of agent to that of consumer. No longer will the dealer have to be the man in the middle, refused aid from the manufacturer who granted him his franchise and besieged by the consumer who considers him to be at fault for automobiles not prepared for delivery or not repaired properly.

Under this proposal, the Federal Trade Commission will be given many new and important responsibilities. It will become the consumers' watchdog with power to administer sanctions for failure of the manufacturer to comply with federal law. In the establishment of the regional arbitration agencies a section of the Federal Trade Commission will become the vehicle for settlement of legitimate consumer complaints against the automobile manufacturer.

We recognize that this proposal, although with adequate precedent, is a radical departure from present law. We will therefore not burden you with any extraneous remarks and will close our testimony by urging that the Federal Trade Commission support the adoption of this proposed legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Thank you gentlemen.

LET'S ACT NOW

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I reintroduced legislation which I first sponsored in 1967 concerning bargaining and strikes. This joint resolution calls for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to review and recommend revisions in the laws relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts. I truly hope that this year we can move this legislation through the House. If there is any question as to the need for such legislation, may I recommend a review of recent statistics released by the Department of Labor. Quite briefly, the statistics established last year—1968—was the biggest strike year since 1953. They listed 4,950 labor stoppages. In all, 47 million man-days of work were lost as a result of strikes last year. What a ghastly and costly blow to our Nation.

But, look ahead; 1969 could be the worst ever.

I truly hope Congress will act now rather than be forced into hasty reaction later. Permit me also to insert two extremely timely newspaper editorials which appeared in the Port Huron Times Herald, Port Huron, Mich., on January 9 and 10 commenting on this subject:

GOVERNMENT MUST MEET LABOR CRISIS

The slow strangulation of a big chunk of the oil distribution industry deserves the immediate attention of State and Federal officials.

In Detroit, Teamsters have added their muscle to a strike of oil workers against seven suppliers of gasoline and fuel oil—part of a nationwide strike of 60,000 Oil-

Chemical and Atomic Workers in a wage dispute.

It is only a matter of time—and not much time, at that—before severe shortages will cut vital transportation and, worse, will bring thousands of householders face-to-face with how to combat a Michigan winter with no fuel in the furnace.

Another facet to the labor disruption of people's lives was added today by a strike of the Wire Service Guild against the Associated Press, the Nation's largest newsgathering organization, threatening a dimout of news to people throughout the entire United States.

It is high time that State and Federal officials come to grips with the power that unions have to threaten the health, welfare and safety of citizens. It is high time that government, concerned for the rights of individuals in every other sphere of life, attack the blind spot it has for the right of individuals against the ruthless squeeze that labor unions remain free to impose on a helpless citizenry.

We say to President-Elect Nixon, Senator Philip Hart, Senator Robert Griffin and Rep. James Harvey—we say to Lieut. Gov. Milliken, Senator Alvin DeGraw and Rep. William S. Jowett that no other crisis today is as urgent as that posed by unchecked union power to deprive citizens of commodities and services essential to their health and well-being.

For government to continue to close its eyes to such power—and its abusive use—is to approve of an anarchy that can destroy our society.

We do not, by any means, blame unions for every strike. Nor do we welcome government intervention in yet another area of American life.

Nevertheless, the conclusion is inescapable that only government can right the wrongs being suffered by citizens. Only legislation can restore people's rights to the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" they once enjoyed. If labor unions will not recognize any responsibility to citizens, then government—however reluctantly—must step in to insure that our economy and our society continues to function.

The matter is that serious. The crisis is here. Government must act now!

THE DANGERS—AND NEEDS—ARE CLEAR

The Times Herald editorial on page one Thursday urged prompt and effective action on the part of government to resist the misuse of power by organized labor.

It charged State and federal officials with the clear responsibility to prevent the nationwide hardship and peril which must follow serious interference with essential goods and services.

That stand was not lightly taken. We recognize the real danger inherent in government control in the sensitive relationship between union and management.

We have consistently urged de-emphasizing government control where there is will and ability to find acceptable solutions within the private domain by nongovernment agencies.

But government obviously must move when there is an unresolved threat to the health, welfare or safety of the American people.

We recognize very clearly that government interference in union-management affairs is close to the heart and core of our economic system. Such interference can only be justified by a major tampering with the rights and well-being of uncounted millions who have no direct involvement in the disputes at issue.

Yet we believe that current strike activities, direct and sympathetic, constitute such a major tampering. The forces of labor have gone overboard in the exercise of their rights.

They are using their legitimate strike

weapon unjustly against a multitude of innocent people. The fact that their own membership may be suffering along with everybody else is no justification for an attack on the public at large.

Continuation of these policies without some effective element of control, whether that be new legislation or realistic application of existing laws, could lead to a major disaster in this country.

It is no exaggeration to say it could even result in an upheaval of our political system.

Carried to extremes, it could resolve itself into a stalemate crisis which nothing short of forced socialism or dictatorship could break.

These are not faint-hearted anxieties. They are distinct possibilities when vital elements of the American society are threatened.

And vital elements ARE threatened when fuel supplies could be cut off, or transportation of essential goods could be halted, or necessary public services could be withheld.

That is why we say again, most emphatically, that government must step in to protect the American people. Power tactics which would use the health, happiness and safety of innocent people as an instrument of negotiation can only be countered by the greater power of government.

Cold weather, hunger and disease will not wait for a politic time.

The time is now for legislators on the State and federal level to recognize the intensity and urgency of this problem and to start doing something about it.

TO BE A NATION UNDER GOD

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at this time when we have just inaugurated a new President of the United States, I feel it is appropriate to insert in the Record a sermon prepared and delivered on Sunday, January 19, 1969, by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, S.T.D., Litt. D., LL. D., pastor of the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, D. C., from the pulpit of that church. His sermon is most meaningful and inspiring to me, and its delivery right before the official inauguration helped set the tone of that event for many of us who heard the sermon, which follows:

To Be A NATION UNDER GOD

(By Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, the National Presbyterian Church pulpit)

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Psalm 33:12.

"Do not throw away your faith now, for it carries with it great reward." Hebrews 10:35.

In ancient Sparta it was the custom of mothers to present shields to their sons before going into battle, with the statement, "Either bring this back or be brought back upon it." Many young men were given courage when they were presented with their father's shield.

This Lacedaemonian ceremony was in the mind of the author of this verse in the Letter to the Hebrews. It was declared, "Cast not away your confession of faith. This is your shield. Keep it and it will be your defense. This faith, thy father, by the grace of God, has always kept. Keep it also or thou must expect to perish."

These are unforgettable words which are applicable to America in this hour. "Do not

throw away your faith, for it carries with it great reward."

What is it then that makes America utterly unique among the nations of the world? This is an apt question for today.

"In the beginning God." On these, the first words of the Bible, early America staked down its life.

This central tenet of our life was explicit in our Declaration of Independence. It is implicit in our instruments of government. It permeates our institutions. And it is manifest in our common days. The virtues of our people and the values in our culture are derived from the premise that this is "a nation under God."

This basic truth has been mediated to our people through many religious traditions and by many denominations. All espouse in common a faith in a transcendent God in history and beyond history. In some this faith in God has been intimate and personal; in others an attitude of life derived from the social climate and the cultural atmosphere produced by religious faith, principally evangelical Christian faith.

To be sure, America has as a principle the complete separation of the institutions of the Church from the institution of government. In our pluralistic religious structure this separation has been a source of virility to both Church and state. But, while we cling tenaciously to this principle of separation, no doctrine of American life has ever minimized the presence, the power, or the influence of religion in our national affairs. Our national life begins and continues its whole structure on the premise of the first words of the Bible, "In the beginning God."

To be "under God" is to acknowledge that this is God's world—that He is the sovereign Lord and Ruler of all life. He is the God of Creation, Man, created in His image, bears some of God's characteristics. Man is a person as God is a person; and the only reason for treating human beings with dignity and respect is that they are persons created in God's image, with immortal souls and an eternal destiny. Thus created by God in God's own image, man is free under God's rulership. His freedom is God-bestowed, not an attainment but an obtainment. Man is born free and the chief end of this free man, as the catechism long ago said, is "to glorify God and enjoy Him forever." God Himself is the Lord of Creation and He will have no other gods before Him. Therefore, that nation which deifies itself or absolutizes some reality in its life, as did Nazi Germany, cannot be a nation "under God." Such is idolatry, for that nation has usurped God's place. Americans have always rejected this temptation. Americans believe God is above the nation.

To be "under God" is also to be under His providence. There is a destiny for that nation whose "God is the Lord"—a destiny shaped and determined by the Almighty Himself. Our spiritual forebears covenanted with God, not as a tribal or a racial deity but as the universal God who, while being the God of all people, becomes in a special sense the God of those who accept His purpose for human life.

Our history has meaning only in these terms. We are a people under God's providence.

To be "under God" is to be guided by Him. That nation which seeks to understand and obey His laws, that nation which seeks to discern and do His will—only that nation becomes an effective instrument of God's purpose on the earth. Above all, over all, guiding all, empowering all is the transcendent God. To the degree we possess His mind and spirit which is at the center of the universe, and which we Christians believe to be revealed by Jesus Christ, we are and we shall remain a "nation under God."

This concept of freedom under God cannot survive as a mere intellectual expression.

Apart from its source, it will wither and die. But enriched by prayer, strengthened by worship, maintained by a variety of spiritual disciplines, our great nation can successfully confront all forces which would corrupt its life or destroy its freedom. A dynamic and witnessing faith is not an option for our time; it is an imperative for all ages.

But deeper than these truths, a nation "under God" is a nation under God's judgment. God is sovereign Ruler of a moral universe. Man is not the final source of values. Nor is the nation the highest tribunal of judgment. The values by which both men and nations are judged are eternal. They rest with God. They inhere in His character. Man and his institutions are under God's final judgment. There is a divine order above all and beyond all, in time and beyond time, where love and justice are righteousness and truth are absolute the perfect order of God's Kingdom where God rules the heart and conscience of all beings. There is a higher court of Judgment above all persons, above all nations, above all cultures, even above all universes—the Court of God's eternal perfection. A nation "under God" is always under His judgment.

Here in this Capital city this truth was legislated into our Pledge of Allegiance, is printed on our postage stamps, and imprinted on our coins. Now we have put it in our new Church.

Now let us each impress it deep within our own hearts and manifest it in our lives and national conduct. Such testimony, to be sure, will sharpen the irreconcilable differences between the two great poles of power in our world today. But it will also give us the strength to live in these times and play our God-appointed role in history.

Our dominating concern in Washington on January 20, 1969, is not what we know, not the skills we possess, not the wealth we have accumulated, but rather the spirit we convey to the world. To whom are we committed? By Whom are we led? These are the commanding questions.

Freedom under God is not permanently secured, nor safely installed anywhere without personal responsibility and unceasing vigilance. Freedom is always only one generation away from extinction. Freedom must be won, understood, guarded, and enriched in each age.

Not out of fear or insecurity, or as a substitute for solid thinking, not as an escape to an easy and comfortable way do we seek to reclaim our ancient heritage. But rather we worship and pray, we trust and obey, because it is the very life-spring of our national being.

If we are to lead in this hour of life, America must become a citadel of man's true freedom and a vast bastion of spiritual power, the light of which shines in American lives so brightly at home it will illuminate the dark places of all mankind.

Rightly do we sing:

"Our Father's God, to Thee,
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright,
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

PRAYER

O God, Our Heavenly Father, we beseech Thee to remember each of us and all of us that we may make the days ahead a time of personal and national renewal. Grant that Thy word may take deep root in our hearts and produce in us the fruits of the Spirit.

Alarm the careless, humble the self-righteous, kindle the lukewarm, soften the hardened, relieve the doubting, and renew Thy people with grace and strength enough for our times.

Of the abundance of Thy love, give us more than we desire or deserve, for the sake of Thy Son Jesus Christ Our Lord. Amen.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW CHALLENGES TO THE VALUE OF SEPARATISM AND BLACK STUDIES

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR. OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article from the New York Times of January 19, 1969:

NEW CHALLENGES TO THE VALUE OF SEPARATISM AND BLACK STUDIES

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"We have suffered too many heartaches and shed too many tears and too much blood in fighting the evil of racial segregation to return in 1969 to the lonely and dispiriting confines of its demeaning prison."

These words were spoken last week by Roy Wilkins, the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in confronting one of the most controversial education issues of the day: the demands by militant black students for separate courses, faculties and "autonomous racial schools" within universities. His appeal was also directed at white administrators who give in to the demands and, he said, illegally create "Jim Crow schools."

Within two days Mr. Wilkins was challenged by Dr. Nathan Hare, the young, black director of the black studies program at San Francisco State College, where classes have been disrupted by a student strike over "separatism" questions.

"People like Wilkins should be given a scroll and retired . . . like old race horses or prize fighters," Dr. Hare, a Chicago Ph. D. and former prize fighter, said.

The contrasting views reflected the growing controversy that is threatening the peace of higher education across the country. The specific issues vary—from the call for independent "black study" institutes with all-black enrollment and with the independent right to hire and fire teachers and administrators, to the successful veto of a play to which some Negro students object.

The rash of conflicts raises the question: What are the probable consequences of black separatism in academia?

Most important, most observers feel, the school within the school is likely to create inferior institutions. Many Negro students still come from educationally limited backgrounds, and there is a severe shortage of black college teachers. This would turn separatist enclaves into second-rate annexes and would feed the myth of Negro inferiority.

At the same time, black separatism will bring about white separatism, thus reinforcing the alienation of the races. Admittedly, black students still have many justified complaints about life on the white campus. A black student at Brandeis University, for example, said he resented such questions as: "How does a Negro feel when there is a report of black riots?"

At Yale last year, Negro students asked to be separated from their white roommates. When told by a dean that their presence was important to the whites, a black student said: "We're tired of being textbooks for whites."

ARTIFICIAL CAMPUS INTEGRATION

Moreover, whites and blacks tend to go off in their own direction on weekends, thus making the integration of the campus community incomplete and somewhat artificial.

Yet, the campus offers perhaps the best opportunity to change American racial patterns and to create a new fabric of cohesion.

Last week, Stephen J. Wright, president of the United Negro College Fund, warned that such separatism "isn't going anywhere," adding: "It will only lead to an intensification of the kind of hatred that will help destroy the

nation and the myriad opportunities for Negroes."

But Dr. Hare refused to "assimilate" into the present campus. "The Bible says there is a time for everything," he said. "I think this is a time for hate."

Dr. Hare left no doubt that he saw separatism as a way of revolutionizing youth—and the support of black students' uprisings at Brandeis, San Francisco and elsewhere by the predominantly white, revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society illustrates the pulsing power of this theory.

There are similar dangers in separatism for black studies a subject. In confining these studies to an all-black ghetto, the risk is that they turn into ritual rather than an exercise of academic rigor and intellectual honesty. Some observers rationalize that even this approach has therapeutic value in the search for identity, but others fear that it is only patent medicine.

When black studies are offered regularly within the whole institution, their value is probably greatest when they lead to integration with what has until now been largely all-white history, economics, art history and even sociology.

The need for a reorientation can be gauged from recurring complaints that American history, even on the elementary school level, often begins with stories of the red, i.e. colored, man who lacked the skills and drive to build a country and who therefore had to be replaced by the civilized white man.

The drive toward separatism in black studies is a reaction to the all-white history that has often been academia's standard fare. The "black is beautiful" approach in history as elsewhere, is an absurdity comparable to, say, the "white man's burden" concept. It is of little help in the task of weaving an honest, nonracist pattern of history, research and teaching.

Last week, after he made his appeal, Dr. Wilkins received a letter from a black college student in New York denouncing the content or what he said was being dished out under the black studies label—such as an African Dance course given by the physical education department and a Negro history course so separate that it never seems to make contact with American history which, said the student, "was the problem to begin with."

Finally, academic separatism has an erosive effect on civil liberties. It leads to censorship of plays (reminiscent of the days when equally defensive Jews wanted to ban "The Merchant of Venice"); it results in exclusion of whites from black students' meetings as well as the barring of the white press, or even all press coverage, from closed sessions on campus.

Yet, free speech, freedom of the press and academic freedom are virtually inseparable from civil rights, and this is what Mr. Wilkins tried to say last week to "some white Americans, torn and confused by today's clamor of some black students" for self-created apartheid.

A SOLDIER'S MEANING OF SERVICE TO AMERICA

HON. WALTER S. BARING OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American public the honorable thoughts put down in writing by a good American shortly before he died in Vietnam war action while serving the United States.

Before I enter his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to say that what Sgt. Jeffrey A. Davis, of Brownsburg, Ind., wrote, which was reprinted in one of my State's newspapers, the Reese River Reveille in Austin, Nev., especially is noteworthy to me because of my personal feelings against what I term the loud and violent protest-for-protest-sake movement in this country by misguided people who are a continuing social menace to our American way of life. If only these agitated persons would read the U.S. Constitution, they would discover they have the right to peaceful protest, not violent. And, if they will just read Sergeant Davis' letter, they will find what their moral duty to America is.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we, in the House of Representatives, and Americans everywhere search for an answer for these people who I would hope really can be productive and law-abiding citizens helping to protect the freedom of America and of all people. In the same light, though, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that these unthinking youths and adults involved in this protest-for-protest-sake movement, search their own minds about what is right and wrong. Those engrossed in the movement should have the dignity by being Americans and should feel it their duty by being Americans to take up this searching responsibility before they ruin their own lives, the lives of others, or further damage the principles of America.

There are so many good things about our free country and so many good things which still can be done to even greater improve this Nation that it is for this reason it is despairing to me to hear of a good American's death, while he fights for freedom and a better way of life; but at the same time as he performs his duty and eventually gives up his life, we at home continue to be besieged by raucous and what I also term the violent "anti-U.S. demonstrations" by thankless agitators.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today Sergeant Davis' personal words with the prayer that his letter can be heeded by all American citizens. I believe he says in an excellent manner what a person's duty and service to his country means.

I DIED FOR GUYS WITH PROTEST SIGNS

Sgt. Jeffrey A. Davis of Brownsburg, Ind., killed recently in battle in Vietnam, knew whom and what he was fighting for. A letter to his wife, with instructions to open it only in event of his death, told the story. Here are excerpts, as published by "The Indianapolis Star" on September 20—

"It is too bad I had to die in another country. The United States is so wonderful, but at least I died for a reason, and a good one."

"I may not understand this war, or like it, or want to fight it, but nevertheless I had to do it and I did."

"I died for the people of the United States. I died really for you; you were my one real happiness. I died also for your mom and dad so that they could go on working . . . For your brothers that they could play sports in freedom without Communist rule."

"I died for my parents that they could enjoy my dad's retirement in freedom, go on vacations and have fun . . . For others who enjoy this wonderful country and who

appreciate what they have and thank God every day for it."

"I died for the guys with the long hair and protest signs. The draft-card burners, the hippies, the anti-everything people who have nothing better to do. The college kids who think they shouldn't have to serve because they are too good—I died so these people could have a little longer time to try to get straightened out in life."

"God knows they need it. I died for the so-called "younger generation" of which I was a part but for some unknown reason I never became an active member. I guess I was a "square" or something with short hair, no police record, didn't drink or smoke (not included) and volunteered for the service."

"I died for the parents of these kids also, God forgive them. I died so these members, active members, of the "young generation" could have the right to do what they do. To protest, have long hair, go to college of their choice, wear weird clothes, and run around mixed up, with no direction at all. "I died so they could protest the war I fought and died in. Without it, what would they protest? But I also died for the many thousands who died in this war and other wars before for these same reasons. For the men who fought gallantly on the many battlefields of many wars to keep this country free. I guess that in order to gain freedom there must be war. I died for the United States."

THE OFFICE OF SHERIFF—FROM BIBLE TIMES TO TODAY

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG OF MICHIGAN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, from the days of Nebuchadnezzar to our present generation the office of sheriff has been an important arm of government. Thomas Jefferson once called it the most important executive office of the county.

An extremely interesting article on the history and the work of the office of the sheriff was recently written by Truman Walrod, managing editor of the National Sheriff, in which the treatise appeared. The magazine is the official publication of the National Sheriffs' Association, the national headquarters of which is located in Washington. In charge of the national office is Ferris E. Lucas, executive director, a long-time sheriff in the State of Michigan. The president of the association is William J. Spurrier, of Iowa county, Marengo, Iowa.

Because the article not only is of historic value but because it is so interestingly written I commend its reading to my colleagues and readers of the RECORD. It follows:

THE ROLE OF SHERIFF—PAST-PRESENT-FUTURE (By Truman Walrod)

A history of the office of sheriff is a chronicle of western civilization . . . a biography of democracy . . . a word-picture of man's quest for equity and self-determination in matters pertaining to his government.

This narrative begins in the Old Testament and continues through the annals of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Wherever we look as we scan the documents of Anglo-American, we find the sheriff entrusted with the maintenance of law and order and the preservation of domestic tranquility.

It is not possible to state with exactitude the date when the first sheriff swore to protect the lives and property of his constituents or fellow citizens. Some historians date the office, or rather its prototype, to the ancient Roman pro-consul. Some express a belief that the office may have been derived from Saxon Germany. Others assume that the word sheriff is an anglicization of the Arabic word sharif which literally translates illustrious or noble and signifies an Arab chief or prince who is a descendant of Mohammed through his daughter Fatima.

SHERIFF MENTIONED IN HOLY BIBLE

The Book of Daniel recounts the presence of the sheriff at the setting up of the golden image (ca. 600 B.C.) by the Chaldean king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar:

"Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was three score cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits: he set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon.

"Then Nebuchadnezzar the king sent to gather together the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.

"Then the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, were gathered together unto the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up; and they stood before the image that Nebuchadnezzar had set up."

Historian W. A. Morris in his book on the Medieval English Sheriff to 1300 makes these observations:

"The office of sheriff is one of the most familiar and most useful to be found in the history of English institutions. With the single exception of kingship, no secular dignity now known to English-speaking people is older. The functions, status and powers of the office, like those of kingship itself, have undergone change, but for over nine centuries it has maintained a continuous existence and preserved its distinguishing features."

Walter H. Anderson, in his Sheriffs, Coroners and Constables, states:

"The office of sheriff is one of antiquity. It is the oldest law enforcement office known within the common-law system and it has always been accorded great dignity and high trust."

JEFFERSON ON SHERIFFS

Thomas Jefferson wrote in his *Value of Constitutions*:

"[T]he office of sheriff [is] the most important of all the executive offices of the county."

Joseph J. Casper, Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, spoke to the 28th Annual Informative Conference of the National Sheriffs' Association in Louisville, Kentucky, in June, 1968. He said:

"There is no honorable law enforcement authority in Anglo-American law so ancient as that of the county sheriff whose role as a peace officer goes back at least to the time of Alfred the Great."

If there is one who seeks the remarkable characteristics of the office of sheriff, he will not find it solely in antiquity. The benefits of the sheriff and the job of sheriff—the deeds and the activities of the sheriff—will not be found in the renowned medieval sagas or in the tales of the American western sheriff. They are to be found, I think, instead in the aspects of this important public office such as the vital jobs they perform in the area of our changing social, political, and economic lives . . . the competent discharge by men of dedication, who hold a job that has a host of functions—both civil and criminal.

"There are some citizens who have no knowledge of nor appreciation for them [sheriffs]."

It is for these people, i.e., those with no knowledge of, or appreciation for, the ancient and honorable office of sheriff, that the following paragraphs are offered.

LAWS REQUIRE ENFORCING

Were it not for laws which required enforcing, there would have been no necessity for the sheriff. There would have been no need for the development of police administration, criminology, criminalistics, etc. This is not the case however. Man learned quite early that all is not orderly in the universe. All times and all places have generated those who covet the property of their neighbors and who are willing to expropriate this property by any means.

Among the very first to set forth a comprehensive code of laws was Lipit-Istar, King of Isin (2207 B.C.), whose Sumerian subjects had indicated by their behavior that some legally binding guidelines were advisable.

The Babylonian king, Hammurabi (ca. 2100 B.C.), devised a codification which is still studied today.

King Thutmose III (ca. 1500 B.C.) delivered a speech on justice when he appointed Justice Rekhmire in ancient Egypt.

The Jews were ordered to follow and obey the first five books of the Old Testament, the Pentateuch.

The Assyrians and the Chinese attempted to codify their laws. The Code of Manu was used by the rulers of India. The Romans, always conscious of the relationship between government and its citizens, established a digest of Roman law in 450 A.D. Justinian improved and expanded this codification in 550 A.D.

Students of political science and the humanities continued their studies. Contemplated were various ways of trying to determine and establish the best of all possible governments . . . the most equitable of all societies.

THE MAGNA CARTA AND THE SHERIFFS

The major breakthrough came in 1215 A.D. when King John, third English king of the line of Plantagenet, signed the Magna Carta or Great Charter in a meadow near London and thereby granted certain freedoms to the barons of his realm. The sheriffs were there. They were already recognized as the chief law enforcement officers of their respective "counties." As in the Biblical account above narrated, the sheriffs were recognized as principal participants in the drama of government . . . the trag-comedy of human existence.

The fabric of American society was cut from the pattern fashioned in the Mother Country: England. English customs derived in turn from the Anglos, the Saxons, and the Normans. (Granted there were other influences which moulded traditions in the British Isles, e.g., the Celts, the Romans, etc., but the Anglo-Saxon/Norman influence seemingly contributed the most to Anglo-American governmental concepts.)

ANGLO-SAXONS AND HOME RULE

Early Anglo-Saxon communities in England were very much in favor of home rule and home control. They were fierce independent people who did not want or trust any form of centralized government. They lived in small rural tuns, or towns. Prior to 700 A.D., these early Anglo-Saxons began to arrange themselves in squads of tens and hundreds when they engaged in their countless wars. It has been said that these early inhabitants of England preferred war to peace. Be that as it may, their decimal system of wartime deployment of warriors proved similarly to be a practical one during occasional periods of peace.

Ten families living together in a tun comprised a tithing. Each tithing elected a tith-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ingman who served as leader. Ten tithings totalled one hundred and this latter group was headed by a gerefra or chief (Gerefra subsequently became reeve in the Saxon tongue.) Both the tithingman and the gerefra/reeve were elected officials. Both possessed judicial as well as police authority.

Although there were tribal authorities as cited above, there was no real attempt at governmental centralization until Egbert, King of Wessex, endeavored to win the allegiance of all "Englishmen" in 827 A.D.

Alfred the Great (871-901 A.D.) saw the establishment of a system whereby every freeman pledged the good behavior of his neighbor within the same group or community. Under this system, the groupings of freemen into tithings and hundreds were continued. The reeve was required to assume the responsibility for giving the alarm, also called the hue and cry, when a criminal or escaped suspect was at large.

THE SCYRE-GEREFA DEVELOPS

At this time there was a further expansion and the familiar hundreds were combined to form a shire which was the forerunner of the county. Each shire had a form of super chief who was also known as a reeve. To differentiate this latter official from the reeve of a mere hundred, he became known as a shire-reeve, which came to present day English as sheriff. (Shire derived from the earlier Saxon scyre or scir.) Quite literally then, the sheriff—then as now—is the "keeper or chief of his county."

During this same period, the office of alderman or earl also existed. It is possible that a power "struggle" between these officials may have resulted in more than one instance. Apparently each thought of himself as supreme and did not welcome any challenges from the other.

In any event, the sheriff was clearly the chief law enforcement officer of his county and was responsible for the maintenance of law and order. He did not shoulder this responsibility alone however. Each tithingman and every citizen shared in this duty. If a member of a tithing disobeyed a law, the tithingman must take the accused before the shire-reeve for trial. Although the prisoner might be physically in the custody of the tithingman, every member of the tithing was equally responsible for seeing that he be brought to justice.

This direct citizen participation was known as the *hue and cry* and was the direct lineal ancestor of the procedure known in the U.S.A. as the "citizen's arrest." While this form of arrest is not too common in America today, citizen involvement in Great Britain has been and is greater. This has been credited by some students of criminology, etc., as contributing to the measurably lower crime rate in England than in the United States.

Another innovation which must be credited to the Anglo-Saxons is the "watch and ward." Initially, the tithingmen were responsible for maintaining the watch (night guard) and the ward (day guard). Those who performed these services did so without pay. It was a duty of citizenship. Anyone sixteen years or older was subject to call.

Eventually, sheriffs were allowed to assign four to six men in each tun for night watch. The men as they patrolled their "beats" carried a lantern and staff.

Between 700 and 800 A.D., sheriffs were appointed usually by noblemen who had been granted large estates by various kings. The sheriffs were to rule and to protect the interest of the noblemen. In areas reserved to the crown, the king appointed his own sheriffs.

It was a kingly responsibility to maintain the peace. Naturally enough, therefore, the king appointed a "deputy king," an authority to care for the details of peacekeeping. As in modern-day America, it was the sheriff who was charged with this function.

HASTINGS FALLS TO WILLIAM

We have so far concentrated primarily on the period prior to the Norman invasion and conquest which dates from the fall of Hastings in 1066. It was in that year that William the Conqueror defeated Harold II, the last Saxon king, and established the House of Normandy upon the throne of England.

With the fall of Hastings, also ended was the Saxon form of local government and local control. While the Saxons thought highly of "home rule," the Normans consolidated their power in a highly centralized bureaucracy.

Big government, as we all know, usually brings with it big spending which necessitates big taxation. The Norman regime followed this general pattern. By 1085, King William ordered the compilation of all taxable property owned by each individual. This census of taxation was called the *Domesday Book*. The sheriff is mentioned no fewer than five times therein. It was incidentally at this period that the sheriff became also official tax collector for the king.

Seldom does an increase in taxation promote satisfaction among those taxed. King William was already faced with possible insurrections among the remains of the Anglo-Saxon forces which had earlier been defeated. In the interests of national harmony he required all subjects to take an oath or pledge of allegiance to him. The pledge was administered upon the plains of Salisbury; so, it became known as the Salisbury Oath. Some historians feel that this oath was the forebear of the American pledge of allegiance to the flag.

The strong, centralized government continued to grow. William died after twenty-one years of rule. His third son, Rufus, ascended to the throne but was slain by an arrow after thirteen years of relatively uneventful reign. Rufus was succeeded by his youngest brother, Henry I.

HENRY I ESTABLISHED PENAL CODE

Henry in 1116 established a penal code of sorts in which he enumerated murder, arson, counterfeiting, and robbery as felonies. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon practice of dispensing justice locally, Henry reserved unto himself the right to punish. It was he who maintained the first right of civil suit and of damages. Selectmen (the forerunners of our grand jury) were chosen to hear the evidence and arrive at the facts in criminal cases.

Nearly a century passed. The sheriff remained as the chief law enforcement officer, the extension of the authority of the king. The powers of the sheriff increased steadily during the Norman rule.

The House of Normandy departed from the scene with the death of Henry in 1135. The House of Blois produced one ruler, Stephen. Then the House of Plantagenet became the ruling family. Henry II and his son, Richard the Lionhearted, ruled with a fair degree of success.

After Richard's death in 1199, he was succeeded by his younger brother, John. John's rule was absolute. The barons rebelled at his despotism and, in 1215, forced him to sign the now famous document that was to prove the cornerstone upon which the British and American governments were to be built.

THE MAGNA CARTA IS SIGNED

This instrument is known as the *Magna Carta* or Great Charter. It was in effect a treaty between John and the barons, signed upon a site named Runnymede, not far from London, which amplified an earlier such document signed by Henry I. It enumerated rights and prerogatives reserved to the barons and guaranteed certain freedoms. The *Magna Carta* was without doubt one of the most significant secular manuscripts ever signed. It is considered to be of so much import to democratic government that in 1965, in honor of the late President John F.

January 27, 1969

Kennedy, the British government set aside one acre of this Thames-side site to be thenceforth known as Runnymede, U.S.A.

By this unprecedented move, one acre of English soil became the property of the United States, to be so owned so long as both nations continue to exist.

While discussing the *Magna Carta*, it is only fitting that mention should be made of the fact that there were, at the very least, nine mentions of the sheriff therein.

The period from 1275 to 1500 in England is known as the Westminster Period because of the Statutes of Westminster, the first of which was enacted in 1275 and which contains no fewer than sixteen allusions to sheriffs. The provisions of the statute have been described as intending to "make everyday life easier for all kinds of freemen by protecting them in their free tenements and defining the limits of interference with their freedom."

Government reforms were begun. The offices of bailiff and of sergeant developed. The sheriff remained the representative of the king within each county. The sheriff was appointed by the King and was an extension of royal authority.

The House of Plantagenet gave way to the House of Lancaster which in turn was to be replaced by the House of York, the House of Tudor, and the House of Stuart.

The Commonwealth Period extended from 1653 to 1712 and saw Oliver Cromwell, later Richard Cromwell, as the heads of government. The duties of the sheriff had changed but little during this period, although his authority was perhaps better defined.

County government remained for the larger part in the hands of the sheriff. He was definitely considered the leading officer and was commonly referred to as the *great man* in his county.

Let us meet a few of these great men of ages past.

We are all familiar with the legendary Sheriff of Nottingham who pursued Robin Hood persistently, albeit futilely, for many years. There are other names which come to us too as we search the pages of law enforcement history.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERYCKE?

One, little known, stands out from the rest. That name is Richard Amerycke, High Sheriff of Bristol, England in 1503. It seems possible . . . even probable . . . that it was through this sheriff that America derived its name.

Although historians have generally supposed that the continents of the New World were named for the obscure Florentine navigator, Alberico or Amerigo Vespucci, they have been at a loss to explain why the given name of the "godfather" was bequeathed to the Americas. It is practically unheard of to name a city, state, or nation, except for the surname of its discoverer, ruler, etc. The only exceptions to this rule are in the cases where an entity is named for a king or queen who goes only by the one name, e.g., Prince Edward Island, Georgia, Elizabethtown, Victoria, etc.

Were it common to do otherwise, we might well have the state of George rather than that of Washington. Our nation's seat of government would possibly be known as the District of Christopheria. Residents of Houston would by now have become accustomed to living in Sam (or would it have been Samuel), Texas. They might even have taken to entering their favorite restaurant and ordering Julius, instead of Caesar, Salad.

This is not the case, however. It appears that crediting Signore Vespucci with fathering the name of the Americas was a mistake, fostered by a lack of communications between nations, and perpetuated by a complicity or reluctance to "tamper" with history.

Why Amerycke? Let's look at the facts as they are available to us today. Let us meet

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the High Sheriff of Bristol and discover his role in the founding of the English colonies in the western hemisphere.

Henry VII, king of England, authorized John Cabot's voyage from Bristol, May 2, 1497, in a ship named the *Mathew*. On June 24th of that year, Cabot landed near the northern end of Cape Breton Island. He claimed the region on behalf of Henry VII and returned to Bristol, there to claim a pension of twenty pounds sterling and the title of "great Admiral" which had been promised to him that found the new Isle." The name of the man who paid John Cabot his pension was recorded in the Customs Roll at Bristol as one Richard Ameryck, Collector of Customs of the Port of Bristol. The name has been written and recorded in several ways. Amerycke, Ameryck, and Ap Myrke are found throughout the records of that English port city. Amerycke was a leading citizen of Bristol. He became sheriff in 1503.

Now to examine the conundrum of where first was the name America ascribed to the continents of North and South America.

Martin Waldseemüller or Waltzemann published a large map of the world in 1507 and with it a small treatise titled *Cosmographic Introductio*. The southern continent of the New World was therein identified as South America.

In 1607, Jodocus Hondius of Amsterdam who was successor to Gerardus Mercator, most famed of the Renaissance cartographers, published a map identifying the western continents of North and South America.

It is Wadseemüller who is generally credited with having accorded Vespucci the honor of being namesake to the newly discovered continent of South America. Let us remember that the date was 1507.

Meanwhile during the mayoral year 1496-97, the Bristol Calendar (a diary of important local events) is said to have contained the entry: "This year [1497] on St. John the Baptist's Day [June 24th], the land of America was found by the merchants of Bristol, in a ship of Bristol called the 'Mathew,' the which said ship departed from the port of Bristol the 2nd of May and came home again the 6th of August following."

The citizens of Bristol then were apparently referring to the newly discovered continent as America. This was in 1497. The earliest confirmed voyage made by Vespucci was in 1501.

Cabot, after his return, gave one island to a companion and another to his barber. Some Italian friars had Cabot's promise to be made bishops. It is only probably therefore that some honor would be bestowed upon the man who paid Cabot his pension. At that time, the explorer didn't know he'd discovered a new continent. He doubtlessly thought it only an island somewhere off the coast of India or China.

While it is generally agreed that the U.S.A. inherited its form of government, its customs, and its language from England, it appears probable as well that the nation was named for an Englishman, the High Sheriff of Bristol, one Richard Amerycke. That name must stand out from the rest as of particular significance to the United States of America.

Let us turn our attention to other, less significant, but equally interesting sheriffs of the past. Throughout history there have been "hawks" and "doves." This has been true in external (international) and in internal (law enforcement) affairs.

THE WICKED SHERIFF

One sheriff who was a hawk, i.e., he pursued his suspects wherever they might go, is known to historians as the "wicked sheriff." It was custom that those who fled into a church were immune from arrest. Sheriff Leofstan gave chase to a criminal who fled into the sanctuary of St. Edmunds Abbey. The zealous lawman followed his quarry into

that place of refuge and dragged him out and back to jail.

While this was doubtlessly the mark of a good peace officer, it did not endear Sheriff Leofstan to the clergy who felt he was trespassing against their sacrosanct domain.

Later during the same period, some prisoners reportedly also took refuge inside a church. An unnamed sheriff, perhaps remembering the uproar over the Sheriff Leofstan affair, decided it wasn't worth it. Knowing however that allowing prisoners to escape could cost him dearly, he (the sheriff) took his family and together they sought refuge inside the same church. How long they remained there and the disposition of the case if and when they ever emerged is not recorded.

Then as now, there were cost "squeezes." The men chosen to fill the office of sheriff were honored greatly through their position as chief law enforcement officer. The honor was not a profitable one, however. Conversely, it was a costly one. No one but the affluent members of English society could afford to serve as sheriff.

There was always the problem of "making good" on revenues not collected in full. But even beyond this expense, the sheriff was expected to be a gracious host when judges or other dignitaries came from London to hold court in the various shires (counties). It was expected that lavish entertainment would be furnished by the chief officer of the county on these occasions.

In 1624 one Englishman wrote: "On Tuesday, July the 6th, our High Sheriff going from Kedington to Bury St. Edmunds in the morning, I accompanied him thither, many other of the gentry of the shire meeting him on the way and attending him also. After we had dined with him, we likewise accompanied him in the afternoon, going out to meet the judges that were coming to hold the assizes at Bury."

One sheriff was reportedly fired for not riding out to meet the judges who expected an escort into the county seat.

One sheriff's son wrote his father set forth to meet the judges with 116 servants in liveries, every one in green satin doublets, white divers gentlemen and persons of quality waited on him in the same garb."

A TRY FOR ECONOMY

Another sheriff, William Ffarington, tried to keep down the cost of entertaining visiting dignitaries. Even with this economy in mind, Sheriff Ffarington had fifty-six helpers including a steward, clerk of the kitchen, two yeomen of the plate cupboard, a yeoman of the wine cellar, two attendants in the sheriff's chamber, an usher of the hall, two chamberlains, four butchers and their assistants, eight cooks, five scullions, a caterer, porter, poultier, slaughterman, two watchmen for the horses, two to attend the docket door, and twenty to take turns watching the prisoners.

These court sessions took place on an average of four times annually.

Because of this extraordinary expense, the office of sheriff was not sought after. Many well-qualified persons took steps to try to avoid being chosen. When a man was appointed, he naturally had to serve.

County government remained primarily in the hands of the sheriff. He was aided by the justices of the peace. The sheriff was however definitely the leading officer and was as mentioned earlier referred to as the great man in the county.

When settlers left England bound for the New World, it was only natural that they would take with them their culture and their Anglo-Saxon heritage. In New England where towns and villages were the principal governmental unit, the watch and ward proved most effective. In the Middle Atlantic states and in the south where plantation life became established, the county system was preferred.

THE SHERIFF COMES TO THE NEW WORLD

Apparently when the first counties were established in Virginia in 1634, the office of sheriff was officially transplanted to the North American Continent. There is a record of a sheriff being chosen by popular vote as early as 1651; but, appointment was at that time apparently the rule.

Although the sheriffs of colonial times were among the more affluent citizens, the position was not a costly one. In fact, it was generally profitable. There was not the entertaining to do and there was not the pomp and ceremony that there was in England.

What with the position being both honorable and profitable, it was greatly sought after by virtually all men of means. The sheriff was definitely the great man whether in England or colonial America although the colonists who had a decided propensity for abbreviating did frequently refer to him as the high sheriff.

Maryland and Virginia were apparently the first colonies to bring the office to the shores of the New World. It was therein specifically set forth that the sheriff should have as nearly as possible the same duties in these new states as he had had in England.

As mentioned earlier, there was not the costly entertaining or lavish pomp and pageantry in this country as there was in England. There was however one very important ceremonial duty . . . that of proclaiming a new king or queen of England.

When William and Mary assumed the throne in 1689, the sheriff of each county officially announced: "That tomorrow their most sacred Majesties, by Eleven of the Clock in the Morning, before the Court house Doore in James City, be Proclaimed King and Queen of England, France and Ireland & of the Territories and Dominions thereto appertaining . . . and that the Sheriffs Summons the best appearance that can be had at that time, for the Testifying the due Honour and Obedience, and acclamations of Joy, by firing Great Guns, Sounding of Trumpets and beating of Drums."

Even in this case it was the county rather than the sheriff who had to stand the expense of the celebration. In the instance just recounted, the county (James City, Virginia) paid for 7300 pounds of tobacco, as well as one barrel of powder, trumpeters, cannons, and 211 gallons of cider.

It is still the duty of the High Sheriff at Providence, Rhode Island, to make an official proclamation notifying the citizenry of the election of a governor.

SECULAR AND ECCLESIASTICAL DISAGREEMENTS

As in England, there was cause for some discord between the secular and ecclesiastical arms. Travel was difficult in early America. Most folk did go to church, however. Sheriffs soon formed the habit of serving their papers at the church doors . . . This did not promote church attendance. Quite the contrary, it acted as a deterrent. The pastors became provoked and at in at least one state proved to be a formidable lobbying group. Sheriffs were forbidden thenceforth from serving their papers so as to interfere with the parishioners thereof.

The "high sheriff" was not to be so easily defeated however and was able to prevail upon the legislature to pass a law requiring that ministers must read any proclamation from higher authorities to their congregations on two successive Sundays.

As in England, respect for the authority of the sheriff was strictly enforced by law. A certain Benjamin Cartwright was sentenced to receive two lashes on his bare shoulders for "opprobrious language uttered agst the sherr in contempt of his office & consequently of the authority whence it derives."

A special seat was reserved for the sheriff in most churches. It was recorded in one instance that a Richard Price crowded into the seat reserved for the sheriff. A scuffle

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ensued "to the dishonour of God Almighty & contempt of his Majesty." The trespasser was bound over to the General Court for his offense.

VALUE OF EXPERIENCE PRAISED

There is much discussion nowadays concerning the value of experience. This is nothing new. Some 250 years ago, the same question was raised in colonial Maryland when a Sheriff Edward Sweatnam was removed from office by a legislative body which stated that after four years, someone else should get a turn at serving as sheriff. There was no discussion nor suspicion of incompetence, misfeasance, or malfeasance. The consensus was that Sheriff Sweatnam was well qualified for the position but that change was desirable solely for the sake of change.

The council chose as sheriff an Allan Smith who was without experience in law enforcement. Lord Baltimore severely reprimanded the group for its choice, saying he felt it extremely poor practice to remove an experienced man from office in favor of one without experience. Lord Baltimore went on that he "ever took care to continue good men in their places an encouragement to continue just and faithful."

The sheriff was charged too with the execution of punishment. Some sentences which were ordered to be carried out by the sheriff including putting "Thomas Norcombe in the pillory for his second offense of hog stealing for the full time & space of 4 hours." A Hamblin and Elizabeth Spicer were to be given "five lashes apiece for slandering John Courts." A sheriff was ordered to "nail John Gonere by both ears to the pillory, with three nails in each ear, and afterwards to whip him with twenty good lashes for perjuring himself."

Among his other duties, the sheriff was charged with dealing with religious non-conformists. In at least one instance, a sheriff was criticized quite severely for "not stopping very frequent meetings of this most pestilent Sect of ye quakers."

THE SHERIFF AND THE WILD WEST

As the frontier moved westward, so moved the sheriff. Perhaps in the long and colorful history of the office, there is none quite so picturesque as that of the sheriff of the late Nineteenth Century.

Gold and silver, cattle and oil . . . any one alone was enough to lure men westward in the hopes of striking it rich. Many went west to work. Many others also followed the trek toward the cow-towns, the mining settlements, the railroad construction sites, and the territory beyond the restraints of civilization. They went, not to work, but to prey upon those who did.

A code of sorts grew out of this frontier atmosphere. Shooting an unarmed man was wrong as was shooting a man in the back. Two men shooting it out was considered perfectly acceptable. It was the established way to settle disputes. The loser was not able to appeal his case in most instances . . . at least not to any earthly judge. His remains were planted in a six-by-three grave in some boothill.

The sheriff had his work cut out for him. Sheriffs of the old west could be divided into two basic categories . . . the quick and the dead.

This is not to imply that all sheriffs of the wild and wooly west were of a "shoot first" frame of mind. There were some who felt the best justice was administered by their trusty six-shooters. There were others who seldom if ever drew their guns, and even less frequently ever shot anyone.

LAW AND ORDER BROUGHT TO DEADWOOD GULCH

When one hears of Deadwood Gulch, he thinks usually of "Wild Bill" Hickok. Hickok went to Deadwood after spending some time in Dodge City, Kansas, where he built up a reputation as a fearless frontier marshal. Legend has it that while in Kansas he shot

somewhere between fifty and seventy-five badmen.

"Wild Bill" drifted into Deadwood early in 1876, shortly after gold was discovered in the Black Hills of Dakota Territory. Within a few months of his arrival he was shot in the back by Jack McCall while playing cards in Saloon No. 10. Movies and television notwithstanding, "Wild Bill" Hickok did nothing to "clean up" the violent gold-mining gulch. He died too soon. Someone had to step in, and as usual throughout recorded history, this duty fell to the sheriff.

After Hickok's assassination, the citizens elected a sheriff. His name was Seth Bullock, a kindly but determined man. There is no record of him ever having killed anybody but he did enforce the laws. He did make Deadwood a relatively safe place in which to live. He did it by reason rather than by violence.

AN ARIZONA SHERIFF DIDN'T BELIEVE IN JAILS

Not all frontier sheriffs were so peacefully inclined. Sheriff John Slaughter of Cochise County, Arizona, didn't even believe in jails. His technique, and it was an effective one, was to advise an outlaw that he had a certain number of hours to get out of Cochise County. At the end of that time limit, if the badman was still in the county, Sheriff Slaughter gunned him down.

When the citizens of the county seat town of Tombstone offered to build a bigger jail, Sheriff Slaughter is quoted as saying, "I don't expect to fill the jail. I see no advantage in going to the great expense of tracking down an outlaw, arresting him at the risk of your own neck, and bringing him back to Tombstone with the possibility of a gang rescue en route. When I get through the only outlaws remaining in Cochise County will be dead ones."

CONTINUITY AMIDST CHANGES

The sheriffs of ages past have adapted to many situations. Virtually all have proved themselves equal to the tasks assigned to them. The role of the sheriff today is as great as it ever has been. He is still the great man in his county.

Professor Edward A. Farris of New Mexico State University phrases it succinctly when he states:

"[T]he sheriff is the only viable officer remaining of the ancient offices, and his contemporary responsibility as 'conservator of the peace' has been influenced greatly by modern society."

"While changes have been brought by technological and social advances, the framework of government within which the sheriff functions has not changed drastically. His duties and powers may be altered by the existing social and political climate, but his basic responsibility—to protect life and property—has not been diminished."

What about the sheriff of today? Professor John L. Sullivan of Pasadena City College makes these observations:

"With roots stemming primarily from Great Britain, the sheriff of today in the United States has become an integral part of American law enforcement. The past has proven that the American people like to elect their top law enforcement officers in their counties. Since the formative years of our country, this office of sheriff has been coveted. Even persons outside law enforcement often campaign for the office of sheriff. In the past, unqualified and questionable political hacks sometimes were elected to office; however, with the great professional advancement of law enforcement, many high-caliber men now seek the sheriff's office. Previously, political connections, popularity, and an easy conscience were the strongest factors in a successful election to the office of sheriff. Today, however, college graduates, ex-FBI agents, and dedicated law enforcement veterans who have worked their way up the ladder of success in police administration are seeking and winning the office of sheriff."

January 27, 1969

After more than a millennium of existence, the sheriff continues to function as the great man in his county. Wherever he may be, he is functioning today much as he did one thousand years ago but with one very important difference.

TODAY'S SHERIFF PREPARES FOR TOMORROW

Where the sheriff of yesterday placed little emphasis on training, the sheriff of today appears practically a fetishist when it comes to education.

As the crossbow gave way to the primitive flintlock which in turn gave way to the six-gun, et cetera, ad infinitum, the sheriff is not unaccustomed to change. But now perhaps more than ever before in history, law enforcement is faced with complex, moving, and rapid changes in methodology, technology, and social attitudes.

The path from Anglo-Saxon England in the early centuries of the Christian era to modern-day America has been a long and difficult one. The expressway leading to the future may offer even more challenges. Through education, training, and perhaps most important self-determination and dedication, the tithings . . . the hundreds . . . the free men and women of America . . . with their sheriff at their head . . . will lead the way to tomorrow and all the tomorrows yet to come . . . unafraid and ready for whatever each new day may bring to challenge the domestic tranquility of each county and parish in America.

**DEVELOPING HUMAN RESOURCES—
A GREAT NATIONAL NEED****HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the approaches we take to meet the very real problem of hard-core unemployment, the ultimate goal and solution must be decent jobs at decent wages. Union manpower expert Julius Rothman, president of the Human Resources Development Institute, made that clear as he was questioned recently on the AFL-CIO's public service interview, Labor News Conference. That, Mr. Rothman said, is the projected course of the institute's program. The work of this nonprofit corporation, established by the AFL-CIO Executive Council, has relevance and importance to both industry and government, as well as to citizens everywhere. I now offer the transcript of that broadcast, January 7, on the Mutual Radio Network, and include it in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

Subject: Developing Human Resources—a Great National Need.

Guest: Julius Rothman, president of the Human Resources Development Institute.

Reporters: Nell Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press; Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Inc.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Julius Rothman, president of the Human Resources Development Institute, a non-profit corporation established by the AFL-CIO Executive Council.

In cooperation with the U.S. Department

of Labor, the Human Resources Development Institute is formulating a nationwide program to recruit, train, employ and upgrade the unemployed and the under-employed. Here to question Mr. Rothman about the specific objectives of the Institute and how it will work toward achieving them are Nell Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press, and Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Conn, I believe you have the first question?

CONN. Yes, thank you, Mr. Harden.

Mr. Rothman, how does the Institute actually operate? Do you train workers or what?

ROTHMAN. Well, we may train workers, but chances are, we probably will be operating more or less as a catalytic agent in the 50 communities that we are set up to work in.

We intend to work with existing manpower programs, seeing to it that they do the jobs that they set out to do, and at the same time, move organized labor—our local unions—in the direction to promoting manpower programs on their own.

So, we will be doing several things—working, for instance, with the National Alliance of Businessmen, working with on-the-job training programs, helping them to become productive programs. At the same time, we may very well develop programs of our own, through the local unions in the communities that we are working in.

CONN. I take it that at the present time, your role is primarily that of liaison with the workers, and the business sector, and the labor movement generally, to encourage programs on their part.

ROTHMAN. To a large extent, that's true. And we have to recognize that our impact will be in what we can do to make sure that existing manpower programs are really training the hard-core unemployed for meaningful employment at decent wages.

This is our goal. And the impact we make on the local community will measure the success of our program.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Rothman, can you give us any figures on how many such programs you are currently involved in, and how many people are covered by these programs, in terms of training?

ROTHMAN. Well, it is hard to really enumerate the number of programs we are currently involved in, because they are so diffuse and run in so many directions.

For instance, about a dozen national and international unions today have on-the-job training programs. About half a dozen unions and some state building trades councils have Job Corps training programs, in which journeymen are training kids to go into the apprenticeship program. We have 50 outreach programs today, in which the building trades unions are reaching out into the community for hard-core unemployed youngsters and preparing them for apprenticeship training in the building trades.

Now, the exact numbers involved, we don't know—somewhere around half a million, perhaps, is what we would consider the hard-core. There may be more.

But, we are now dealing largely with that group which has little education, almost no motivation, no job experience—the kind of person with whom you have to start from scratch in propelling him toward a job.

GILBRIDE. Can you tell us, Mr. Rothman, some of the lessons you have learned so far, in trying to motivate such people and train them for jobs?

ROTHMAN. Well, one of the things we know is that you can't deal with this group in terms of dead-end employment. That is, they know pretty quickly whether or not they are going to continue at some kind of menial task all of their lives. So what we have to do is begin to develop job ladders for them, so that they can move on up.

Secondly, you can't employ them at wages so low that they offer no real hope for this

particular kind of group. They have to feel that they are not only going to be getting minimum wages, but as they move up the ladder they are going to be getting wages that will enable them to move out of poverty. This is the second lesson.

The third lesson, I think, is that we have to recognize that every group emerging from the poverty areas is concerned, to some degree, with this thing we call status. That is, they want jobs that have some real meaning, and jobs that have some dignity, jobs they can do with pride. I think this is the third lesson we have learned.

CONN. Mr. Rothman, how do you actually go about reaching the hard-core unemployed? What are the steps that you take—the local police?

ROTHMAN. One of the things that we have done, Mr. Conn, in working so far, is employ for local staff, many people from the minority groups, so that they can use their contacts within the minority group to reach in and find the hard-core unemployed.

We also work with the Urban League in the outreach program. They have contact in the ghettos and in the slum areas.

We also work with the Workers Defense League, which is primarily lead by minority people, and therefore has contacts within the minority group.

In other words, we actually go into the slums and into the ghettos, looking for these youngsters, to give them some perspective of what they might be able to do with their lives.

CONN. You mentioned motivation as a very important factor. Among the hard-core unemployed that you have recruited to date—do you find that you can instill this motivation in them? Do they see the prospect of permanent jobs as something they want?

ROTHMAN. Oh, sure, they want permanent jobs. But, they want decent jobs at decent wages. That's the key.

You can't motivate them by giving them some perspective on car washing or jobs as domestics. You have to be able to give them some perspective on work that would give them the feeling that they are accomplishing something—that they are part of the mainstream. That is part of the whole thing.

They have to feel that they are part of the mainstream of American economic life.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Rothman, do you find a difference dealing with youngsters of minority groups as opposed to youngsters who are not in minority groups—youngsters who both have the same unemployment problems?

ROTHMAN. Well, there has been some difference. I think it is a lot easier to deal with groups that are in the majority, because I think that they feel they can make it out of the role that they have been sort of cast into somewhat easier. By and large, they have been easier to propel into the mainstream.

GILBRIDE. In other words, perhaps, racial discrimination is one strike they may not have had against them, and this makes it a little bit easier?

ROTHMAN. Precisely, Mr. Gilbride. That's exactly right.

They haven't been given all these promises over the years—promises that have not been fulfilled. They don't find themselves cast back into a second-class citizen role. They know that if they develop skills, they can move into the job market and begin to earn at a level that makes sense to them, in terms of economic status.

CONN. Mr. Rothman, this program operates largely on the basis of government funds. What are the prospects for continuing the program under the Republican administration?

ROTHMAN. Well, we feel the prospects are pretty good. We feel that the Republican administration will recognize that the skills, the background, the contacts and relationships of organized labor are extremely important in making any manpower program work.

For instance, when President Lyndon B. Johnson—almost a year ago—set up the National Alliance of Businessmen, it was just that—it was an alliance of businessmen, headed by Henry Ford II. They found pretty quickly that if they were going to be successful, they needed organized labor's participation. So they came to the AFL-CIO Executive Council meeting last February and asked for it. AFL-CIO President George Meany responded, first, by assigning John Livingston as the full-time coordinator at the National Alliance of Businessmen, and then, by encouraging the AFL-CIO central labor bodies in each of the 50 metropolitan areas to assign a coordinator to work with the National Alliance of Businessmen's program.

We are continuing this. The Human Resources Development Institute is going to be working, to a very large extent, with the National Alliance of Businessmen.

For instance, we have already developed one program at their request—the "buddy system"—a program designed to help the newly-hired hard-core worker adapt to the shop he has been hired to work in. A worker from the shop works with him—buddies with him—and helps him over the rocky points of that first few weeks, or the first month, of employment. This is one of the things—specific things—that we are doing with the National Alliance of Businessmen.

We think that any program in the manpower field, in order to be successful, has to have the backing of organized labor.

And, we think that the new Administration is going to recognize that, too.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Rothman, unless I am mistaken, I seem to detect quite a bit of thinking of late, that this whole problem of the hard-core unemployed can be better handled by private industry, even to the extent, I believe, that in some quarters, it is believed that eventually, the private sector of the economy can take the whole thing over and the government can get out of it. What do you think, along these lines?

ROTHMAN. I think that in the final analysis, the private sector cannot handle the whole thing.

I think that there is always going to be a need for a very large measure of government involvement in any manpower training program. For instance, the National Alliance of Businessmen is a businessmen's program. But, it is financed by funds that come from the Labor Department, and without these funds, there would be no program.

Employers are receiving up to \$3,000 per man for the training—out-of-pocket training expenses—necessary to equip this hard-core worker for employment in the shop.

GILBRIDE. In other words, it is a losing business—financially—in the beginning, and somebody has to pick up that initial cost?

ROTHMAN. Exactly. It is a costly thing to train a worker and to adequately equip him with motivation and job skills. There aren't too many employers who are willing to put this out, without some way of being reimbursed.

GILBRIDE. I wonder if you could tell us this, Mr. Rothman: for some years now, I believe—four or five years, at least—there have been quite a few government programs along this line—largely experimental, perhaps. How does your set-up—the Human Resources Development Institute—differ from all these previous programs?

ROTHMAN. It differs, only in the sense that now we begin to propel organized labor—the local unions in the local communities—toward more direct involvement in manpower programs at both the operational level and the policy level.

GILBRIDE. Have unions been dragging their feet, in effect?

ROTHMAN. It is not that they have been dragging their feet.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is that in effect, they have sort of felt that manpower programs were business' responsibility, and that while they have been consulted, it's been a sort of second cousin type thing—at arms length.

From now on, we are going to be involved directly, and immediately, and closely in the manpower programs at the local community level.

It is not enough for us to be concerned, as we have always been concerned, about passage of manpower development and training legislation and all that goes with it. This we have done at the Washington level. We have been exceedingly interested and deeply involved in the passage of this kind of legislation.

But, we have to get involved in the operations of manpower programs, and they operate at the community level. Our local people—our local leadership—are burdened people—many, many things are asked of them and they get involved in all sorts of programs. Now, we are telling the 50 metropolitan areas cities involved in the HRDI program that there is going to be a full-time person on the staff of the local central labor council who will be working with this local central labor council and its affiliated unions—working with management, working with government officials in the manpower field—so that we can have maximum and complete involvement in manpower programs.

CONN. Mr. Rothman, as you noted, you have a goal of programs in 50 cities, by the end of 1969. Do you have functioning programs in many of these cities at the present time?

ROTHMAN. Yes, our arrangement, Mr. Conn, with the government is that we would have 10 cities going by the first of December, 1968, and we do have 10 cities—Boston, Atlanta, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, New Orleans, Los Angeles, New York, Houston and Minneapolis-St. Paul.

CONN. Mostly the larger cities in the country.

ROTHMAN. The larger cities, yes—this is where we are going to be working—the 50 largest metropolitan areas.

By the middle of February, we will have 25 more of these large metropolitan areas going—staffed with people on the payroll of the Human Resources Development Institute. We hope that by the middle of March, and no later than the first of April, we will have the remaining 15 cities on the way.

CONN. These operations that are set up are working in various phases of your program—pre-apprenticeship training, on-the-job skills, and so on? Have you found that you get good cooperation from the unions, as well as business, in these endeavors?

ROTHMAN. We are getting excellent cooperation from the unions. It is something that they needed and wanted. Our affiliated unions are particularly happy to be able to get more deeply involved in manpower operations.

CONN. What are some of the real problems that you have in the pre-apprenticeship training program? The hard-core unemployed—you mentioned that they are under-educated, and so on. Do you have to provide courses in basic education to enable them to eventually become apprentices?

ROTHMAN. In some cases, yes. As a matter of fact, there are many instances in which you have to provide remedial education—reading, mathematics, and so on, so that you can bring these youngsters up to the level at which they can be adequately prepared to take and pass the apprenticeship training programs.

In some instances, however, you can get dropouts with three years of high school, who are adequately equipped to take these examinations. What they do need, though, is the specific material related to the exami-

nations, whether it is for an electrician's apprenticeship exam, or plumber's, or sheet metal worker's, and so on. Then, you train them for that specific program.

CONN. Do you require examinations to even qualify for pre-apprenticeship?

ROTHMAN. No.

CONN. In other words, someone with only an extremely limited grammar school education—elementary school education—could probably qualify and then go on from there.

ROTHMAN. Many youngsters with limited backgrounds have the native ability to go on, and certainly, this is encouraged.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Rothman, you mentioned your payroll a moment ago. Could you tell us something about the size of your staff and your costs of operation? Also, if you wouldn't mind, could you tell us something of your background, how you got involved in this, and what you are paid?

ROTHMAN. Yes, sure, I would be glad to. Mr. Gilbride.

We are going to have 50 men in 50 cities—men and women, I should say—we don't discriminate against women. We have a national staff of five. So altogether, we will have 55 professionals in the field. Our payroll amounts to the total sum, really, of what we got from the Department of Labor, which is a million and a half dollars. This will be spent over a 15-month period.

My own background has been here with the AFL-CIO. For the last couple of years, I have been the coordinator of the AFL-CIO's poverty program, which also has spread into the manpower field. It was natural when we set up this program, perhaps, that I would come over and work in it.

I am paid, incidentally, by the AFL-CIO, and I'd like to say that the AFL-CIO and the local central bodies are contributing almost a quarter of a million dollars to this program. We don't have to, but in order to give us more leeway in making this program a success, we are doing this voluntarily.

CONN. Do you have any goals, manpower-wise, that you have set for the end of 1969?

ROTHMAN. Not really. We don't have any goals, except that we hope to continue to push for full employment. It is on the basis of a full employment economy that we can continue to train workers from the hard-core unemployed group to take their places in the mainstream of the American economy.

Unless we have full employment, we can't do this.

HARDEN. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's guest on Labor News Conference was Julius Rothman, president of the Human Resources Development Institute, a non-profit corporation established by the AFL-CIO Executive Council. Representing the press were Harry Conn, editor of Press Associates, Incorporated, and Nell Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

MEMPHIS EDITORS LAUD INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorials which give very fitting tribute to the great and inspiring inaugural address of our new President,

Richard Nixon. The first, from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, "A Crisis of the Spirit," takes note of the spiritual aspects of the President's message. The second, from the Memphis Press-Scimitar, "Message To Lift People," points up the challenge President Nixon has given to all Americans.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Jan. 21, 1969]

A CRISIS OF THE SPIRIT

Richard M. Nixon has begun his presidency of the United States with an appeal for the two things the people of a restless nation and war-torn world desire most—peace and understanding.

His message was effective. He indicated to the people of our nation and to the nations abroad that he understood that the crux of their problems is not found in material things as it was 35 years ago but in the fact that we face "a crisis of the spirit" which calls for an answer of the spirit.

"To find that answer, we need only to look within ourselves," he said.

It was clear President Nixon was seeking to gather behind him all those who have been critical of the Vietnam War on the ground that it has prevented the nation doing at home the things that need to be done, those critics of what has come to be known as the "establishment" who want the nation to go forward in social and economic matters in a fashion that will benefit the lowly as well as the lofty.

But he warns, as President John F. Kennedy did in a somewhat different fashion eight years ago, that government cannot do all that needs to be done by itself; as Mr. Nixon said, "each of us shares in the shaping of his own destiny."

Even as protesters marched in the crowds around the nation's Capitol where the inaugural ceremonies were taking place, President Nixon asked that the nation begin to take up its many tasks by lowering its voices.

"We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices," was his fitting admonition at this time.

His words were not specific. There were no promises to do what heretofore has proved impossible. But Mr. Nixon offered himself and his administration to all men on Earth as instruments for shaping a world of brotherhood.

No more can be asked of any man at this juncture. He said it, and he said it well.

Now begins the difficult task of implementing the hopes and dreams of a new administration.

President Nixon comes into office after a bitter presidential campaign which saw the nation torn into segments perhaps farther to the left and right than at any time in recent history. Because of those divisions, it became impossible for any man to win the presidency with a majority of the electorate. Mr. Nixon comes into office, therefore, as a compromise candidate for many citizens.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon indicated he understands that and seeks to truly bring the nation together again. The depth of his statement makes it clear that "together again" will be more than a slogan. It foretells a period of calm and careful working for the desires of all to the degree that the people will make it possible.

Let those who agreed with Franklin Roosevelt that "we have nothing to fear but fear itself" and those who were inspired by John F. Kennedy's "ask not what your country can do for you; rather ask what you can do for your country" come forward now and join President Nixon in the realization that "until he has been part of a cause larger than himself, no man is truly whole."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The things of which President Nixon spoke yesterday are truly the things of which the American dream is made. In the Nixon inaugural words, "The American dream does not come to those who fall asleep."

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, Jan. 21, 1969]

MESSAGE TO LIFT PEOPLE

In his seasoned political career, Richard Nixon has earned a reputation for making himself understood, for precision in language.

But his inaugural address was more. There was a lift in his message—phrases of eloquence, phrases to raise the spirit, to enlarge hope. In this sense, it was a new Nixon as well as a new leader to whom we listened.

The specifics will come later, but noon yesterday was the time to set a pattern as befit the occasion: Recognition of the problems which face us, and the agony of them; the philosophy and the attitudes which must set the course in treating the problems.

In his first official words the President surely measured the mood of the people, of this land and every land:

"We are caught in war, wanting peace. We are torn by dissension, wanting unity. We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment. We see tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them."

That is Mr. Nixon's monumental opportunity: To strive for the peace, to inspire the unity, to lead in the tasks.

And, to begin, he called for an end to the shrillness, the bombast, the aimless clutter that impair and defeat our most useful tools in crucial times: Understanding, negotiation, common sense.

"To lower our voices would be a simple thing," he said.

Let that be a maxim to live by!

Let it be minded at the Paris peace table. Let it be tested and nurtured in our legislative halls, on our campuses, in our streets, in our diplomatic dealings, in our treatment of each other.

"We cannot learn from one another," said Mr. Nixon, "until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so our words can be heard as well as our voices."

Another President, now retired to Texas, had offered a similar predicate.

"Let us reason together," he had said softly.

But his plea was lost in the shouting.

Yet, until such an attitude is adopted, we cannot well gain the peace, or acquire the unity, or assure the goal Mr. Nixon set for his presidency: "The decent order that makes progress possible and our lives secure."

"The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker," said the president.

The world needs a legion of peacemakers.

Mr. Nixon promised to do his share, to work to make peace welcome where it is unknown, to make it strong where it is fragile, to make it permanent where it is temporary. And to seek an "open world" in which no people live in "angry isolation."

A historic undertaking, calling for the best that is in the new administration, the best that is in the American people, the best that is in all mankind.

"For the first time," the President said, "because the people of the world want peace and the leaders of the world are afraid of war, the times are on the side of peace."

But the people of the world have always wanted peace. Only the leaders, fearless beyond their comprehension, have blundered into history's disastrous conflicts—leaders who shouted to bolster their out-size ambitions, whose bluster negated the learning which surely might have led to a world of satisfaction and amity, rather than frustration and strife.

God grant that it be true, as Mr. Nixon hopefully said, that these leaders, however motivated or however come to power, may now indeed be afraid of war. May they remain eternally so. And to that end let them

January 27, 1969

be warned by Richard Nixon's companion promise: To keep the United States "so strong as need be for as long as need be."

In the message there also were promises to be applied within the nation: To press ahead in meeting urgent problems, to enlist the national energies not only in "grand" enterprises but more especially in the "small, splendid" efforts which are so important in resolving problems, as contrasted to proclaiming solutions.

Instead of exclusive government programs, Mr. Nixon promised to spread the work, to bring all people into common endeavor for national goals.

"The American dream does not come to those who fall asleep."

Goals are not charted, or usefully measured, amidst shouting and rock-throwing. They are not achieved in anger or by postures which deny persuasion. They are achieved by the decent order, by the talk which comes from thought and ideas, by toll and spirit.

"To lower our voices would be a simple thing."

The President has made a good beginning. Now it is up to the rest of us as well as he.

A REALISTIC TRADE POLICY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD a statement recently made by Merrill A. Watson entitled, "A Plea for a Realistic Trade Policy." This statement calls attention to the problem faced by the footwear industry in the United States. The footwear industry supports the orderly marketing approach to the import problem under which both domestic and foreign producers would share in the growth of the domestic market. The statement follows:

A PLEA FOR A REALISTIC TRADE POLICY

(By Merrill A. Watson)

(Note.—The Secretary of State says it has been United States policy to lower barriers to international trade on a basis of reciprocity while Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture explain the need for quotas on textiles, oil, meat and dairy products, and another government agency denounces all quotas as placing a heavy burden on the little man. This is not a game of shuttlecock, merely the daily routine in the muddled import situation.

(In this exhaustive paper on Trade Policy, Merrill Watson follows the twisting road of the free traders in their efforts to implement their theories regardless of consequences to many industries.

(Watson presents the implication of free traders that concern over organized foreign competition is the mark of greed and anti-social tendencies. In this article he backs his argument with 126 quotations from men in business, government and the press. Nobody in the shoe, leather or allied trades should miss this enlightening analysis of the import problem.)

INTRODUCTION

In the year that has passed since the Kennedy Round was completed, trade policy has been aired at great length in legislative halls, in various committee hearings, and in the news media. A number of excellent papers on the direction of future trade policy expressing personalized points of view have been presented at hearings. With the deteriorating trade balance, the introduction of a

number of quota bills for industries most affected by imports, and more agricultural quotas, the alarm has been sounded in free-trade quarters that the "protectionists" are threatening to dismantle the entire trade liberalization achievement of the past 35 years. Extravagant generalizations on both sides of the debate raise a serious question as to whether it is possible to have a rational discussion of trade policy at the present time. Charges of "free trader" and "protectionist" are hurled back and forth, and "free trader" editors write on "The Protection Racket."¹ It is doubtful if the discussion on trade policy takes place in any other country in the world on such a naive level.

The freetraders, by using "protectionist" and "beggar-my-neighbor" slogans, have apparently done a better job in sticking pins into the opposition from a publicity point of view. "Protectionist" has a curious twist. It all depends on what kind of protection you are talking about. When news media announce that "major elements of President Johnson's consumer-protection program gained ground in Congress,"² and Governor Rockefeller of New York announces a broad program of local, state and federal action to provide greater "protection" for consumers,³ this kind of "protection" is heartily endorsed by many "free traders" who are all for automobile safety, fair packaging, truth in lending, and so on. But most consumers are workers and interested in jobs, and job protection may be important to workers who see their livelihood threatened by a flood of imported products.

Former Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor has suggested an armistice in the "free trader" and "protectionist" battle. He has said: "The terms free trader and protectionist don't tell the full story any more. They leave a gap in the philosophical spectrum of those engaged in international trade relations, far too complex and polarized today not to require at least one bridge between them. Furthermore, by now the terms are used so emotionally that it's difficult to be rational about them. The free trader extremists have made 'protectionist' into a dirty word, akin to 'profits.' It's so easy for critics of one side or another to take the easy way out, to hurl epithets and labels at those with whom they disagree, and to generalize in situations where facts differ widely. What about calling some of us who occupy a middle position by the name, 'conservationist'? A conservationist, as I see it, wants to conserve for the American people the wage levels to which they are accustomed. And the profit levels. And the high standards of investment and research and general working conditions.

"Today a conservationist doesn't want to bar imports, but wants to see them enter this country on an orderly, reasonable basis. He wants to avoid unreasonable disruption and hardship among domestic producers. In fact, a conservationist wants to see a continued liberalization of international trade, but on a truly reciprocal, orderly and fair basis."⁴

There are no signs at present that the "free traders" are willing to lay down their arms and abide by such a truce. With the competitive ammunition provided by practically all the economic textbooks and 35 years of trade liberalization under their belts, they apparently feel invincible. It is extremely doubtful if they will give the opposition the satisfaction of being called "conservationists."

EXTRA-GROWTH BEGINS AT THE TOP

Administration officials have unquestionably led the way in castigating "protectionism" and "protectionists" and exaggerating the importance of foreign trade in the economy. Denouncing any appeal for help from

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

imports as a return to Smoot-Hawley, warning about the dangers of retaliation from abroad if any protective action is taken, and inflating the probable results of the long, drawn-out Kennedy Round negotiations have not been conducive to rational discussion and understanding of the problem. Whether it is before the Joint Economic Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee or the hearing of the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Administration spokesmen tread warily up to the Hill to repeat the same clichés. And other officials repeat them in public speeches. Secretary of State Rusk told the Senate Finance Committee: "For 33 years it has been the policy of the United States to lower, on the basis of reciprocity, barriers to international trade. This policy has served our nation well. It has contributed, I believe, especially since the Second World War, to the remarkable rise in our national prosperity and in the standard of living of our people."⁵ He has been followed by the Secretaries of Commerce, Labor, Interior and Agriculture, who echo the same statements while, incidentally, explaining the need for textile, oil, meat and dairy quotas. It was unfortunate for Secretary of Agriculture Freeman that his protest against "protectionism" was followed by a press announcement the same day that President Johnson had ordered temporary quotas on imports of condensed and evaporated milk and cream on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture.⁶ And Special Trade Representative Roth performs his duty in denouncing all quotas as placing "a heavy burden upon households and upon all Americans whose incomes are low and fixed—notably our senior citizens."⁷

Later the distinguished Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach warned in a speech that "protectionist legislation now before the Congress would undo four years of hard negotiations for lower tariffs and reverse, in large part, 30 years of success in the nation's foreign trade policy."⁸ And Mr. Roth continues his plea for the poor: "The cost of living would go up particularly for the poorest of our citizens."⁹

Is it any wonder, in the light of this hyperbole, that some businessmen spokesmen take the same line in arguing against import controls? Carl J. Gilbert, chairman of the executive committee of Gillette Company and chairman of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, testifying on the future of U.S. foreign trade policy, said: "Pointing the way to the long-range goal (freedom of international trade) in this vital area of both foreign and domestic policy is of great importance to all sectors of our highly productive economy and not just in terms of their stake in export expansion."¹⁰

In the light of this leadership in extravagant statements, it is hardly surprising that a group of prominent businessmen take full-page ads headed "The \$30-billion Question" in New York and Washington newspapers implying that "protectionists" are at work in legislative halls to cut off all our exports. Probably the all-time high for exaggeration, however, appeared in a statement by the president of one of the nation's leading department stores that a protectionist policy could "seriously inhibit the economic growth and even the stability of the entire world."¹¹

What is the importance of our foreign trade to the economy? What are the facts? Actually, the contribution of exports to our economy has changed little in the last 35 years. Exports have grown from \$2 billion in 1934 when they were 3.2 percent of our gross national product to \$30.9 billion in 1967, or 3.9 percent of GNP.¹² Of this total, \$3.2 billion were exports on government account, leaving a total of \$27.7 billion of commercial exports, or 3.5 percent of GNP. Imports have shown greater growth from \$1.7 billion in 1934 when they were 2.6 percent of GNP

to \$26.8 billion in 1967, or 3.4 percent of GNP.¹³

In the last 10 years U.S. exports have expanded at the rate of \$1.1 billion a year compared with an average expansion of \$34.4 billion in GNP. There has been a slight upward trend in the relation of imports to GNP particularly in the last decade. At 3.4 percent of GNP, imports in 1967 reflected the highest ratio since 1934.

What has been the influence of tariff reductions on imports? Duties have been reduced by negotiation (and partly by rising prices) from an average of 47 percent in 1934 to about 11 percent at present and approximately 7.8 percent by 1972 when the reductions of the Kennedy Round will be complete. The percentage of imports entering free of duty to total imports declined from 61 percent in 1934 to 38 percent in 1967, while dollar volume increased about 10 times. The percentage of dutiable imports increased from 39 percent of total in 1934 to 62 percent in 1967, while dollar volume increased approximately 25 times. Dutiable imports increased \$9.2 billion, or less than \$1 billion a year, over the past decade, while GNP has increased \$337.7 billion, or \$33.7 billion a year. The dollar volume of dutiable imports exceeded duty-free imports for the first time in 1956 and increased over two and a half times since that year.¹⁴

There are many reasons for international trade. As Joan Robinson points out: "Nations, in various shapes and sizes, are formed by history and geography without any regard to economic conveniences. As population grows and tastes and technology change, the pattern of demand and supply of various goods and services in the trading world is constantly shifting; at any moment the inhabitants of one patch of the earth's surface find that their resources, natural or accumulated, their skills and inventiveness, their market connections and business acumen, make it easy to sell more to the rest than they need to buy from the while another is finding it very hard."¹⁵

Along with the many variables involved in calculating demand for the world's products, this adds up to the fact that no meaningful conclusion can be reached as to the influence of duty cuts on imports.¹⁶ While dutiable imports almost doubled between 1960 and 1967, it is not inconceivable that they might have increased 50 percent or about the same amount as duty-free imports, and perhaps more if there had been no change in duties.

It has been estimated that an increase of one percent in the annual U.S. growth rate would add approximately \$50 billion a year to GNP. It would seem that some of the energy devoted to inflating the importance of the trade problem could better be devoted to discussions of policies for growth.

With all the emphasis and exaggeration in Administration circles on an average gain of a billion dollars a year in trade, it is surprising indeed to see the lack of concern, except among monetary specialists and America's international companies, over investment controls which may have a substantially greater impact on trade.

Sales of American-owned manufacturing affiliates were in the neighborhood of \$50 billion in 1967 or about two and a half times U.S. exports of manufactured goods.¹⁷ At the Senate hearings on gold cover removal, discussion indicates sales from all U.S. activities abroad might reach \$165 billion a year with an annual return of possibly 10 percent, possibly two thirds of which is reinvested abroad and one third returned here.¹⁸ It was recognized there was a possibility of substantial error in these estimates. And sales to these American corporations abroad account for about 25 percent of our U.S. exports.

In the light of this huge and growing stake in other countries, is it any wonder that Professor Haberler used such terms as "absolutely shocking" and "simply horrible" in

Footnotes at end of article.

describing U.S. investment controls? And he concludes, "So, in the medium run the program will reduce some of our exports and in the long run it will cut into investment income. Hence, the program will be counterproductive in the long run even in narrow balance of payments terms."¹⁹

Over half of the 166 senior international executives involved managing international business who participated in the National Industrial Conference Board's survey of corporate practices identified this program as a major problem for their companies. The majority of those so reporting were highly critical of the control program not only because of its burdens on them but also because they believed it would harm rather than help the balance of payments.²⁰

And yet little has been said about this phase of our trade problem as compared with the volumes accumulating on trade as the exchange of goods.

WHO SHOULD RETALIATE?

Accompanying the crescendo of exaggeration on the importance of trade in our economy have been dire warnings of the consequences of any attempt to protect our markets against low wage competition from abroad. Even mild protection, we are told, would be met by retaliation abroad on a massive scale. Secretary of State Rusk said: "This means, purely and simply, that foreign countries will retaliate against quota restrictions in the United States. . . . World trade would shrink to insignificant levels if each country were free to go back on its word with impunity. This, too, is not theoretical. We know what happened in the 1930's when each country tried to export unemployment by insulating itself from the world economy behind high tariffs."²¹ The direction of the retaliation to which our own exports would be subjected is, moreover, something over which we have no control. Other countries could pick and choose the section of American exports to restrict."²² Under Secretary of State Katzenbach warns that "any such legislation (on our part—protectionist) would result in a spiral of retaliation by others. . . . The United States has already been formally put on notice by some 40 countries that they strongly oppose the proposed legislation."²³

And Ambassador Roth told the House Ways and Means Committee: "The imposition of protectionist quotas, or increased tariffs in breach of our commitments, would be met by heavy retaliation against our exports. In 1962 when the United States, by escape-clause action, impaired the value of its tariff concessions on carpets and glass, the European Common Market immediately withdrew concessions of value to us. They didn't negotiate—they acted. And they acted on items designed to hurt our trade. . . . Later, when the Common Market denied access to our chickens we acted in the same way—with a sharp increase in our tariffs against Volkswagen trucks, starches, and French cognac. If any of the more important quota bills before you should pass, there isn't the slightest doubt that the retaliation that will follow will, of necessity, be massive."²⁴

And the *Wall Street Journal* joins the chorus: "Among nations, as among little boys, there is a tendency to strike back when someone hits you. If history is any guide, then new U.S. import curbs will quickly bring retaliation abroad, further crimping America's foreign sales."²⁵

It is true that raising tariffs on carpets and rugs some time ago brought certain restrictions against what was reported to be an equivalent volume of U.S. exports. This, however, was little more than shadowboxing as far as the effects on total trade are concerned.

Now, if there is any justification for retaliation it lies with the United States which has,

in many cases, ignored reciprocity and led the parade toward trade liberalization. As Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Resources, has said, "The other path (freeing trade) is the one we are committed to follow—by our own example—not to compound what other nations have done to restrict trade."²⁶

What have these nations done as the United States has turned the other cheek? The president of Mexico visits the United States and warns a joint session of Congress against American "protectionism." While Mexico has some of the highest duties in the world on certain products, embargos others and licenses still others, she enjoys the benefits of GATT without the responsibilities of membership.

Japan sent a delegation to protest the rise of protectionism in the United States.²⁷ Yet, the Japanese philosophy in trade is summarized very well by Japanese industrialist Yosomatsu Natsume, who said: "Chaos would reign in Japan if U.S. industries are allowed to enter our country unhampered by tariffs. Our smaller businesses would be buried by the thousands."²⁸

In Japan all products are subject to licensing. There may be several lists of products, one of which may consist of articles subject to open general licensing with no specific prior import license required. Another may be of restricted products with importation subject to specific license. The government may at any time transfer products from the general license to specific license category without consultation with other countries that might be concerned. Japan continues to exclude many U.S. products through these licensing and import quota arrangements.²⁹

Ken O'Kubo, president of Mitsubishi Industries, gives the reason why extensive negotiations have been necessary to persuade the Japanese to ease quotas and restrictions to give the American automobile industry a foothold in Japan which exported 362,245 motor vehicles in 1967 while importing a minuscule 14,886. He said: "The Japanese distribution system would be plunged into serious confusion by an invasion of American capital goods if we did not limit American investment in Japan."³⁰ While agreeing to remove restrictions on imports of engines and parts in 1972 and expanding quotas somewhat on vehicles, U.S. ownership will be permitted only up to 50 percent of total, and that will be considered on a case-by-case basis. And the Japanese government must give prior approval to any joint venture and maintain some control over it.³¹ No wonder the Japanese Economic Planning Agency forecast Japan export trade in 1968 would reach eight percent of the world market as compared with a current 5.5 percent.

While many quotas on industrial goods have been removed by our Western trading partners, there still are import quotas, exchange restrictions, import licenses, excessive or unreasonable documentation requirements, labeling, packaging regulations, and arbitrary technical standards—all barriers to trade. "Among the less developed countries, such restrictions are almost a standard part of their development programs."³² Here are a few examples of items under restriction. Belgium imposes a quota on coal, and the United Kingdom virtually prohibits all coal imports. France maintains licensing restrictions on certain electronic equipment. In Italy, licenses are required for imports of citric acid, crude calcium citrate and essential lemon oil; quotas apply to tetrathyl lead and anti-knock preparations; and imports of elemental sulphur are prohibited. Austria limits imports of penicillin and other antibiotics. Canada prohibits the importation of used aircraft and used automobiles.³³

Agricultural protectionism in Europe is extensive and covers virtually all major commodities in all countries. It consists of a large variety of trade controls, including

internal price supports, traditional import restrictions, customs duties, quantitative restrictions, as well as newer devices such as minimum prices, variable levies, import calendars, conditional imports, mixing regulation, state trading, equalization taxes on imports, and preferential trading systems, all dedicated to the goal of self-sufficiency and raising farm income which in Europe is about one half of nonfarm income.³⁴ Moreover, countries with export surpluses have adopted numerous measures to facilitate sales, including direct export subsidies, transport subsidies, special tax exemptions, price equalization arrangements, and other measures. Export rebates of the American market countries may amount to 15 percent to 16 percent.³⁵

The United Kingdom (the home of free trade prior to 1932) restricts imports of orange and grapefruit juices and canned grapefruit from the United States through dollar quotas even though these restrictions are not sanctioned by GATT. We continue to ask that they be removed. Sweden and Denmark restrict imports of apples and pears; Finland, dried peas and soy beans; Norway, honey, apples and pears and canned fruit; Austria, poultry; Sweden, meat and edible oil. Then there is the state trading found in both agriculture and industrial products. Japan, France and Italy have state trading in cigarettes; France also in coal, petroleum, paper and newspaper; Norway, Sweden, and Finland in alcoholic beverages; and so on.³⁶

The European Economic Community has concentrated on domestic price supports, protection against competitive imports, and where the necessary, export subsidies. These apply to 85 percent or more of the EEC production.³⁷ The variable levy system creates a major problem for U.S. agricultural exports, a third of which go to the EEC. This system permits imports only when domestic producers cannot supply all the domestic market at a predetermined price and insulates much of the Common Market agriculture from competition.³⁸

In August, 1962, the EEC imposed variable levies on poultry which almost tripled the previous level of protection. This brought about a sharp reduction in the shipments of U.S. poultry to the Common Market, and today they are less than half what they were at that time. Poultry production in the EEC has increased and has brought about pressures to export. Subsidized sales of poultry from EEC to other European countries has cut the United States market even further.³⁹

Even before the Kennedy Round could be analyzed the EEC established an export subsidy on canned hams amounting to about 25 cents per pound in the face of an agreement with the United States not to increase the minimal import duty of three cents a pound.⁴⁰

Assistant trade representative Harold Malmgren pointed out what we are up against in working with the EEC in a recent speech: "In Europe, for example, the Common Market has increasingly focused its energies on the situation of internal problems, while foreign interests have been pushed lower down in the order of political and economic priorities. The consequence has been sharply increasing protection against foreign agricultural products. . . . The system has become a bureaucratic nightmare, with regulations piled upon regulation. Amendments follow one another with such rapidity that few policy people can follow these controls. . . . The Common Market Commission has recently proposed new regulations for the importation of canned fruit and vegetables. . . . If adopted, these regulations would further restrict our access to the EEC Market and would impair rights we obtained in past negotiations."⁴¹

And the report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee comments: "The European

Footnotes at end of article.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Common Market practices of rebating their own indirect taxes on their exports and buoying these same taxes on imports—a practice sanctioned, incidentally, by the rules of GATT—constitutes a conspicuous form of discrimination against U.S. exports.”⁴⁵

Professor Baldwin of the University of Wisconsin told the same subcommittee that while the United States has certain barriers in textiles, oil, and certain agricultural products “most of our barriers are represented by clear-cut laws and well-known public regulations. In many foreign countries, on the other hand, informal administrative devices are used to thwart the attempts of U.S. businesses to sell abroad.”⁴⁶

And speaking of restrictions on U.S. exports, it is worth noting that many European countries, while granting trade concessions to the United States by various devices such as import licenses or informal quotas, do not accord other nations, principally Japan, the full benefit of these concessions. Our concessions go automatically to all nations, including Japan; theirs do not. Thus, our industries are subject to increased import competition from Japan. Those interested in the detailed restrictions around the world on U.S. exports should examine the “Preliminary Inventory of Nontariff Trade Barriers by Country” placed in the Congressional Record by Senator Muskie (D., Maine) on March 7, 1968, and a similar report placed in the records of the Ways and Means Committee hearings on trade on June 26, 1968, by Congressman John Dent (D., Pa.).

It is clear that other nations give little thought to retaliation by the United States when taking steps in the interest of their own domestic industries and agriculture. All these expressions of fear of retaliation made by U.S. officials must convince other nations we are a paper tiger, afraid of our own shadow. In the final analysis, trade is determined by economics not politics. In most cases, except for the EEC where it could come from the bloc, retaliation must come from an individual country on a country-by-country basis, and each country, as well as the EEC, has something to gain from maintaining trading relations with the United States. We see other countries provide an effective degree of protection for their domestic agriculture and industry. There are a few cases which bear out the retaliation warnings, but the total effect on our trade has been insignificant compared to the effect of the action by other nations on our export trade. Furthermore, there was no action taken by them with the passage of the 1964 meat import law, nor after the curtailment of dairy imports.

In the light of all the hypocrisy that has attended the discussions of trade and the threats of retaliation, it was like a breath of fresh air when the French representative at the New Delhi conference, after listening to a number of Western European nations brag about their outstanding records in liberalizing trade and implying that criticism from the poorer countries could not possibly be leveled at them, said: “I have heard such speeches for the last 20 years until I know them by heart. In the post-war days it was the contrast between the economies of Western Europe and the United States. Today it is the developing nation and developed countries. The fact of the matter is that where there is a clear difference in economic levels between countries, exchanges between these countries cannot be governed by the principles of economic liberalization. Force of conviction among the developing countries is robbing them of their reality.”⁴⁷ The French have always been known as realists.

EXAGGERATION ON THE KENNEDY ROUND

Similar exaggeration works its way through propaganda on the accomplishments of the

Kennedy Round. In his message to Congress on the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1963, President Johnson said: “When I reported to the Congress last November on the Kennedy Round, I said it would mean new factories, more jobs, lower prices to families, and higher incomes for American workers and for our trading partners throughout the world.”⁴⁸

An official Commerce statement on the “historic Kennedy Round” without further information would lead to a very inflated idea of its importance to the United States: “Tariff concessions were granted on an estimated \$40-billion worth of free world trade—concessions greater than those made in the five previous negotiating rounds combined.”⁴⁹

Senator Jacob Javits (R., N.Y.) at a hearing on the future of U.S. foreign trade policy congratulated Ambassador Roth and his staff for his “extraordinarily gifted service which was shown in this case (the Kennedy Round) which is so critically important to the security and prosperity of our nation.”⁵⁰ And commenting on this and other things: “I especially regret that the report (*The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*) fails to give adequate recognition to the brilliant success of the Kennedy Round of trade negotiation.”⁵¹ Acting Secretary of Commerce McQuade said: “I think given the aggressive and imaginative character of U.S. businessmen that it will open up great new opportunities for them in the international market.”⁵² A leading businessman pointed out: “Great accomplishment has come from these five years of tough negotiations (the Kennedy Round) in freeing up large parts of the international trade of the world’s most important industrial trading nation.”⁵³ Secretary Rusk indicates the Kennedy Round was our most successful tariff-cutting venture: “In Western Europe the economic miracle of recovery from World War II in less than a decade and the unprecedented levels of prosperity which have followed would not have occurred—at least not so rapidly—if it had not been for two decisions: first, the decision at our urging to break down intra-European barriers; then the agreement to join with us in successive multilateral, reciprocal reductions of trade barriers. The most successful phase of this cooperative venture was the conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations last year.”⁵⁴

Are these statements reasonable? Dr. Howard Piquet, senior specialist in the Library of Congress, has estimated that the tariff reductions granted by the United States in the Kennedy Round might result in increasing U.S. imports by anywhere from \$50 million to \$100 million. The average percentage point reduction authorized was calculated at six points or less than half that of the 1945 act and less than a third of that from the 1934 act.⁵⁵

This is not far from the estimate by David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, that “A good guess might be that as a direct result of the Kennedy Round U.S. exports and imports will rise by around five percent, with the gain spread over a period of five years or more. This relatively modest percentage translates into an increase of close to \$3 billion in total U.S. foreign trade. So you can readily see what it could bring in terms of export opportunities as well as somewhat stiffer import competition.”⁵⁶

Surely a rise of one percent, or approximately \$300 million, a year in exports (and present indications are it may not be this much) and the same rise or, as it seems at present, more in imports is a small return on the investment in the Trade Expansion Act and five years of struggle. As noted economist Oscar Gass in a brilliant article in the *New Republic* asked in 1962, “Is the economic gain to the American economy, from the further lowering of customs duties, likely to be large? This may be questioned.”⁵⁷

It is not surprising that Professor Cooper

of Yale commented on this point at the Congressional hearing on the future of U.S. foreign trade policy: “It is true that tariff cuts amounted to something like 30 percent on \$15-\$16 billion of U.S. trade (taking imports, and exports together and agriculture as well as industrial goods). But these tariff cuts are to be spread over four years, and they stem from negotiations which took nearly five years. If allowance is made for the very long time over which these cuts should be averaged, the Kennedy Round was only about 45 percent better than the Dillon Round, which was widely regarded as amounting to next to nothing. Moreover, some of the cuts in the Kennedy Round did much less in the way of reducing protection than they appear to, since, at least in the textile and metals industries, tariffs on raw materials were often reduced substantially more than tariffs on fabricated products.”⁵⁸ Searching for something to which to attach praise, Professor Cooper said: “To focus on these blemishes, however, would be to do the Kennedy Round an injustice. The number of commodities covered was far greater than in the Dillon Round. Moreover, the Kennedy Round preserved the forward momentum of trade liberalization.”⁵⁹ This same thought—that the United States was lucky to complete the Round—was echoed by Ambassador Roth when he said: “I think many of us who worked in this have felt that one of the great advantages of a successful Kennedy Round was that we averted some thing quite terrible—that is, of a failure. If there had been a failure, I feel—and I think all of us who worked in this felt—that it would have set back the growth of a liberal world trade policy many years . . . and therefore we are grateful that it was, in the final analysis, possible to put such an agreement together.”⁶⁰ In other words, completion of the Round, regardless of concessions, was in itself a victory.

WHY ALL THE ALARMS?

Have we completely lost perspective on this trade question? Is this exaggeration of the importance of trade, the threats of retaliation, and the inflated estimates of Kennedy Round results necessary or even justified? As Gass said six years ago, “Nobody is suggesting that international trade be reduced in any drastic way.”⁶¹ As we have seen, our exports and dutiable imports have grown by a billion dollars a year, more or less, over the last decade. If exports had increased 50 percent more, would this gain of even a half billion dollars a year in trade, or about one fifteenth of one percent of GNP, justify all of this hyperbole? Would it add moderately to our standard of living, reduce inflation, or help the old folks to any important degree? It seems doubtful. At present it seems more likely that the protectionist policies of other countries and the increasing cost of American merchandise will hold the gain to something less than this amount. As Gass asked, “Is this the bold new road to the future of the American economy?”⁶²

And what about imports? How much more surely they have grown if all imports were duty free? The Piquet estimates given earlier would seem to bear out the prophetic comments of Gass in his analysis of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962: “The potential economic gain to the United States from further trade liberalization is the smaller because we already admit either duty-free or with very low duties many items in which foreign production costs are greatly lower than ours.”⁶³

It is necessary to sound all these alarms to scare away the “protectionist” threat. The “protectionist” movement has been won up out of all proportions by the “free traders.” As Edwin L. Dale, economic writer for the *New York Times*, points out: “The supposed rise in protectionist sentiment in Congress is not quite what it seems. . . . It does not mean a complete turning back on

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the merits of free international trade. . . . American industry and agriculture along with Congress have discovered the device of the quotas as a means of keeping import competition within limits. The quota as now used is a device to limit imports to a share—often a fairly generous share—of the growing internal market." And again: "The bills in Congress almost all involving quotas reflect a little-realized fact that some important industries which have managed to raise the loudest protest have already won protection through quotas without any collapse of American trade policy. . . . Technically it is true that the bills would affect \$6.4 billion of imports and subject U.S. exports to retaliation in the same amount. But most of the bills would reduce imports little, if at all. Primarily they would control future import growth in the affected products."⁶²

NATIONAL GOALS AND TRADE POLICY

One of the oldest and most responsible groups propagandizing for free trade is the Committee for a National Trade Policy. In testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee June 11, 1968, the chairman dealt in sweeping generalizations on how free-trade policy serves the national interest and, using the domino theory, how any deviation from it could easily bring us to a controlled economy and even undermine American prosperity. The chairman said: "The committee's goal has always been a national trade policy best suited to serve the total national interest of the United States. We believe that the trade policy essential to this objective is one that fosters the consistent, gradual elimination of artificial barriers to international trade on a reciprocal, multilateral basis. . . . Our committee has always opposed import control legislation, because such statutes would impair the national interest. Once the United States starts a pattern of import quotas, allocating a fixed percentage of the U.S. market to American producers and the balance to foreign suppliers, we will find ourselves opening a Pandora's box of governmental controls. A protected market inevitably leads to a spiral of price increases, and this in turn will certainly lead to a popular clamor—and a justifiable one—for price controls. We could expect to see a wide range of government intervention in the U.S. economy such as we have never experienced except in war time, and one which could totally distort the competitive economy which has made America prosperous."⁶³

This reminds one of the story of the man on the train who refused to tell his seat companion the time or day on the theory it might lead to conversion, which might lead to an invitation to dinner, to marriage with his daughter, divorce, and all sorts of dire consequences!

The committee raises an important question: What is a national trade policy best suited to the "total national interest" of the country? Is it a free trade policy? Perhaps and perhaps not. Our "total national interest" may well be somewhat different from what it was 35 years ago when it was expressed in the 1934 reciprocal trade program.

In 1946 Congress passed the Employment Act, which charged the Federal Government with the responsibility to promote "maximum employment, production and purchasing power."⁶⁴ Does the national trade policy of the committee (a free-trade policy) serve the national interest of the Employment Act? Officials have been emphasizing, or perhaps overemphasizing, for a long time, and particularly since the struggle over the TEA of 1962, the amount of employment provided by export trade. The same exaggeration persists with the present Administration: "Our exports are benefiting a lot of people in export-related industries. I'm thinking now about the thousands of workers and busi-

nessmen in such enterprises as handling, transporting, warehousing, processing, packaging, freight forwarding, insuring, financing, and many others. For these people, expanding exports bring assurance of continued jobs and profits."⁶⁵

Oscar Gass commented in his *New Republic* article on the tendency to inflate the employment demand from exports: "During the Eisenhower Administration, it was common for official statements to say that exports were responsible for four million American jobs. On exuberant days, the figure was five million."⁶⁶ He asked, "Will it be easier for the United States to maintain full employment in an economy in which international trade is more important? The contrary seems likely."⁶⁷

Gass pointed out that emphasis on the employment contribution of foreign trade is to "let a very small tail wag a very big dog. . . . In the United States we have every year far greater cumulative additions to our labor supply than we could conceivably get even once from Trade Liberalization. . . . We have done a poor job of employing this growing labor power. There is no reason to believe we would do much better with the relatively small net increment of unemployed hands earned from more international trade. Indeed, because of the probable concentration of the unemployment profit from more international trading in some industries and regions, we might do worse than generally."⁶⁸

Even if the enthusiasm and hyperbole of all the special interests appearing at the hearings before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House on the impact of imports on American industry and employment is wrung out, the statements of members of Congress and dozens of industry representatives suggest that there is a serious question as to whether the full-employment policy is being bolstered by present trade policy or is being further burdened."⁶⁹

What about the national interest as expressed in our agricultural policies? Whether one agrees with or condemns them, these policies represent the will of Congress, and certainly congressional "national interest" in improving farm income and the economic welfare of farmers. Price supports, reserve stocks, acreage controls, soil bank, the agricultural trade and development and assistance act of 1954, farm subsidies, and parity concepts are part of our national agricultural interest."⁷⁰

The basic conflict between the goal of the Committee for a National Trade Policy and our agricultural policy becomes clear when Secretary Freeman testified that "we had to invoke Section 22 [Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933] action last year to protect our dairymen from imports that would undermine price support or other Department of Agriculture programs."⁷¹ Freeman also said: "The meat import law of 1964. . . . sets a target which imports cannot exceed in any year without 'triggering' quotas. If quotas are ever imposed—and they haven't been yet—they will hold imports to a level based on average imports in the 1959-63 period, adjusted to take account of the change in U.S. production. . . . We are sympathetic with the problems of the beef-exporting countries, but they must look for help, not to us, but to the countries that created the problem."⁷²

Just recently State Department officials saved the Administration the embarrassment of establishing meat quotas under this act by working out voluntary arrangements with several countries to control meat exports to the United States.

The Secretary also pointed out that quotas on evaporated milk and cream were invoked to protect U.S. agricultural support prices and tariff investigations were underway to determine if quotas should be placed on other

dairy products.⁷³ On September 25, 1968, it was announced that Secretary Freeman had requested and the President had acted to place temporary quotas on most low-priced foreign cheeses which come chiefly from Denmark, Finland, West Germany and Austria. Imports had surged since the President had requested the Tariff Commission to investigate the need for such quotas. The story quoted Agriculture Department officials as saying "You can't tell the importers from the exporters any more. . . . Some (former importer nations) are subsidizing domestic butter production at 85 cents a pound and selling it for 10 cents." Low-price imports place heavy burdens on the dairy-support programs, and these quotas will undoubtedly be made permanent when the tariff investigations are completed.⁷⁴

Secretary Freeman summarizes the situation in agricultural trade as follows: "Export subsidies as used by some foreign countries have given us serious problems recently, both in our own market and in markets abroad. The United States took selective action this spring when subsidized canned tomato products began to come into our market from the European community. The U.S. Treasury Department, after investigation, announced that beginning June 1, 1968, it would apply countervailing duties against such imports. The countervailing duty, of course, protects our producers by offsetting the artificially low prices of the subsidized products. We are also concerned about the way subsidized products are taking away traditional foreign markets for farmers. The EEC is using subsidies, or contemplating their use, for just about every product the area exports: grain, flour, dairy products, meat, poultry, lard and others. But the Community isn't alone. Denmark, for example, subsidizes exports of poultry and dairy products. Australia subsidizes shipments of canned fruit, and so it goes."⁷⁵

Many, of course, will contend that our present farm policies do not promote the "national interest" in agriculture. And it may be, as one expert has suggested, that the protectionist features of our farm programs have stimulated protection features in other countries, although it is doubtful if the governments of the mixed economies of Western European countries need instruction from us on how to control their economics.⁷⁶ In any event, the point here is that in the light of agricultural programs abroad and our own extensive farm programs, it seems doubtful if further liberalization of U.S. markets for agricultural products as advocated by the Committee for a National Trade Policy is in the "national interest" at the present time.

The oil industry offers another example of where the committee's philosophy may not coincide with national interest: "Because the free competitive market has been unable to perform its primary function of husbanding existing oil reserves, public policy has agreed on the desirability of a conservation policy and the domestic crude oil industry operates under both federal and state control. Some of the strongest advocates of free competitive markets agree that some policy of conservation is desirable."⁷⁷

As J. P. Young has said: "Nations, moreover, are at times more interested in maintaining their 'way of life' and accomplishing certain domestic objectives, such as protection against the spiral of a depression originating abroad, or developing national industries, than in extending trade. International trade in such cases may be sacrificed to national ends."⁷⁸ And our "national interest," as expressed by congressmen in industrial and agriculture legislation, calls for greater emphasis on the promotion of domestic growth, employment and farm income than on action to increase our foreign trade by a few hundred million dollars a year. There is serious doubt in certain quarters than the "free-trade" goal of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, at least

Footnotes at end of article.

without some important modifications, is in the "national interest" today.

THE ECONOMIC BACKGROUND FOR FREE TRADE

There is little doubt that the views of the Committee for a National Trade Policy on a proper trade policy are supported by every economic textbook in the country. All of them espouse the doctrine of free trade and the principle of comparative advantage. While we are admiring this glittering edifice and the list of distinguished economists that built it, we should remind ourselves it has concealed architectural flaws and the roof leaks frequently in a storm.

Professor Clare Griffin states the theory in modern fashion: "If a country is blessed with advantages, it always has greater advantage in some lines than in others. It will, therefore, gain most if it devotes its efforts to the things it can do best and exchanges the products of their efforts for things in which its advantage is least."²³

At the outset, it is important to remember Keynes's comment on economic theory. He points out: "Our criticism of the accepted classical theory of economics has consisted not so much in finding logical flaws in its analysis as in pointing out that the tacit assumptions are seldom or never satisfied, with the result that it cannot solve the economic problems of the actual world."²⁴

It is well to recall the development of the theory of free trade and the many assumptions involved in its construction. Disregarding the work of the physiocrats, Adam Smith provided the foundation for free-trade theory. Smith was revolting against the restrictions of mercantilism. He saw free competition as the great force which would increase the output of goods and extend the division of labor to free trade throughout the world. Smith abhorred mercantilistic controls. To him, the least government was the best government. This was the broad political overture to trade policy.

As Joan Robinson points out: "Free trade had all along been the central doctrine of political economy—for the neoclassicals a belief in free trade became the very hallmark of an economist; protections belonged to the lesser breed without the law. The case for free trade was basically the same as the general case for the individualistic pursuit of profit, though, starting from Ricardo's theory of comparative cost, it was dressed up in a different form. It exhibited an equilibrium position in which competition leads to the maximum utility in the world as a whole being produced from given resources."²⁵

But the laissez-faire economists had something other than trade theory in mind. Joan Robinson summarizes it very well: "The hard-headed classics made no bones about it. They were arguing against the narrow nationalism of mercantilists in favor of the more far-sighted policy, but they were in favor of free trade because it was good for Great Britain, not because it was good for the world."²⁶ And again: In "the pre-1941 world, Great Britain had everything to gain from other nations adopting free trade and very little to lose from maintaining it herself."²⁷ The concept of free trade "as Marshall shrewdly observed, was really a projection of British national interests."²⁸ Perhaps the 1934 reversal of U.S. trade policy was to some extent dictated by the belief that free trade would be good for a younger and more virile U.S. economy.

In order to prove that what was good for Great Britain—manufacturing economy—was also good for other nations, the early economists set up a model with assumptions of perfect competition, full employment and the resources of each country in static condition—all of this, as Keynes has

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

pointed out, with little relation to actual conditions. The scope of these assumptions has been set forth by a group of distinguished economists. While endorsing the ideal of universal free trade, they point out: "Free trade was never supposed to operate in a vacuum, but only within the context of certain conditions. These are, first, that there will be no quantitative restrictions of trade. . . . Secondly . . . that full and complete convertibility of currencies prevail, i.e., that the free trade area in question constitutes, in effect, one homogeneous payment community. . . . Thirdly . . . that no special advantages are reserved to one country in virtue of its tax structure, the subsidies it pays to its domestic producers, or the domestic monopolies and cartels its laws may permit to exist. . . . Fourth . . . that the ratio of money wage increases to productivity increases be approximately uniform in the free trade area. . . . Fifth . . . that the participating countries are all following roughly parallel fiscal and monetary policies. . . . Other characteristics . . . would be the absence of barriers to the free flow of labor and capital across national borders and security for capital investments against nationalization without just compensation."²⁹

By the early thirties the impact of the Great Depression on Great Britain, as well as on other countries, was bringing about a serious examination of laissez-faire economic principles. As Joan Robinson points out: "The doctrine that, at least from a patriotic point of view, it was desirable to preach when England was the greatest exporting nation made precious little sense at any level in the 1930's. . . ." The hangover from pre-war confidence in the doctrine only gave way when unemployment and the chronic weakness of the British balance of trade were so much exaggerated by the world slump as to force even economists to notice that something had changed."³⁰ The result was a commitment by this home of free-trade doctrine to a program of modest protection.³¹

Another shock to "free traders" came in 1936 when Keynes, in "The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money," agreed that the mercantilists were not completely wrong and that protection which curtails imports may be necessary to build employment at home.³²

In all fairness, it must be pointed out that Keynes warned against overdoing it on protection: "It does not follow from this that the maximum degree of restriction of imports will promote the maximum favorable balance of trade. . . . There are strong presumptions of a general character against trade restrictions unless they can be justified on special grounds (presumably these mean employment). The advantages of the international division of labour are real and substantial, even though the classical school greatly overstressed them." He goes on to caution a policy of great moderation on trade restriction: "The fact that the advantage which our own country gains from a favorable balance is liable to evolve an equal disadvantage to save other countries (a point to which the mercantilists were fully alive) means not only that great moderation is necessary . . . but also that an immoderate policy may lead to senseless international competition for a favorable balance which injures all alike."³³

Keynesian thinking was responsible for a few holes in the roof of the GATT structure. Joan Robinson concludes: "The Keynesian revolution broke through the pretended internationalism of free trade doctrine and helped to introduce a genuine internationalism into our thinking. The post-war international agreements, though strongly influenced by free trade ideals, left escape clauses for countries suffering from balance of payments difficulties, and for underdeveloped countries; and they permitted home employment policy to take precedence over

international obligation. In principle, though very little has been done about it, regulation of trade in primary commodities is accepted as an objective of policy (though the free trade fanatics still deny it) and when our own balance of payments improves by impoverishing primary producers, at least we recognize that it is nothing to be proud of. This awareness of the variety of problems that face other nations, and the abandonment of the pseudo-universalist free-trade doctrine, is a great advance in enlightenment."³⁴

And as Joan Robinson points out, things have now come to the point in Great Britain where "Lancashire now has to be defended against cheap textiles from countries whose indigenous industries she was once encouraged to ruin in the name of free trade."³⁵ And more trade restrictions may be ahead. Following the last devaluation, the National Institute for Economic and Social Research in Great Britain urged that the government "plan now for possible import restrictions in case improvements in the balance of payments take longer than expected."³⁶

The conflicts of the doctrine of comparative advantages in today's "dynamic mixed economies" have rarely been better stated than by Robert Schwengel:

"Competition within a modern industrial country, while a driving force, does not do all aspects of the job it is traditionally supposed to: it is not relied on as a general equilibrating mechanism for the national economy as a whole. It is supplemented by direct government action in many sectors of the market economy such as those determining farm prices, oligopoly prices, investment, savings and wages. The theory of international trade has not found a way to live with this fact. . . ."

"But the free flow of trade among national economies can do only part of the job. Alone, it is not adequate, in the modern industrial world, for pursuing even the economic objective of maximizing the community's total income by allocating productive resources to the most efficient use."

"There would also have to be enough free competition within the several national economies to bring about a strong tendency toward general economic equilibrium. Such equilibrating domestic competition is part of the model from which economists reasoned out the neoclassical theory of international trade, including the doctrine of comparative advantage which is so frequently mentioned as a guide in the conduct of United States trade policy. The theory has advanced greatly in sophistication over the years, but the main policy conclusions drawn from it have not yet been demonstrated to be valid except for a relatively simple, static model where competition free of government intervention does the economic determining within the individual countries."

"The theory conveyed highly relevant and practical insight for members of the vigorous, competitive commercial-financial community of early nineteenth century England with its small, technologically, relatively simple industries, its mercantilist-protectorial foreign trade barriers, and its unchallenged economic nationalism. The theory again gave valuable insight for the industrial world in the throwback of the inter-war depression with disintegration of internal economic organization and suicidal, isolationist trade intervention by every government. At that time, the genius of the trade agreements program for the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers lay in its blending of this theory-of-international-trade approach with an international peace objective. As a result, many leaders of opinion came to associate the freeing of trade with emergency from the traumatic experience of the depression; this association, taken together with the traditional success of free trade during the rise of Victorian England to wealth and power,

²³Footnotes at end of article.

has surrounded free-trade theory with an aura of proven validity and even, for some, of moral imperative.

"Meanwhile, the economic world has changed and the theory has become archaic. The model whose main elements were selected for relevance to the intuitively perceived need of early nineteenth-century England yields many conclusions and insights that are irrelevant and backward looking in today's industrial world."²²

As Professor Samuelson, one of the high priests of free trade, said, while warning against disregarding the doctrine of comparative cost: "If theories, like girls, could win beauty contests, comparative advantage would certainly rate high in that it is an elegantly logical structure. An oversimplified one, as far as our rushing out to make immediate applications to real life is concerned."²³ We can agree with him on both counts.

A good way to summarize this discussion of free-trade theory was suggested by Hans-Gunther Sohl, president of August Thyssen-Hütte, A.G., of Germany, in a speech to the American steel industry. He said: "To set free trade as a goal by no means suggests that we should ride the principle to death. There will always be special situations in particular countries when internal economic difficulties conflict with the target of free trade. I think it would be unfair and, I think, also unwise to leave a country in that situation unaided in the search for a solution of its problems."²⁴

A NEW DIALOG NEEDED

All this adds up to the fact that we are desperately in need of a new dialog on trade. Senator McCarthy's comment on Administration statements on other matters is appropriate to the trade discussion: "It is time to have done with the language of excess, of exaggeration."²⁵ We have had enough hyperbole on the importance of foreign trade in our economy, on the success of the Kennedy Round, and enough warnings about retaliations if we make the slightest move in the direction of protecting domestic industry. And we have had sufficient exaggeration from industry on the impact of imports while enjoying good production and profits. With the trade policy hearings of the Joint Economic Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, and the President's special representative on trade, we have had enough airing of the "free trade" and "protectionist" points of view. The hearings have amassed a wealth of data on industry competitive relationships here and abroad and have produced some excellent theory papers which paint with a broad brush the goals to be sought on trade policy. It is time now to get down to specific cases on an industry-by-industry basis and decide what shall be done.

Dale points out one of the reasons why this is so difficult: "There is also a view that the State Department is so free-trade minded that it will not even listen to reasonable arguments on import problems."²⁶

And Senator Long has pointed out another: "If the Executive branch would stop bombarding us with scarecrows and sit down with us to discuss particular industry problems and their solutions, then we could have a fruitful legislative year. At the moment, they are even quoting from Sacred Scripture to justify their views. If this continues, we will have to invoke the help of the Lord to guard us against his overzealous children."²⁷

Let us agree there are basic elements of truth on both sides of the trade question. Let us agree that trade liberalization begun in 1934 was a good thing, both economically and politically, for this country and for the world. With our relatively young and vigorous industrial economy, it was to our own interest, as it was to Britain's, to encourage

freer trade; furthermore, that it is a long-run ideal toward which we may work our way on the theory that "In a generally prosperous world, we are likely to do better than in a miserable one."²⁸ We can find a general area of agreement on this in spite of the fact that we may have to make some detours and stopovers while on this journey. After all, we don't know how much the "free-world" trade, which in 1967 amounted to around \$190 billion (exports measured f.o.b.), would have been without the past 35 years of trade liberalization. And we don't know whether or not the United States would be as well off today or even better off as far as employment potential goes if we were selling \$20-billion worth of exports annually instead of \$80 billion and importing \$18 billion instead of \$27 billion.

The 1934 Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act was passed as the country was moving out of a recession. In his message to Congress in January, 1962, President Kennedy called this act a "landmark measure" which "brought growth and order to the free world trading system."²⁹ Although in some respects influenced by the Great Depression, it reflected a basic change in U.S. commercial policy. Following World War II, in 1947 the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was signed during a period when the rebuilding of economies that had been destroyed by war was just getting underway. The Trade Agreement Act of 1962 was called by President Kennedy a "wholly new instrument" to meet the "challenges and opportunities of a rapidly changing world."³⁰ Time has proven it was not "wholly new," and events have shown it was not an instrument capable of meeting the trade challenges of a changing world; rising economic nationalism, trading blocs, rising communist world trade, international corporations, and U.S. balance-of-payments deficits.

We need rational discussion of the trade question because great changes have taken place in the world since 1934. As former Undersecretary of State George Ball has said: "Our modern world is different in almost every respect from that of 1934. The handful of European metropolitan nations dominated one-third of the world's population through colonial structures that were at the same time closed trading systems, while American industry concentrated on our domestic market. It was a very wide world-producing and even selling abroad was still thought of as something exotic and quite outside the scope of most American enterprises. . . . But the modern world is marked by air transport and telephones and teletypes, computers and automation, it is a world in which thousands of American companies no longer make much operation distinction between domestic and international trade. They no longer see their markets or their production limited by national boundaries but do business in every corner of the globe, utilizing raw materials and components, plant facilities and capital, labor and managerial talent wherever they may find them so as to produce the highest yield with the least cost to serve markets wherever they can be developed."³¹

Since World War II the Western economies as well as that of Japan have been rebuilt; these modern factories and resources offer a far greater competitive challenge to American industry now than in 1934. In addition, we have supported and encouraged the formation of Common Market trade blocs and free-trade areas in various parts of the world, which foster preferential trading for members. At the same time, we are striving for a policy to assist the less-developed countries speed up their industrialization to provide more competition for U.S. industry.³²

There are other fundamental changes which affect trade between nations. Close to half the population of the world is organized under communism with collectivized industries. Costs in these countries are not

calculated as in Western countries, and central planning dictates the products to be exported and imported, usually based on the need for dollars.

The changing character of U.S. trade since 1960 suggests that the framers of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 did not anticipate the rising competitive problems of American industry and agriculture in foreign markets.³³ Up until a few years ago, the trade balance of the United States was the pride and joy of our balance of payments. Trade balances of \$4 to \$6 billion a year were sufficient to offset the cost of military adventures, investment abroad, give-aways, and foreign aid. In the last few years, the situation has been changing at an alarming rate. Our commercial trade balance (the difference between exports and imports minus exports on government account) fell from \$9 billion in 1964 to \$2 billion in 1965. In 1967 the commercial balance had fallen to \$255 million. One experienced observer estimates the 1968 commercial trade deficit at anywhere from \$1.5 to \$2.5 billion.³⁴

There is little doubt that the economic boom and creeping inflation are responsible in part for rising imports and the slowing of exports. An examination of the U.S. trade position, however, indicates that other factors are involved and raises serious questions as to future trends in our commercial trade balance.

Since 1960, world exports have increased from \$113.4 billion to \$190 billion in 1967, or 67.5 percent, while U.S. exports have gone up from \$20.6 billion to \$31.6 billion for the same period, or 53.4 percent. Exports of industrial Europe, excluding Great Britain, have moved up from \$37.7 billion in 1960 to \$70.2 billion in 1967, or 86.2 percent. The U.S. share of world exports has fallen from 18.2 percent in 1960 to 16.6 percent in 1967, while Industrial Europe's share has risen from 33.2 percent to 36.9 percent. The Japanese share has risen from 3.6 percent in 1960 to 5.5 percent in 1967.³⁵

While U.S. exports of semi-manufactures and finished manufactures together showed a modest rise from 67.4 percent of total exports in the period 1946-1950 to 73.8 percent in 1960 and 76 percent in 1967, U.S. imports of the same products rose from 40.2 percent in the 1946-1950 period to 55 percent in 1960 and 69.5 percent in 1967. The steady climb in imports of finished manufactures from 17.9 percent in the 1946-1950 period to 48.8 percent in 1967 reflects the growing competition from Europe and Japan.³⁶ A detailed examination of these figures reveals the changing character of our foreign trade. "We have become primarily suppliers of agricultural raw materials, chemicals, raw and semi-finished products, and machinery. We have become importers of end-use consumer products. . . . This results from two factors. First, other countries exclude, by tariffs, quotas, variable levies, internal taxes, and other devices, many of those products which we can produce economically; and, second, other countries are, in many products, lower cost producers than we are."³⁷

Fortune magazines in its June, 1968, issue points out the crumbling of the U.S. export surplus and suggests that we may have reached the end of the era in which we could count on industrial superiority to counterbalance lower wage costs abroad. The trade figures "seem to be indicating some important shifts in competitive power." *Fortune* mentions that while it was expected that industry in other industrial countries would catch up with the United States or at least come close to it in mass production efficiencies and technology at some time. "What is surprising is the extent and force of the competition. The startling rise in imports suggests that the catching up has gone faster and spread further than seemed possible just a short time ago." *Fortune* concludes: "These trends may reflect basic changes that require examining of longstanding assumption; that U.S.

Footnote at end of article.

capital, technology and large-scale production could more than offset the disadvantage of higher wages and costs.¹⁰² The April 1968, bulletin of the Federal Reserve Bank raises the same basic question.¹⁰³

The American correspondent of the London *Economist* in the May 18, 1968, issue points out: "There is nothing fuddy-duddy about the American economy, but there are matters of high and rising wages of growing acceptance of imports by consumers, of increasingly aggressive marketing by foreigners, of continuously lower tariffs—in general, what may turn out to be a 'structural' change that will outlast a moderation of domestic demands through higher taxes."¹⁰⁴

A continued deterioration in our commercial trade position will, in spite of increased earnings from international investment, add to our balance-of-payments burdens and focus wide attention on the seriousness of our competitive position internationally.

IS THE PROPOSED TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1968 THE ANSWER?

Any down-to-earth dialogue on trade policy will require some discussion of the adjustment assistance provisions of the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1968. This proposal, incidentally, shows no evidence of having been influenced by the several extensive hearings on trade policy and could have been written (and, in fact, probably was) before the hearings. And these hearings, while turning up a wealth of information, appear to have changed few minds on either side of the dialogue. The proposed 1968 Act contains three sections. The first would give the President authority to "adjust tariff rates as future developments might require."¹⁰⁵ Spokesmen say "the authority will not be used in any major bilateral or multilateral trade negotiation—but used largely to offer compensatory tariff concession in cases where the United States finds it necessary to increase a rate of duty."¹⁰⁶ According to Ambassador Roth, the request for tariff negotiation authority was limited because a "thorough review of our trade policy is required."¹⁰⁷

The second calls for a repeal of the American Selling Price (ASP) system of customs evaluation which has long been a bone in European throats. A deal was worked out at Geneva to get rid of it by giving reductions in certain nontariff barriers abroad. Congress will probably ignore this request, as strong opposition to dropping ASP exists in certain sections of the chemical industry.

The third, modifying the adjustment assistance provisions incorporated in the 1962 TEA, is the only section of real interest to industry generally. The revised adjustment assistance provisions are patterned after those in the United States-Canadian auto agreement of January, 1965. All parties—government, labor and industry—regardless of trade policy leanings, now recognize the complete failure of the adjustment assistance provisions of the 1962 TEA.¹⁰⁸ At that time, Oscar Gass, with rare foresight, said: "In the circumstances, this 'adjustment assistance' seems unlikely to be expeditious or of substantial value. To my mind the whole idea of adjustment assistance is a blind alley—at best the unemployment compensation provisions contain useful suggestions for general unemployment legislation."¹⁰⁹ In fact, the 1962 provisions were not even an alley. Practically all, or over twenty, appeals for help from industry and labor were turned down by the Tariff Commission, which probably interpreted correctly the tests for eligibility under the stringent provisions of the 1962 TEA. In recognition of the increasing number of protests against rising imports and the ineffectiveness of the original 1962 Act, even free-trade groups called for modification of the adjustment assistance provisions.¹¹⁰

This in itself is indirect recognition, however reluctant, that rising imports are posing

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a problem for an increasing number of industries and may well pose a serious problem for the country in the years ahead. The President now says "relief should be available whenever increased imports are a substantial cause of injury" and that administration (of the 1968 adjustment assistance provisions) will be patterned on the automotive trade act of 1965, with determination by the Secretaries of Commerce, Labor and Treasury instead of by the Tariff Commission.¹¹¹

What is the history of the automobile adjustment assistance? The United States-Canadian auto agreement was signed January 16, 1965. Workers eligible for assistance may receive weekly payments of 65 percent of their average weekly wage but not exceeding 65 percent of the national average wage in manufacture. In 1967 the maximum received was \$73 a week. Workers may receive these payments for a maximum of 52 weeks. If they are in a training program, they can receive it for an extra 26 weeks.

Workers over 60 are allowed an additional 13 weeks. The average worker under the auto agreement has collected pay 26 to 27 weeks. Adjustment assistance is paid through the states in a manner similar to the regular unemployment compensation. Other benefits are training opportunities, including travel and subsistence payments and relocation allowances. Most workers have been absorbed before the allowance period has expired.

Through June, 1968, 21 petitions for worker adjustment assistance have been acted on with 14 certifications covering 2,493 workers eligible for certification and 1,853 found eligible for assistance. Approximately \$3.4 million has been paid to workers over the three and a half years of the agreement, and \$56,000 paid for living allowances during worker retraining. No petition for adjustment assistance has been submitted by firms. Firms certified may obtain loans for land, plants, equipment and, in some cases, working capital, technical assistance, and a certain form of tax relief.¹¹²

Is adjustment assistance the answer to the challenge of increasing imports? Is it a workable solution to the displacement of workers and factories? Philosophically, it is designed to lubricate and eliminate the creaking wheels of the competitive system while the doctrine of comparative advantage does its work. It contains no restraining elements to the raw threat of international competition but is supposed to save the wounds of those who suffer thereby.

It is difficult to draw any conclusion as to how the proposed adjustment assistance provision would work with industry, as there has been no experience in the auto agreement. The operation could raise difficult administrative problems. If a manufacturer finds he cannot compete with low-priced imports and is on the road to bankruptcy, how will this be handled? In most cases, labor differentials are so great it is not a question of new plants and equipment. Is he to be given loans to build a new factory to produce an entirely different product? And what assurance is there that this project will be a success? If it is a matter of loans, aren't there enough agencies existing without setting up additional administrative machinery?

If he decides to simply liquidate his business and quit in the face of what seems to be impossible competition, must he wait for bankruptcy? And how much is he to be paid? In other words, who establishes the liquidation value of the business? The complications involved in working out procedures for such firms would appear to be enormous. If there are subsidies for not producing cotton, are there to be subsidies for not producing shoes?

Unquestionably, adjustment assistance as a last resort would be better than nothing on the theory that any help to a drowning man is welcome.

For the workers it would appear to be,

calculated as in Western countries, and reinsurance. The experience in the automobile agreement would indicate that in justified situations it may provide a bridge to move from one job to another. The question may be asked, Can it not be handled through the regular unemployment compensation channels? The question may also be asked by those who are in training. Will the jobs be there when the training is completed? But this shades into a broader question of national policy.

The adjustment assistance procedure may pose even more serious problems for the economy. If shoes can be made cheaper abroad, the United States will then make something else where it has an advantage and assist workers and industry to move into these fields. That might not be too disturbing to the economy if only a few industries are involved. What happens when an increasing number of industries are affected? When woolens, steel, man-made textiles, shoes, glass, candy, agricultural products, find imports absorbing an increasingly share of the market? In addition to the costs that could be involved with expanding adjustment assistance, we should consider the comment of Senator Edward Brooke (R., Mass.): "We must, therefore, take into account the possible consequences for this nation if we were to become excessively dependent upon foreign suppliers (in times of war) for such items as oil, steel, textiles, and electronic components."¹¹³ Who decides what proportions of such products should be made in the United States and what share should come from abroad? And in the normal peacetime economy with a rate of employment of four percent or better, how do we reconcile a growing dependence on imported products and a reduction in employment and production in these products in the United States with a full-employment policy?

Finally, under the best of circumstances, if it were to take care of the shifts of labor brought about by imports and compensate manufacturers driven out of business by low-priced imports, it still does not get to the root of the problem from the industry standpoint: the loss of market share and market growth for domestic manufacturers. American industry has a strong feeling of proprietorship in a market that has grown, in part, through its own promotion efforts.

Manufacturers of baseball gloves and ski boots, who have lost the bulk of their market to imports, are not particularly interested in adjustment assistance. It will not save them from drowning in a flood of imports. Manufacturers of footwear, where essentially all the market growth of the last decade has gone to imports, are not asking financial help to convert factories which are not suitable for the manufacture of anything other than footwear. In steel and textiles, formidable market penetration has been made by imports which promise to take a steadily increasing share. In practically every case this is the result of higher labor costs in the United States which, in turn, are in great part the result of national economic policies over which industry has little control. Industry has come a long way in its thinking on trade liberalization since the thirties. It is not asking to turn back the clock and shut off imports. It does believe it is reasonable to ask for an orderly sharing of the market.

THE NEED FOR RATIONAL DISCUSSION OF THE TRADE PROBLEM

It is imperative, in the light of vast changes in world conditions since our trade liberalization policy began 35 years ago, that in our discussion of trade policy we come to grips with the specific problems of industry and agriculture in foreign competition. Significant developments over the past decade point to dangers ahead. These include growing signs of aims for self-sufficiency abroad and the building of new capacity which will provide even stiffer competition for Ameri-

Footnotes at end of article.

can industry; early signs of a decline in our competitive posture in world trade; a still formidable array of barriers to our trade abroad, and a continuing lack of reciprocity in trade negotiations in spite of complete economic recovery of our trading partners for the effects of World War II.

The recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board, mentioned earlier, commented as follows on current trends abroad: "Rampant misguided nationalism abroad and increased government controls in the United States are posing major problems for American companies with foreign operations." The report identified "economic protectionism, punitive taxes, regulations, quotas and increased interference by foreign governments." One panelist said: "The increase in nationalism in Europe and Latin America will continue to generate obstacles to trade and investment abroad by U.S. international companies. The trend in this direction seems to be increasing in almost every sector of the world market."¹¹

And finally, according to Secretary of Commerce Smith: "our competitive position in the world is being seriously damaged by the wage-price spiral in which we are engaged. . . . We are pricing ourselves out of many world markets." While Mr. Smith argues the heart of the problem of sharply rising imports and sluggish exports is the more rapid rise in wages than in labor productivity, more than this is wrong in the trade picture, as this paper has attempted to show.¹²

In the light of these developments, the changing trends in world trade, and our commercial trade deficit, we have had enough philosophical debate and high-sounding expression of idealistic goals on both sides of the trade debate. We can agree with the general aims and objectives that look toward increasing world trade. What is needed now is an intensive examination of those industrial and agricultural areas where important changes are taking place. Professor Robert Baldwin has suggested that "the Congress provide a small amount of funds annually for the purpose of undertaking economic studies designed to determine the ability of workers and employers in various industries to adjust to increased import competition. These studies should be undertaken by economists both within and outside of the Government."¹³ While his suggestion was aimed at improving the economic analysis used for tariff negotiations, it could be equally useful in determining the factors responsible for changes in foreign and domestic competitive relationship in specific industries, projecting future trends of imports and exports and calculating the impact on individual industries as well as the economy as a whole.

Former Under Secretary of State George Ball has said: "Many of our post-war policies have mixed a vague and irrelevant universalism (an outgrowth of America's evangelical vision of itself as a pristine land in a corrupt world) with new and transitional pragmatism; improvising crusades and crusading improvisations."¹⁴ And Ball argues that the goal of mature foreign policy will require not only "tough-mindedness and the avoidance of moralistic mush" but a careful definition of the limits of our world interests and responsibilities. It is not known how much of this comment, if any, Ball intended to apply to trade policy. In any event, it seems appropriate in this area.

It is important that government representatives and industry begin rational discussion of industry's import problems. Failure to do so could result in legislative action not in the best interest of either party. The economic forces at work here and abroad are bound to bring about, eventually, some changes in our present trade policy. It is far better to recognize frankly the problems of a growing number of industries and thrash out a

reasonable solution than to remain aloof from a realistic consideration of the facts until a major challenge to present trade policy is presented.

Fortunately, there are a few signs that the time may be approaching for such discussion. Assistant Secretary of Commerce Lawrence McQuade was quoted recently as believing there "may be a cause" for liberalizing the Trade Act's "escape-clause" provision which authorizes the President to protect industries damaged by imports, and suggested that the trade law's national security clause might be more widely used as a basis for import quotas. Mr. McQuade indicated that, on the one hand, with the technological gap shrinking and, on the other, significant wage disparities here and abroad, the United States will have more difficulty in expanding its share of world trade.¹⁵

A significant comment, indicating Washington is awakening to the import problem, was made recently by Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs William Chertner in referring to the activities of our multinational corporations in switching output to countries with the "slowest rates of inflation." He asked whether it is "in our national interest to encourage the rapid transfer of our new technology to foreign countries through branch plants and subsidiaries abroad or by licensing arrangements—particularly when this means the bestowing of the most advanced technology on economies that enjoy a considerable advantage in labor costs?" He continued, "Planners for some of our international companies may have to prepare a defense."¹⁶

And even Mr. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, seems to be recognizing the need for more realistic discussion of the trade question. He said recently, "If this drive for market sharing does succeed . . . we must begin to explore what type of governmental agency may be needed to review price and investment decisions and protect the interests of consumers and unprotected producers."¹⁷

Whether or not Mr. Roth's purpose was to create the bogey of an expanded bureaucracy, his statement suggests that international agreements such as the Long-term Cotton Arrangement means vast new administrative structures. It must be admitted that the administration of market shares between various countries will require staff, supervision, and more paperwork. There will be many frustrating experiences and innumerable details. But past experience with the LTCAs does not indicate any insuperable problems or the need for a great new bureaucracy to manage the operation. The industry divisions of the Commerce Department with some expansion are perfectly competent to handle the problem. The President's Council of Economic Advisers is certainly competent to review price and investment trends, and the President's consumer advisor will watch out for consumer interests. Finally, if the results are similar to the LTCAs where imports have grown at a rate double that provided by the agreement, there would be little basis for importers to object to unfair treatment.¹⁸

What is not likely to be particularly helpful to rational discussion of the trade problem if the President's recent appointment of a thirty-four member public advisory committee on trade policy composed, with but few exceptions, of dedicated free traders. This committee is expected to advise Mr. Roth, who probably selected the members, on "legislative and other measures as may be required" for long-term trade policy.¹⁹ It is not surprising that several congressmen on the floor of the House have taken strong exception to the composition of this committee as reflecting "a total disregard of the principle of fair representation and cannot be allowed to go unchallenged." And, "The posture of our trade policy involves far more than a dedication to free trade—it is my judgment that such a balanced view of this

import program is most unlikely to come from the President's new advisory committee on trade policy."²⁰

FOOTNOTES

¹ Barron's, October 16, 1967, page 4.

² New York Times, July 12, 1968.

³ New York Times, July 8, 1968.

⁴ John T. Connor before New York Board of Trade, New York, New York, November 19, 1967.

⁵ Statement of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, "The Price of Protectionism," before Senate Finance Committee Hearing, October 18, 1967.

⁶ New York Times, July 11, 1968.

⁷ Statement of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations William M. Roth before Senate Finance Committee Hearing, October 18, 1967.

⁸ New York Times, October 31, 1967.

⁹ Address by Ambassador William M. Roth, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, prepared for the 23rd Annual Cleveland World Trade Conference, Cleveland, Ohio, March 28, 1968.

¹⁰ Statement of Carl J. Gilbert, Chairman of the Executive Committee, The Gillette Co., *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 186.

¹¹ Remarks of David L. Yunich, President, Macy's, before British-American Chamber of Commerce, November 8, 1967, *New York Times*, November 9, 1967.

¹² Note: In fact, in 1929 with a tariff of 40.1 per cent, exports were 4.2 per cent of gross national product.

¹³ Note: The United States records both exports and imports on an approximate f.o.b. (point-of-shipment) basis. Most countries record imports on a c.i.f. (cost-insurance-freight) basis. If our exports in 1967 had been recorded on a c.i.f. basis, they would have totalled \$29 billion, for a surplus of \$1.9 billion compared with the official figures of \$4.1 billion. If commercial exports are compared with imports, c.i.f., then a trade deficit of \$1.3 billion would have been recorded. Economists and U.S. officials, in spite of the practice of other nations, believe the f.o.b. basis is most consistent for measuring the volume of imports and exports, although some economists admit that for comparisons of imports with domestic production cost, freight, insurance, duties, clearance charges, brokerage fees, and all other costs of making import available in this country should be included and added to the f.o.b. import data.

¹⁴ And will fall to approximately 7.8 per cent when Kennedy Round reductions are completed. See Table 23, "Trends in International Trade of the United States," by Dr. Howard S. Pickett and Dr. Merrill A. Watson, *Congressional Record*, vol. 114, pt. 14, p. 18277.

¹⁵ Joan Robinson, *Economics: An Awkward Corner*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1967, page 16.

¹⁶ J. W. Culliton, "Foreign Trade Review," *Compendium of Papers on Legislative Oversight Review of U.S. Trade Policies*, Committee on Finance, United States, February 7, 1968, Volume 2, page 637.

¹⁷ Dr. Howard S. Pickett and Dr. Merrill A. Watson, "Trends in International Trade of the United States," *Congressional Record*, June 21, 1968.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Professor Gottfried Haberler, *Congressional Record*, vol. 114, pt. 2, p. 2137.

²⁰ New York Times, September 3, 1968.

²¹ Note: The implication is met again and again that tariffs were responsible for the Great Depression. GNP fell from \$103.1 billion in 1929 to \$55.6 billion in 1933, a decline of 47.5 billion. U.S. exports fell from \$4.39 billion in 1929 to \$1.875 billion in 1933, or a decline of \$2.72 billion (\$2.17 billion in 1929 dollars). It is doubtful if the \$2.7 billion

decline in exports produced the \$47.5 billion decline in GNP.

¹³ Statement of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before House Ways and Means Committee, June 10, 1968.

¹⁴ *New York Times*, October 31, 1967.

¹⁵ Statement of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations William M. Roth before House Ways and Means Committee, June 4, 1968.

¹⁶ *Wall Street Journal*, October 5, 1967.

¹⁷ Address by Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Resources, before Apparel Research Foundation, November 30, 1967.

¹⁸ *New York Times*, August 29, 1968.

¹⁹ John Dent, *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, vol. 114, pt. 21, pp. 27209-27210.

²⁰ *Journal of Commerce*, July 15, 1968.

²¹ John Dent, *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, vol. 114, pt. 21, pp. 27209-27210.

²² *Journal of Commerce*, July 15, 1968.

²³ Executive Branch Statement, *Compendium of Papers on Legislative Oversight Review of U.S. Trade Policies*, Volume 1, page 338.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, page 332.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, page 334.

²⁶ *Can We Muddle Through?* National Association of Manufacturers, Chicago, Illinois, April 18, 1968.

²⁷ Executive Branch Statement, *Compendium of Papers on Legislative Oversight Review of U.S. Trade Policies*, Volume 1, page 333.

²⁸ Lawrence Witt and Vernon Sorenson, "Problems of Agricultural Products," *Issues and Objectives of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, A Compendium of Statements submitted to the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, September 1967, page 172.

²⁹ Executive Branch Statement, *Compendium of Papers on Legislative Oversight Review of U.S. Trade Policies*, Committee on Finance, United States Senate, February 7, 1968, Volume 1, page 334; Address by Harald B. Malmgren, Assistant Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, before the Canners League of California, April 1, 1968; Statement of John A. Schnittker, Under Secretary of Agriculture, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, pages 29-33.

³⁰ *New York Times*, May 10, 1968, and June 10, 1968. Note: United States now resorts to subsidy route to meet poultry competition and win back markets.

³¹ *Journal of Commerce*, November 22, 1967.

³² Address by Harald B. Malmgren, Assistant Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, before the Canners League of California, April 1, 1968.

³³ *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, 1967, page 5.

³⁴ Statement of Robert E. Baldwin, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 224.

³⁵ *Daily News Record*, March 7, 1968.

³⁶ Message of the President to Congress on Proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1968, as submitted to the Congress and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, May 28, 1968.

³⁷ *The United States and the Kennedy Round*, Office of Publications and Information for Domestic and International Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, March 18, 1968.

³⁸ Statement of Senator Jacob K. Javits, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 5.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

³⁹ Individual Views of Senator Jacob K. Javits, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, 1967, page 19.

⁴⁰ Statement of Hon. Lawrence C. McQuade, Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 65.

⁴¹ Statement of S. M. McAlahan, Jr., President, Anderson, Clayton & Co., *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 173.

⁴² Statement of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the House Ways and Means Committee, June 19, 1968.

⁴³ Dr. Howard S. Piquet, "Trends in International Trade of the United States," *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, vol. 114, pt. 14, p. 18276.

⁴⁴ Statement of David Rockefeller, President, Chase Manhattan Bank, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 225.

⁴⁵ Statement of Oscar Gass, "The Crusade for Trade," *The New Republic*, March 19, 1962.

⁴⁶ Statement of Richard N. Cooper, Professor of Economics, Yale University, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 225.

⁴⁷ Statement of William M. Roth, President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 18.

⁴⁸ Oscar Gass, "The Crusade for Trade," *The New Republic*, March 19, 1962.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Edwin L. Dale, *New York Times*, November 2, 1967.

⁵¹ Statement of Carl J. Gilbert, Committee for a National Trade Policy, before House Ways and Means Committee, June 11, 1968.

⁵² *Economic Report of the President*, February 1968, page 58.

⁵³ Statement of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman before House Ways and Means Committee, June 10, 1968.

⁵⁴ Oscar Gass, "The Crusade for Trade," *The New Republic*, March 19, 1962.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ Hearings before General Subcommittee, May 18, 24, 25, 1967; June 6, 7, 1967; July 26, 27, 1967, Part I, Part II.

⁵⁷ Hendrik S. Houthakker, "Economic Policy for the Farm Sector," American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

⁵⁸ Statement of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman before House Ways and Means Committee, June 10, 1968.

⁵⁹ *New York Times*, June 10, 1968.

⁶⁰ *Wall Street Journal*, September 25, 1968.

⁶¹ Statement of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman before House Ways and Means Committee, June 10, 1968.

⁶² Charles B. Shuman, President, American Farm Bureau Federation. "They Need Not Starve," before National Convocation on "World Hunger," New York, September 11-13, 1967.

⁶³ Paul Davidson, "Public Policy Problems of the Domestic Crude Oil Industry," *American Economic Review*, March, 1963, page 85.

⁶⁴ J. P. Young, *The International Economy*, Fourth Edition, Ronald Press, page 174.

⁶⁵ Clare E. Grimm, *A Tariff Policy for Modern Times*, Michigan Press, Volume V, September, 1953, page 9.

⁶⁶ J. N. Keynes, *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., 1936, page 378.

⁶⁷ Joan Robinson, *Economic Philosophy*, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1962, page 62.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, page 124.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, page 65.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, page 127. (See Marshall comment on List.)

⁷¹ Statement of Patrick M. Boarman, Associate Professor of Economics, Bucknell University, "A Declaration of Principles by a Committee of Economists," presented to the House Committee on Ways and Means, April 9, 1962.

⁷² John Robinson, *Economic Philosophy*, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1962, page 88.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, page 65.

⁷⁴ J. P. Young, *The International Economy*, Fourth Edition, Ronald Press, page 264.

⁷⁵ J. N. Keynes, *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., 1936, pages 335-340.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pages 338-339.

⁷⁷ Joan Robinson, *Economics: An Awkward Corner*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1967, page 129.

⁷⁸ Joan Robinson, *Economics: An Awkward Corner*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1967, page 16.

⁷⁹ *New York Times*, May 24, 1968.

⁸⁰ Robert Schwenger, *Issues and Objectives of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, pages 69-70.

⁸¹ Paul A. Samuelson, *Economics*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Fifth Edition, 1961, page 724.

⁸² *New York Times*, May 24, 1968.

⁸³ *New York Times*, July 31, 1968.

⁸⁴ Edwin L. Dale, *New York Times*, November 2, 1967.

⁸⁵ Senator Russell Long, "The Need for a Reappraisal of U.S. International Economic Policies," before Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, December 7, 1967.

⁸⁶ Dan Robinson, *Economic Philosophy*, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1962, page 126.

⁸⁷ Stanley D. Metzger, *Trade Agreements and the Kennedy Round*, Coiner Publications, Ltd., Fairfax, Virginia, 1962, page 1.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, page 1.

⁸⁹ Statement of Hon. George W. Ball, Former Under Secretary of State, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 272.

⁹⁰ N. R. Daniellian, *Can We Muddle Through?*, National Association of Manufacturers, Chicago, April 18, 1968.

⁹¹ Statement of N. R. Daniellian, President, International Economic Policy Association, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 199.

⁹² Kenneth M. Spang, Vice President of Overseas Division, First National City Bank, and Chairman, New York Regional Export Expansion Council, *New York Times*, May 20, 1968.

⁹³ Dr. Howard S. Piquet and Dr. Merrill A. Watson, "Trends in Inter-National Trade of the United States," *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, vol. 114, pt. 14, p. 18268, tables 1 and 2.

⁹⁴ *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, vol. 114, pp. 18271-18272, tables 9 and 10.

⁹⁵ Statement of N. R. Daniellian, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 205.

⁹⁶ Lawrence A. Mayer, "The Troubling Shift in the Trade Winds," *Fortune*, June 1, 1968.

⁹⁷ Federal Reserve Bank *Bulletin*, April, 1968.

⁹⁸ "Imports to Blame," *Economist*, London, England, May 18, 1968, page 48.

⁹⁹ Proposed "Trade Expansion Act of 1968."

January 27, 1969

as submitted to the Congress and Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, May 28, 1968.

¹⁰⁷ Here's the Issue, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, July 12, 1968, Volume 7, Number 13, page 2.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., page 3.

¹⁰⁹ Statement of William Roth, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 20; International Trade, Resolution No. 207, Seventh Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 1967.

¹¹⁰ Oscar Gass, "The Crusade for Trade," *The New Republic*, March 19, 1962.

¹¹¹ Statement of John W. Hight, Executive Director, Committee for National Trade Policy, *Compendium of Papers on Legislative Oversight Review of U.S. Trade Policies*, Committee on Finance, United States Senate, February 7, 1968, Volume 2, page 535.

¹¹² Message of the President, "Proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1968," as Submitted to the Congress and Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, May 28, 1968.

¹¹³ Canadian Automobile Agreement, Second Annual Report of the President to the Congress on the Operation of the Automobile Products Trade Act of 1965, Committee on Finance, United States Senate, May 21, 1968; Memorandum to Automotive Assistance Committee from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of International Affairs, August 1, 1968.

¹¹⁴ Intercom, Foreign Policy Association, Inc., May-June, 1968, Volume 10, No. 3.

¹¹⁵ New York Times, September 3, 1968.

¹¹⁶ New York Times, September 13, 1968.

¹¹⁷ Statement of Robert E. Baldwin, Professor Economics, University of Wisconsin, *The Future of U.S. Foreign Trade Policy*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee, July 11-20, 1967, Volume I, page 224.

¹¹⁸ Books of the Times: "The Discipline of Power," by George W. Ball, *New York Times*, April 8, 1968.

¹¹⁹ Journal of Commerce, September 18, 1968.

¹²⁰ Wall Street Journal, September 26, 1968.

¹²¹ Journal of Commerce, September 26, 1968.

¹²² See Statement of America Textile Manufacturers Institute before U.S. Tariff Commission.

¹²³ New York Times, August 31, 1968.

¹²⁴ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 21, p. 27215.

THE BIG WHEEL

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, City Councilman Mario Polvorosa of San Leandro, Calif., is the type of friendly, energetic person who dignifies public service and through his willingness to continuously help, makes community life in San Leandro a better place in which to live.

Mario is known as "the big wheel" and his energy is ceaseless. Above all, he is never too busy or too tired to help a friend.

I sincerely hope that the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce will continue to recognize his value and award him its "El Supremo" trophy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The following article appeared in the January 13 issue of the San Leandro Morning News, and I am pleased to make it a part of my remarks:

As the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce installation nears, it's virtually assured that City Councilman Mario Polvorosa will receive the Chamber's "El Supremo" trophy for his outstanding work in obtaining Chamber members, reported F. A. Lou Meyer, membership relations chairman. Councilman Polvorosa received the Chamber's "Número Uno" trophy in January 1968 with the recruitment of 39 Chamber members during 1967, an all-time high. In accepting the trophy, Councilman Polvorosa promised to top that record this year. As of January 7, the city councilman has signed 42 new members to the Chamber of Commerce. In addition to his devotion and willingness to assist in the Chamber's membership program, Councilman Polvorosa served as co-chairman with the Honorable Judge Gerald Connitt on the Cerebral Palsy drive and is currently devoting his time towards the March of Dimes campaign in San Leandro. With all of this Polvorosa finds time to serve as a city councilman, operate a well-established shoe shine parlor, serve the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce in its membership drives as well as serving other organizations and yet he's always willing to help everyone in the community.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report to my constituents:

MEMO

NEW START.—A new government is now installed in Washington. Our political system—much criticized—has demonstrated its basic virtues by again meeting the test of workability. The peaceful transition of power from one President to another of different political persuasion has been completed. A new Congress is now in operation. The ceremony and the pageantry are over. The nation can now make a new start in trying to solve the great problems which confront it.

JOHNSON.—It was fitting that five clergymen representing five different faiths invoked the blessings of Divine Providence upon the work of the new Administration during the Inaugural Ceremony. No new Administration in history, perhaps, has faced at its outset so many problems of such magnitude. The war in Viet Nam, the Middle East, Soviet relations, China, Europe, Africa, crime at home, urban decay, the black revolution, inflation, violence, national disunity—the list is almost endless. Certainly, the new government must provide the leadership to help the nation meet and solve these and the other great problems, but we must not forget that government cannot do it all. As President Nixon said in his Inaugural Address, "What has to be done, has to be done by government and people together or it will not be done at all. The lesson of past agony is that without the people we can do nothing; with the people we can do everything."

UNITY.—The President has also, and rightly so, laid great stress upon the need for national unity in dealing with problems of the magnitude of those confronting us now. Unity does not mean that we must all agree on every issue or the solution to every problem; that would be impossible. What it must

surely mean instead is that we must be united in our determination not to let disunity destroy us, and in our mutual interest in preserving and advancing basic precepts—the primacy of law, the necessity for order, the goal of justice for all. It does not mean there must be no dissent; dissent is a crucial ingredient in a free society. It must mean, however, that dissent cannot be allowed to degenerate into actions which subvert the national will and our free institutions. It means, as the President said, learning from one another, speaking quite enough "so that our words can be heard as well as our voices" and it means listening to each other courteously enough so we can try to understand the meaning of the words. In view of the nature of our problems, the words of Ben Franklin in 1776 have special significance for us now. "We must all hang together," he said at the signing of the Declaration of Independence, "or assuredly we shall hang separately."

REMINDER.—Your views on current issues, problems and legislation are of vital importance to me in representing our district in Congress. Please send them to me, during the session ahead, at the address shown above. In this connection, you will want to follow my votes in Congress and I make available at the end of each session a complete record of every vote I cast on your behalf. The record for the last session of the 90th Congress is now available and will be sent to you on request.

NEWSLETTER.—*Memo* resumes publication with this issue and it will be sent regularly to you unless you request your name be dropped from the list. Please let me know if there is any error in the mailing address shown on the envelope.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN PAUL SCHENCK

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying special tribute to our esteemed friend and distinguished colleague, the late Paul F. Schenck, who passed away on November 31, 1968. He was a warm and genuine human being who spent much of his life in the service of his fellow man and his country. I was proud to claim him as my good friend.

Congressman Schenck ably represented the Third Congressional District of Ohio for 13 years during the period 1951 to 1964. Those of us who served with him recall with pleasure and with appreciation his many outstanding accomplishments. He served as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was credited with development of an important antipollution law which forced safeguards on automobile exhausts. Previously, he served as a member of the Dayton Board of Education for 10 years, and as president of the Dayton Real Estate Board for 3 years, as well as in many other capacities in numerous civic activities.

It is highly appropriate that we now honor his memory and I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Congressman Schenck's family and in assuring them he will long remain in our thoughts and prayers.

THE PARIS PEACE TALKS AND LAOS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the Paris peace talks now in session, it might be well to consider an agreement made by the North Vietnamese and Soviets in 1962 concerning Laos. Columnist Joseph Alsop stated it briefly but to the point in his column appearing in the Washington Post on January 24:

It is a plain fact that the war in Vietnam would be over in weeks, if the Laos accords of 1962 were now being enforced. Both Hanoi and Moscow signed these accords. Under these accords, Hanoi solemnly undertook to withdraw all North Vietnamese troops from Laos and never thereafter to use Laos as a corridor to South Vietnam.

The column further states:

At present, there are at least 40,000 North Vietnamese troops in Laos. The December-January rate of the Northern troop movement through Laos has also been above 30,000 per month. The Laos accords of 1962 are therefore an uncomfortable topic for Hanoi's negotiators in Paris.

If the subject of Laos is not an issue at the peace talks, the United States might well repeat the costly error it has made before of signing a new agreement while the Communists flagrantly violate agreements made in the past.

I insert the column, "A Nonevent at Paris Talks Cries Out for an Explanation," by Joseph Alsop in the RECORD at this point:

A NONEVENT AT PARIS TALKS CRIES OUT FOR AN EXPLANATION

(By Joseph Alsop)

William of Occam, known as "the invincible doctor," was a contentious early 14th Century theologian who made the unique English contribution to the science of logic. His rule is still called "Occam's Razor," and in non technical language, it runs as follows:

"Always believe the simplest explanation unless you have iron-clad proof of a more complicated explanation."

Occam's Razor is important at the moment, because of the urgent need for a persuasive explanation of a non-event. Until a few days ago in Paris, no serious negotiations with the Communists had ever opened without a long preliminary dispute about the correct agenda and other "procedural" matters. But in Paris, there was no such dispute.

The long argument about the table-shape was supposed to be a mere *hors d'oeuvre*. As soon as the table was favorably reached, the real hassle about procedure was universally expected to begin. Instead, agreement on procedure, including a completely open agenda, was reached within hardly more than an hour. This was the non-event that now cries out for explanation.

The non-event has already had considerable impact, precisely because President Nixon's new foreign policy-makers were just as convinced of the inevitability of a prolonged procedural hassle as were President Johnson's Paris negotiators. The new team had in fact counted on the procedural hassle to give them time to work out their real negotiating position and strategy.

Instead, the members of the Nixon team were left with no time at all. Hence the first Paris meeting "on substance" was gingerly put off until Saturday. And in the interval, this town has been a comic scene of barely

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

occupied offices, with telephone system all awry and new desks hardly installed, full of important persons desperately conferencing about the instructions to be given to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

What, then, is the simplest explanation of this non-event that caught everyone by surprise? The obvious answer is that the Hanoi war-planners were in a devil of a hurry, and could not spare the time for the customary procedural debate. And if they were in such a hurry, the simplest explanation is that they began to run out of breath.

Hanoi has in fact begun to run out of breath militarily, this is obviously a matter of cardinal importance. Yet it is hard to think of other possible reasons for the abrupt departure from the customary Communist negotiating system. For it was a huge sacrifice for Hanoi to omit the procedural hassle.

On the one hand, these hassles always seem meaningless to American public opinion, so that our negotiators are always under pressure. On the other hand, the Communists, who have no public opinion, have always used these hassles to test our strength of will, and to feel out our real negotiating position before getting down to business. And they have always used these hassles, in addition, to keep really objectionable items off the agenda, or at least to push such items to the agenda's very end.

To illustrate the agenda's real importance, it is a plain fact that the war in Vietnam would be over in weeks, if the Laos accords of 1962 were now being enforced. Both Hanoi and Moscow signed those accords. Under these accords, Hanoi solemnly undertook to withdraw all North Vietnamese troops from Laos and never thereafter to use Laos as a corridor to South Vietnam. At present, there are at least 40,000 North Vietnamese in Laos. The December-January rate of the Northern troop movement through Laos has also been above 30,000 per month. The Laos accords of 1962 are therefore an uncomfortable topic for Hanoi's negotiators in Paris.

It probably will not happen. But because the procedural hassle was omitted, nothing now prevents Ambassador Lodge from opening with the statement that full enforcement of the Laos accords is the first item on the American-South Vietnamese agenda. Lodge can even say, with reason, that while one solemnly signed agreement with Hanoi is being daily broken in the most flagrant manner, there is very little point in seeking another agreement which is just as likely to be broken.

It can be seen, then, why the above-mentioned nonevent is of great significance. As stated, it seems to point to a loss of breath. In contrast, the troop movement, proportionally equivalent to an American movement of about 700,000 men, points to another Communist attempt to resume the offensive. But this should be the last attempt of this sort, unless Occam's Razor is misleading in this case.

THE LATE HONORABLE PAUL F. SCHENCK

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great regret to note the passing of our former colleague, the late Congressman Paul F. Schenck, of Dayton, Ohio.

He was a gentleman and public servant of the highest quality with whom it was an honor to serve.

I remember him particularly well be-

cause his last term coincided with my first term. He was one of those Members who take special pains to recognize and assist freshmen Members. Paul Schenck was cordial and warm to me and very helpful in getting me started on my new job as Congressman.

An experienced and careful legislator, Paul Schenck's information and judgments were clearly set forth and always worth having.

The Nation has lost a valuable citizen by his death. I salute his memory and extend my condolences to his family.

ECUMENICAL SERVICES IN OBSERVANCE OF PATRIARCH ATHENAGORAS' ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of all Members of Congress to a most significant spiritual and religious event which took place yesterday, January 26.

Mr. Speaker, on that day Greek Orthodox Churches throughout the Western Hemisphere held special ecumenical services to mark the 20th anniversary of the enthronement of His Holiness Athenagoras I as the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople in Istanbul.

In New York City, Archbishop Iakovos, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, presided during the Ecumenical Doxology at which religious leaders of the Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths participated and representatives of the Jewish faith were present. This special ecumenical service was unique in that it was the first time that nonorthodox clergy have participated in a service offered in a Greek Orthodox Church.

Participants included the Most Reverend Terence J. Cooke, Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York; the Right Reverend Stephen F. Bayne, vice president of the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church; the Reverend Dr. Robert J. Marshall, president of the Lutheran Church in America; the Reverend Dr. Samuel McRae Cavert, who represented the U.S. Conference of the World Council of Churches; and the Reverend Dr. R. H. Edwin Espy, general secretary of the National Council of Churches, who preached the sermon.

Mr. Speaker, this special service and others held in Greek Orthodox churches of the Americas did honor one of the great spiritual leaders of the world.

Athenagoras I, 82, was elected Ecumenical Patriarch by the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1948 while Archbishop of the Americas, a capacity in which he had served since 1931.

His tenure as archbishop of the Americas was marked by the consolidation of the Greek Orthodox communities under the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of North and South America, a task accomplished by unusual administrative

ability, personal magnetism, and great energy. In addition, he founded the Academy of St. Basil in Garrison, N.Y., in 1931 and the Holy Cross School of Theology in Pamfret, Conn.—presently located in Brookline, Mass.—in 1937.

On January 26, 1949, Athenagoras I. was enthroned as the 262d Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople at the Patriarchal Church of St. George in Istanbul in traditional and ancient ceremonies dating back to the sixth century. President Harry S. Truman had provided a special plane for the flight to Istanbul by the newly elected Patriarch.

During his 20 years on the patriarchal throne, Athenagoras has been universally acknowledged as a leading proponent of the ecumenical movement.

It was Patriarch Athenagoras who proposed the historic meeting with Pope Paul VI which took place on the Mount of Olives in the Holy Land on January 5 and 6, 1964. This meeting, enthusiastically acclaimed throughout the world, resulted in the nullification of the "anathema" between Rome and Constantinople, creating a warmer relationship and better understanding between the two venerable Sees of Christendom.

Mr. Speaker, I myself had the very great honor some months ago to call upon the Ecumenical Patriarch in Istanbul and I realized on talking with him that he was a most extraordinary and saintly man. The meeting with Athenagoras I, was one of the most memorable moments of my life.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the special ecumenical services held in Greek Orthodox churches yesterday constitute both a tribute to this great spiritual leader, Athenagoras I, and an important symbol of the growing ecumenism within Christianity.

TRIBUTE TO HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

MR. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join many of my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of a distinguished former Member of this House, and of the Ohio delegation, the Honorable Paul F. Schenck.

Paul Schenck was a most able and conscientious Representative for over 13 years, and although I had the privilege of serving with him for only a few years, he quickly earned my respect and admiration, and I valued his friendship.

In addition to his competent and tireless service to the people of Ohio's Third Congressional District, he proved to be an able and foresighted member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During the years in which he rose to be the second ranking minority member of that committee he made significant contributions to the important problem of air pollution. He also compiled an admirable record of community service to the Dayton area as a private citizen, contributing his time and ener-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gies to a broad range of civic activities including the public school system where he served as a teacher, recreation manager and as a member of the board of education, the Dayton Real Estate Board, and the Boy Scout movement.

His community interests and his work with education and young people are indicative of the warmth and compassion which characterized his work and friendships in the House.

It is with great sorrow that I pay a final tribute to Paul Schenck and extend my deepest sympathies to his wife and family.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the continued Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, recently protested so dramatically by the immolation of Jan Palach, must continue to disturb any world citizen committed to the cause of freedom.

F. Stephen Larrabee, a resident of Deerfield, Mass., and a student at Columbia University, visited Czechoslovakia last summer, during the aftermath of the Russian invasion. His impression of the Czech situation, compiled in a series of four articles for the *Greenfield Recorder*, are both interesting and enlightening.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first two articles of this series:

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder,
Sept. 27, 1968]

THROUGH YOUNG EYES: CZECHOSLOVAKIA—I

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, a Deerfield resident who is a student at Columbia University, was in Czechoslovakia last week. This is the first of four articles he has written about life inside that torn country, all parts of a longer series he is doing on his month-long tour of Europe.)

(By F. Stephen Larrabee)

At present the official policy of the Czech government is to bar tourists and foreign journalists from Czechoslovakia. Despite this, there are ways to get in. One way is, to apply to attend the International Fair at Brno. By buying a special identity card and then doing some fast talking to prove you have a good reason for going there, it is possible to get in. This requires a great deal of patience as well, for in order to obtain a visa you must be at the Czech Embassy before nine AM and be prepared to stand in a line that looks like the last hundred seats at the World Series are for sale.

I personally sent an entire day at the Embassy fighting and shoving and being shoved as I attempted to reach the front of the line for a visa only to be turned back four or five times, each time for a different reason. I tried to obtain entrance as a student, then a regular tourist, then a journalist, and finally, after much probing and questioning, as a visitor to the Brno Fair.

All other avenues were closed to me. I could not get a visa to Prague. When I eventually obtained the needed forms to allow me into the visa section for the Fair the Embassy had closed for the day. In desperation I decided to drive directly to the border with an English journalist friend and try to obtain a visa there, although I had been told this was impossible.

January 27, 1969

At the Czech border I was immediately stopped by a Czech guard. I did not see any Russians. The guard told me what I expected—I couldn't get in, "obtain a visa at the Embassy." I argued with him in German and finally he took me to another official. The second repeated the statements made by the first. I persisted. After a rather heated debate the second took me to a third official. He listened, disappeared with my passport, and just as I was ready to concede, nodded to me.

In a matter of minutes I had paid my fee and had my passport back. The Czechs quickly ushered me through, without even making me exchange any money. Normally, a person is required to cash three dollars for every day he intends to stay in Czechoslovakia. So in those matter of minutes the entire situation had reversed itself and I suddenly found myself driving through Czechoslovakia when it dawned on me that I not only had no notion of where Brno was, but no money. Eventually Brno was located on a map, halfway between Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, and Prague. I decided to drive directly to Prague and just go straight through Brno—without stopping.

When I arrived in Bratislava, the second largest city in Czechoslovakia, about 8 p.m. it was already quiet. An eerie stillness lurked about, only a few people strolled along the streets—most of them young people. Grim reminders of recent events were quite noticeable. Tank treads were firmly pressed into the soft tar of the main street. I walked along until I came to a church. A shiny white plaque was fixed to the side of the church. Two young girls stood placing flowers underneath it. The plaque said simply: "Peter Lenger August 22, 1968." It was enough.

Walking along further, the stillness of the night was broken abruptly by music from the window above me. Ironically, a phonograph was playing the Beatles' latest hit record. Approaching the main square, I was surprised to notice a group of "Beatniks"—complete with guitar, blue jeans and shoulder length hair.

This, I felt, was an indication of the high degree of western civilization in Czechoslovakia for the Soviet Union tries to discourage any such dress or hair styles. The rationale has been that Beatniks are a product of a capitalistic society and are an alienation from society. Alienation occurs only in exploitative, capitalistic societies, so therefore there can be no Beatniks in communist societies.

Many of the girls also had on mini skirts which were as short as anything I have ever seen in London.

When I stopped to ask directions from one young boy who spoke no English or German he began cursing and yelling, "Hitler, Breschnev occupation, Nein, nicht gut; Svoboda, Dubcek, Ya, gut, ya." The next boy I met spoke some English. After giving me the directions, he said, "We hate the Russians, hate them. They are nothing but animals. We shall never forget what they have done."

Later that night I visited the home of an old friend. Her husband, a former television director, was now in Switzerland. She had not heard from him in weeks. And so it went . . .

In the soft light of the early morning dawn, Czechoslovakia looked like a pastoral land awakening from quiet slumber rather than an occupied country. The Russian troops were well hidden and kept off the main roads. People walked to the fields or rode their bicycles along the road. All along the way, in every village, however, the names of Dubcek and Svoboda were scrawled in windows and on walls. Suddenly 25 miles outside of Prague, a tank battalion bivouacked in a field. Russian soldiers trudged through the town. Tanks, their guns pointed toward Prague, stood poised and ready. As

January 27, 1969

the stark reality began to impress its meaning and dimension upon me, I was overwhelmed with sadness, and admiration for the Czech people, and a longing for peace—peace for the world.

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder,
Sept. 28, 1968]

THROUGH YOUNG EYES: CZECHOSLOVAKIA—II

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The author, a Deerfield resident who is a student at Columbia University, was in Czechoslovakia last week. This is the second of four articles he has written about life inside that torn country, all part of a longer series he is doing on his month-long tour of Europe.)

(By T. Stephen Larrabee)

Czechoslovakia is a surprisingly prosperous and modern country. The countryside consists of rolling hills and neat, orderly fields of grain and corn. In many respects the landscape is similar to that of West Germany. Indeed, if I had not known where I was, my first inclination would have been to say Germany.

The architecture in the small towns is German—large imposing towers, small garrets and lead laced windows with shutters, heavy arches under which run cobblestone streets. In the villages one can see the heavy, Slavic women going out to the fields or riding their bicycles to the town, but basically it is difficult to distinguish when one has left the west.

But if the Germanic character of the architecture, so reminiscent of Munich and Vienna seems surprisingly western, it is because Czechoslovakia is by history, custom and tradition, a western country. (Prague, the capital is the home of the writer Franz Kafka and the site of the oldest University in Middle Europe, as well as the oldest Synagogue.)

It was only after the "liberation" of Czechoslovakia by the Russian Troops after World War II that the country came to be associated with the Eastern bloc. Before World War II Czechoslovakia had been a prosperous land whose living standard was about the same as Switzerland's. The Communist coup d'état in 1948 reduced the country to a satellite of the Soviet Union and signalled a further intensification of the Cold War.

The Czechs, however, have never wholeheartedly accepted Communism because many of the more rigid communistic dogmas were unsuited to a country in a highly advanced stage. Czechoslovakia, unlike the Soviet Union, which was largely illiterate, agricultural and underdeveloped at the time of the Bolshevik seizure of power, was an advanced industrial country whose economy was flourishing when the Russians sought to impose their system upon the Czechs by force.

The Czechs have long argued that there are "many roads to Socialism" and that the Soviet model is only one of them. They have tried to convince the Russians that what worked for them at one stage in history is not completely transferable to another country in a different stage of development. In trying to strike the best balance, the Czechs have had to discard some elements of the Russian form to try and adapt Communism to their own needs.

This has often caused the ideologists in the Kremlin to cry that Czechoslovakia was attempting to "restore capitalism" and the recent invasion partly stems from what the Russians see as too much experimentation and deviation from the principals—valid or invalid—of Marxism-Leninism.

Similarly, the Czechs have always had a history of freedom of speech and individual liberties, that has never existed in Russia. In many ways the totalitarian nature of Soviet society merely reinforced authoritarian institutions and practices that existed under the Tsarist autocracy prior to 1917. Thus many Russians were totally unaware

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of certain institutions that were an accepted part of pre-World War II Czech life.

All this is to say that the Czechs are a very different people from the Russians or other communist peoples and that the recent attempt by the Dubcek government must be viewed with this in mind. Whatever the Russians may say or think, the Dubcek regime did not intend to restore capitalism, nor would most Czechoslovaks want to.

Especially not as it exists in the United States, as they feel exploitative and ignores many serious social problems. They prefer their system because they feel it reflects a greater social conscience.

What they do want is an end to repressive practices of censorship, abridgement of freedom of speech and other attempts to curtail individual freedoms. They want, as one Czechoslovak described it, "Socialism and Humanism." They are proud that the Czech student may go to the University for free, that he pays only about two dollars a month for a dormitory room. They speak with pride when they mention social and medical services provided by the state. They like to ask if in the West a student can go to his university dining room and eat for about 15 cents. These services do not reflect just a lower standard of living but a real attempt by the State to open up avenues of education.

They are equally insistant, particularly the young students, that freedom of expression be permitted. It is here that they run headlong into problems with the Russians. For once dissent is allowed, and Pandora's box opened, the Soviet Union feels that other Eastern European countries will be tempted to experiment and then Communism, as it has been known, will erode into some from of Democratic Socialism.

The Communist Party must remain the sole repository of Truth and Power; dissent will only serve to question its authority and undermine the peoples' allegiance to the Party. The Party sees itself as the sole interpreter of history and it is for this reason that Kosygin can say that the "national interest" of the Soviet Union was threatened. The Communist Party in Russia was at the crossroads. If it had allowed the Dubcek government to proceed, other satellites would have desired to find their own paths to Socialism, as Tito has already done in Yugoslavia, and the unity of the Communist world, already shattered by the Sino-Soviet split, would have been irrevocably fragmented.

The irony of the invasion is that it has killed any remaining belief in Czechoslovak Communist Party. Before Dubcek came to power in February of this year, very few people looked with favor upon the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia. Most students wanted nothing to do with it. Now, with Dubcek and Svoboda leading it, it has the confidence and the admiration of the people.

Here in the United States we tend to forget that Dubcek and Svoboda are Communists, still are Communists, though the word Communist has almost become meaningless in the 1960's. Both men have tried to adapt Communism to the nature and character of the Czechoslovak society. For the moment, at least, that attempt appears to have run aground. It has become not only "the tragedy of my life," as Dubcek said, "but the tragedy of the Czechoslovak people as well."

PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of our

former colleague and my friend, Paul F. Schenck. He served the Third Congressional District of Ohio with diligence and dedication and made many significant contributions to the civic life of Dayton.

I served with Paul Schenck on the House Administration Committee where he was the ranking Republican member and on the Joint Committee on Printing. His good humor, kindness, and devotion to his duties will be remembered by all of us who had the privilege of working with him.

I extend my deep sympathy to his wife and family.

NOT ALL BUREAUCRATS ARE BAD

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, criticism so often seems to be the grist of public office that it is indeed extraordinary and refreshing when one hears that a "bureaucrat" has been publicly praised.

Luther Holcomb is a man who deserves and gets that praise. Vice Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Dr. Holcomb was one of the first appointments to the Commission. During his service there, he has made a reputation as being fairminded and practical.

In a position that requires solving some of the toughest policy issues of the day, he maintains the poise and balance necessary to keeping our businesses and our society moving on an even footing.

I have been honored to know Dr. Holcomb personally for some years. Even when he presided over the congregation of the Lakewood Baptist Church in Dallas, he took an active interest in public affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to know that the Government has the services of a man of the caliber of Dr. Holcomb, and at this point, I would like to reprint an article which appeared recently in the *Augusta Chronicle*:

NOT ALL BUREAUCRATS ARE BAD

(By Louis C. Harris)

We have a regrettable tendency, those of us who do not always subscribe to the nostrums concocted in Washington as cures for what supposedly ails us, to regard all bureaucrats as impractical meddlers striving to extract sunbeams from cucumbers.

But such is not the case. In fact, I can now say that one of my very good friends is a bureaucrat!

The gentleman to whom I refer is Dr. Luther Holcomb, the vice chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission whom I came to know for the first time in Athens last year when he spoke on a program of the Georgia Press Institute.

An ordained minister who originally hailed from Texas, Luther Holcomb is one man for sure who has not permitted his role in national affairs to warp one whit his ideals, principles, his sense of humor, nor his concept of fair play.

But because the mark of Washington was upon him, I recall how surprised some of us were when, hearing Dr. Holcomb for the first time, we received an altogether rational and unemotional approach toward achieving equal employment opportunities for men everywhere.

It was with a large measure of delight—and with no surprise at all—that I read another of Luther Holcomb's speeches the other day after receiving a copy from Stan Smith, the general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association and, coincidentally, a former Chronicle staffer.

Stan sent along the speech to various newspaper editors around the country because it had to do, primarily, with the EEOC's ruling in connection with the use of sex labels in classified ads. To eliminate any semblance of "discrimination" in advertising, EEOC said newspapers must no longer list ads under "male" and "female" classifications. Luther Holcomb dissented.

He contended that in such advertising the newspaper is not doing the hiring, but is simply providing a service to the advertiser. Thus, he said, EEOC has no jurisdiction, in the first place. By the same token, he argued, the classification of ads under the heading of male and female is a time-saver for those seeking jobs, as well as for those seeking employes. Havoc will result, he pointed out, if personnel departments are besieged with male applicants unwittingly applying for jobs modeling feminine apparel, or with female applicants for the position of locker room attendant at a men's gymnasium.

As thoroughly in accord as one might expect me to be with Dr. Holcomb's premises, I found far more impressive what he had to say, later on in his talk, as he offered his audience "some observations on issues pertinent to the times."

"Despite America's seemingly infinite capacity for growth and flexibility," he said, "the truth is that our society as now organized has been stretched taut . . . America is 'supercharged.' Hyperemotionalism is on the rise. As a nation, as a people we are capable of creating the greatest good for the greatest number, but we are also capable through self-deception of bringing chaos upon our society." Then he said:

"The time of divisiveness is over. It is now our solemn obligation to stand united and occupy ourselves with the fundamentals and imperatives of the transition to a new administration . . .

"Our new President-elect is aware of the gravity of our social cleavages, but he alone cannot restore unity. Although he has been chosen to lead our nation, the people must cooperate by following. We must learn to respect each other despite our diversities and to trust each other despite our differences. . . . I believe every American should commit himself to unite in spirit with the President."

As for the job he holds, Dr. Holcomb explained that the original concept of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which created EEOC, "was to acknowledge the existence of job discrimination, to make the public aware of it, and by elimination of job discrimination to give minority groups the 'opportunity to achieve' that is uniquely American. It was never intended," he added, "that Title VII would become a permanent part of the functions of the federal system

Said Dr. Holcomb: "The private enterprise system is the backbone of America. American business is known for its creative and progressive techniques, and those innovative methods must be put to use in eradicating discrimination in employment opportunity."

"Likewise," said he, "government must seek a common-sense, down-to-earth approach to problem-solving at every level. Past bureaucratic methods must be alleviated. Government and business, working together, must develop an equitable way to include minorities in every aspect of American opportunity. A revolution of responsibility on the part of all Americans—including minorities—must occur."

Just as I said, Luther Holcomb is an unusual bureaucrat. We need more like him.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1969

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be among the cosponsors of H.R. 3809—the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1969—and I want to express my most earnest hope for its early enactment by this Congress.

As a member of the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Education and Labor Committee, I sat through 4 weeks of hearings last year on the problem of occupational health and safety. My original support for this legislation was strengthened and reaffirmed during these hearings, as I listened to testimony from those who are close to the problem.

Organized labor has long been a leader in demanding that Congress give recognition to the long-ignored problem of worker health and safety. Spokesmen for the AFL-CIO pointed out that American workers comprise 40 percent of the Nation's population, and pay 60 percent of the taxes, but that 80 percent of them are employed in industries where there is little conventional safety and virtually no occupational health protection.

A grim and constant reminder of this neglect is presented in the annual death and injury toll from occupational accidents. Each year, some 14,500 workers are killed on their jobs, and another 2,200,000 are injured. In addition to this tragic and unnecessary human suffering, the Nation experiences an annual loss of 250,000,000 man-days of work, some \$1.5 billion in lost wages, and more than \$5 billion in lost production.

It is almost unbelievable that Congress has virtually ignored the occupational safety problem for 56 years—since the passage of legislation in 1913 to help protect workers employed in the manufacture of sulphurized matches. Industry has expanded many times over in the intervening years, but little has been done in the way of accompanying legislation to protect the workers who have made this expansion possible.

These long years of neglect have created a void that has been only partially filled through a scattering of State laws and regulations. States which have adopted successful worker-safety laws have proved that the goal is both feasible and possible.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1969 takes full advantage of existing State laws, and combines them with the force and prestige of the Federal Government.

The success of these progressive State programs is shown in the death rate from on-job accidents, which range from 19 per 100,000 in States with effective programs, to 110 per 100,000 in States with no safety, or less effective ones.

I have also cosponsored two other bills aimed at protecting worker health and safety in two specific fields—mining and construction.

One is H.R. 2567 which would amend

January 27, 1969

the Contract Work Hours Standards Act to provide new health and safety controls on Federal, federally financed or federally assisted construction projects.

The other is H.R. 4047, the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. This legislation would establish mandatory health standards for miners, principally by requiring controls in dust concentration which causes widespread lung disease among miners. It would also provide more flexibility in the present Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, and would establish some interim standards in the areas of inspections, gas concentrations and escape passages.

Recent mine disasters have highlighted the need for immediate action on this long-neglected problem.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that this Congress has an overwhelming obligation to act quickly and decisively on this legislation. I think we owe it to the American people to rectify this long negligence that has brought death, pain, suffering and financial loss to so many Americans for so many years.

EXPEL THE DELIBERATE LAWBREAKERS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as with many of my colleagues it disturbs me that a willful few should continue to disrupt the learning facilities of this great country. I cannot understand why those who are proven to have been activists in illegality, violence, and anarchy on campus are not expelled forthwith. And I might add it is long past time when the Association of American Universities ought to establish in liaison, a policy that expelled from one is expelled from all.

In this connection I commend the reading of "Violence and the Student Movement," by Allan C. Brownfield, appearing in Modern Age, volume 13, No. 1, winter, 1968-69. Next to ending the war in Vietnam this subject is of genuine urgency to America.

The article follows:

VIOLENCE AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT (By Alan C. Brownfield)

The violence which has occurred on many American campuses, and at the Democratic convention in Chicago, has not been accidental. It has not been the result of brutality by the police, although in a number of instances the police have been brutal.

It has, instead, been carefully planned by the most radical elements of the youthful protest movement. This is, of course, something which the student militants do not hesitate to state frankly for all to understand.

Violence is an intrinsic part of the politics of revolt which threatens to erupt on campuses and in cities throughout the country. Only by appreciating the perspective within which the advocates of such violence operate can society prepare itself for the confrontations which lie ahead.

A leaflet prepared in Toronto, Canada, and reported to have been distributed to Students for a Democratic Society chapters throughout

the country contains instructions on how to make Molotov cocktails and incendiary time bombs.

Urge sabotage as "the next logical step toward obstruction and disruption of the U.S. war machine," the leaflet says that it is ludicrous to think that demonstrations closing down an induction center for a few hours will really hurt Selective Service.

"On the other hand," the leaflet says, "is there anyone who doubts that a small homemade incendiary device with a timing mechanism planted in a broom closet at the Oakland induction center could result in fire and smoke damage to the entire building, thus making it unusable for weeks or months? One person with a fair knowledge of chemistry could build such a device easily and cheaply and could plant it with almost no chance of being detected?"

Joel R. Kramer, President of the *Harvard Crimson*, stated that "Students have learned from history that blood must be shed on the way to the voting booth. They have learned from experience that rocking the boat and making headlines accomplish what could not have been done peacefully."

Discussing the goals of many student activists, Kramer explained the place that force and violence occupy in their tactical strategy:

"The 'new university' that students from Berkeley to Paris seek is a university in which students have real power . . . 'student power does not mean total student control of the university. It does not mean the elimination of university administration, or the elimination of faculty power. Students seek a shift in the balance of power. At most universities, the administration and trustees have most of the power and the faculty has what is left. Students would like to see most of the power divided between themselves and the faculty. . . . If students are to have any of the real power, they know they must take it forcibly, or at least use force to focus public attention on their claims. . . . Force is becoming a popular student tactic because students are learning that it works . . ."

Steve Weissman, a student leader at Stanford University, expresses the view that the time for rational discourse has ended and the time for violence has arrived:

"What the University has done is to get us to think for a number of years that social problems can be solved by rational discussion. . . . There's no conversation between us and the CIA. We're on different sides. I hope people will now see that force is a part of the world—it's not a very pleasant fact, but it's true."

A similar view was echoed by Steve Kinsler, a member of the Students for a Democratic Society at the University of Chicago. He said that "This university owes quite a lot of reparations. This whole society owes quite a lot of reparations. With what the university's done, and the way it's followed in the footsteps of the other major institutions of this society, it may burn some day. It doesn't deserve not to burn."

Not only do student militants show no hesitation in defining and defending their use of violence, but they also do not hesitate to criticize such concepts as tolerance for differing points of view.

University of California Professor Herbert Marcuse, called the "foremost literary symbol of the New Left" by the *New York Times*, has highlighted the intolerance of the student movement. In his book, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Marcuse tells why the New Left is so strenuous about claiming liberty for itself but unwilling to grant liberty to others. People confused about politics, he says, don't really know how to use freedom of speech correctly—turning such freedom into "an instrument for absolving servility," so that "which is radically evil now

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

appears as good." They employ their freedom for improper purposes.

Having established this premise, Marcuse demands "the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armaments, chauvinism, racial and religious discrimination, or which oppose the extension of public services." He says that the correct political attitude is one of "Intolerance against movements from the right and toleration of movements from the left." He proposes, in effect, a dictatorship.

This philosophy was put into action by the rebels at Columbia University. In the violence at Columbia, private papers representing ten years of research were taken from the files of Orest A. Ranum, an assistant professor of modern history, and burned.

Supporters of the student strike are said to have been antagonistic toward Mr. Ranum since he issued a paper opposing the student position early in the crisis when five buildings were occupied by student demonstrators.

Leaders of Students for a Democratic Society disavowed the destruction of Mr. Ranum's research. "We deplore the burning of the professor's papers," one S.D.S. leader said, "but we deplore the provocation of the University even more." Of the burned papers, Mr. Ranum said: "All of this is personally irreplaceable."

The New Left's assault against the American university is less an effort to reform it than to, in effect, destroy it. This point was made in an editorial in the *Berkeley Barb*, a leading underground newspaper:

"The universities cannot be reformed. They must be abandoned or closed down. They should be used as bases for actions against society, but never taken seriously. The professors have nothing to teach. . . . We can learn more from any jail than we can from any university."

The fact that student strikes and campus take-overs are less related to particular campus issues than to the general desire by militant student leaders to effect a revolution, not only in the university, but in the society at large, was reaffirmed by Mark Rudd, the leader of the turbulent Columbia University rebellion in the Spring of 1968. In a letter addressed to Columbia University President Grayson Kirk, Rudd did not hesitate to name "revolution" as the real issue at Columbia:

"You are quite right in feeling that the situation is 'potentially dangerous.' For if we win, we will take control of your world, your corporation, your university and attempt to mold a world in which we and other people can live as human beings. Your power is directly threatened, since we will have to destroy that power before we take over. We begin by fighting you about your support of the war in Vietnam and American Imperialism—IDA and the School for International Affairs. We will fight you about your control of black people in Morningside Heights, Harlem, and the campus itself. And we will fight you about the type of mis-education you are trying to channel us through. We will have to destroy at times, even violently, in order to end your power and your system. . . . We, the young people whom you rightly fear, say that society is sick and you and your capitalism are the sickness. You call for order and respect for authority; we call for justice, freedom and socialism. There is only one thing left to say. It may sound nihilistic to you, since it is the opening shot in a war of liberation. I'll use the words of Leroi Jones, whom I'm sure you don't like a lot: 'Up against the wall, —— this is a stick up.'"

There were two major demands presented by the Columbia student rebels: (1) A halt in the construction of a gymnasium in Morningside Park. The project had become highly controversial. It was opposed by many Harlem groups as well as a growing segment of the Columbia faculty. At issue were both the use of public park land and the archi-

tectural design which provided for separate facilities and entrances for community users and university personnel, inviting the charge that the structure which was actually intended as a service to the community might be turned into a symbol of segregation; (2) termination of contracts with the Institute for Defense Analysis which, Students for a Democratic Society charged, "works on military projects aimed at the oppression of the people of Vietnam" and "develops riot equipment to commit mass genocide against black people" in the United States.

There is much evidence leading to the conclusion that the take-over of Columbia had nothing whatever to do with the construction of a gymnasium or the University's connection with the Institute for Defense Analysis. These, it appears, were simply pretexts for a long-planned exercise of power.

Two graduate students, Dotson Rader and Craig Anderson, presented this information:

"Months before, at an S.D.S. conference in Maryland, the decision had been reached to take physical control of a major American university this spring. Columbia was chosen because of its liberal reputation, its situation in New York and the fact that it was an Ivy League school. S.D.S. felt it was important at this time to disrupt a private, prestigious, tactically vulnerable university. Columbia's relations with the West Harlem community, which borders it on two sides, had steadily deteriorated over the years. The decision to begin construction of a gymnasium in Harlem's Morningside Park had united the community against the university. It had evicted hundreds of people from buildings around the university in order to allow for expansion of the campus."

According to this analysis, the issues which were presented by the student rebels were simply pretexts, "the point of the game was power." To members of the S.D.S. steering committee, Columbia itself was not the issue: "It was revolution, and if it could be shown that a great university could literally be taken over in a matter of days by a well organized group of students then no university was secure. Everywhere the purpose was to destroy institutions of the American Establishment, in the hope that out of the chaos a better America would emerge."

The alleged "success" of the take-over of Columbia University has added to the militancy of the New Left movement. Phillip Abbot Luce, himself a former leader of the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party, discussed the plans of New Left leaders to stimulate Columbia-like confrontations across the country:

"The Columbia experience is being touted by various S.D.S. leaders as an example for other student revolutionaries to emulate in the coming school year. Stealing Che Guevara's call for the creation of many 'Viet Nams' throughout this hemisphere, the S.D.S. leaders now claim as their goal the 'creating of two, three, many Columbias.' According to one S.D.S. leader this means that they will expand the violence 'so that the U.S. must either change or send its troops to occupy American campuses.'"

Tom Hayden, one of the founders of S.D.S., who was blamed by Newark, New Jersey, police officials for helping to instigate the riots in the Negro areas of that city, candidly stated the S.D.S. political approach. Writing in *Ramparts Magazine*, he declared:

"Columbia opened a new tactical stage in the resistance movement which began last fall: from the overnight occupation of buildings to permanent occupation; from mill-ins to the creation of revolutionary committees; from symbolic civil disobedience to barricaded resistance. Not only are these tactics already being duplicated on other campuses, but they are sure to be surpassed by even more militant tactics."

In the future it is believed that students will threaten destruction of buildings as a

last deterrent to police attacks. Many of the tactics learned can also be applied in smaller hit-and-run operations between strikes; raids on the offices of professors doing weapons research could win substantial support among students while making the university more blatantly repressive."

The fact that many in the New Left do not believe in the democratic process was further shown in the May-June, 1968 issue of *Dissent* magazine. This magazine contains a letter from a Columbia University student member of S.D.S. According to the writer "S.D.S. asserts that resistance to Dow Chemical Co. by communities of people is both justified and democratic—even if 51 per cent of the community believes otherwise." The S.D.S. communication goes on to assert that "if the New Left possessed the power to blow up with impunity all Dow Chemical plants making napalm (along with the plants of Lockheed, Boeing, etc. which make weapons) it would do so. . . ."

The revolutionary strategy is to gain student appeal by raising broadly supported issues and then forcing the college administration into refusing to accept student demands. Thus is created a direct "confrontation" between the revolutionaries and the administration. According to Columbia's Vice President, the S.D.S. had sought throughout the year to provoke such a "confrontation" with the college administration.

Roger Taus, a member of the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party, an S.D.S. member, and an alternate member of the Columbia Strike Steering Committee, has stated that:

"The Columbia sit-in confronted tens of thousands of students with a question they must answer: Which side are you on? The side of racist exploitation and imperialism? Or the side of the liberation movement? Carefully planned confrontations like this can sharply expose to thousands the real imperialist and racist nature of this system and win them to fighting on our side against it."¹²

Confrontation as a revolutionary tactic works like this: Manipulate people into a posture in which they are in direct conflict with a power source. Violence can then be created. The first element is to enlist broad support for the stated cause through the raising of false issues. Secondly, the power source must be asked to make concessions which they cannot, or will not, accept. The claim is then made that the student will has been thwarted and the only answer is peaceful but extra-legal measures to gain the demanded change.

While declaring their non-violence and their desire to make only reasonable changes in campus policy, the revolutionaries attempt to gain strength from outside forces. Unless the school administration has taken a strong stand against the revolutionaries from the beginning, they will soon be forced to call in outside help. According to Phillip Luce, "this call for the police is exactly what the revolutionaries want at this point in their program. . . . Suddenly from somewhere, a policeman is hit and he, in turn, retaliates and hits a demonstrator. This has a chain reaction and soon there is a near riot."

As the violence increases, spectators, who have no idea how the violence started, are pulled into the riot by their emotional reaction to seeing the police employ defensive strength to restrain the now-fighting students. Once violence develops, the police become rough. Often they are guilty of brutal excesses of their own. This, Luce notes, "is a classic example of how to create a riot condition and then utilize the shock reaction of onlookers to perpetuate it . . . this is exactly the successful strategy utilized by S.D.S. and various . . . instigators at Columbia."¹³

One end product of a successful confrontation theory is the apparent acceptability of

violence. The revolutionaries claim that police brutality forced them to prevent further violence by employing the counter-violence of self-defense. Ultimately, the theory leads to the revolutionary proclamation that violence must now be accepted by the previously passive students.

In fact, New Left philosopher Herbert Marcuse has made a case for what he terms "socially useful destructiveness." It is his thesis, expressed in the book *The One Dimensional Man*, that by providing man with an abundance of food, clothing, and material comforts, this society robbed the individual of his desire for intellectual growth and self-expression. Since it is obvious that a Socialist revolution will not be brought about by the now docile masses, Marcuse abandons the proletariat as the medium for the desired social upheaval. Instead, he finds much promise in students and the "oppressed" minorities. Using "socially useful destructiveness," they will apply the pressure necessary to obliterate our bourgeois-industrial state. What would come after the Revolution? It would be rule by an elite, for Marcuse would replace democracy with a dictatorship controlled by those who rigidly adhere to his Marxist views. According to the professor, majority rule would be replaced by the "morality" of a presumably infallible minority.

The tactic of violence and disruption erupted in a manner to shock the nation and the world at the Democratic National Convention held in Chicago in August, 1968. The available evidence leads to the conclusion that such violence was planned long in advance, that "confrontation" with the police was sought, and that such confrontation was achieved.

As far back as November 16, 1967, the *Village Voice* reported the leader of the Youth International Party, Jerry Rubin, as saying: "See you next August in Chicago at the Democratic National Convention. Bring pot, fake delegates' cards, smoke bombs, costumes, blood to throw and all kinds of interesting props. Also football helmets."

Early in 1968 the National Mobilization Committee Against the War in Vietnam, headed by David Dellinger, organized a Chicago project committee and placed Rennie Davis in charge with instructions to work closely with Tom Hayden, leader of Students for a Democratic Society, and Jerry Rubin, of the Progressive Labor Party and also of the Youth International Party, more commonly known as Yippies.

Dellinger and Hayden held a press conference in New York on June 29 and were quoted by the *National Guardian* as saying: "We are planning tactics of prolonged direct action to put heat on the government and its political party. We realize that it will be no picnic but responsibility for any violence that develops lies with the authorities, not the demonstrators."

Early in August, Rennie Davis appeared before a meeting of the Chicago Peace Council held at the Lawson Y.M.C.A. He displayed two large 3' by 3' maps of the area surrounding the International Amphitheatre, showing locations where police, National Guard, F.B.I., and other security forces would be situated during the proceedings. He stated that if trouble starts at the Convention, among other things, "the Loop will fall," implying demolition of the downtown Chicago area.¹⁴

The violence which occurred in Chicago was predicted almost precisely by the August 9th Intelligence Division Report of the Chicago Police Department. That report concluded with this statement:

"Due to the talk around the office of the National Mobilization Committee and the general attitude of Rennie Davis and Tom Hayden, the reporting investigator feels that the night of 28 August 1968 there will be wide-spread trouble through efforts of Davis

and Hayden. It is felt that there will be trouble in the Loop Area and possibly on the South and West sides. This would be done in an effort to draw the Police away from the Amphitheatre."

The issue of the police conduct, the fairness of the communications media, and the role of Chicago's Mayor Richard Daley will remain subject to much discussion. That the police force did over-react in many instances is clear. That this is exactly the response which extremist leaders sought to produce is also clear.

Perhaps the most important lesson to emerge from Chicago was the fact that the violence which occurred in that city was long planned by the most militant members of the New Left. It was carried out under the leadership of men such as David Dellinger, Tom Hayden, and Jerry Rubin, the same people who led the march on the Pentagon. This was no idle political demonstration to its leaders, although it was surely viewed in those terms by many of the innocent and idealistic young people who were its participants. Writing in *The New Republic*, James Ridgeway, an eye-witness observer of events in Chicago, stated the following:

"The clashes between police and demonstrators began as calculated maneuvers by the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and the Youth International Party. The strategy was to confront the police, and thereby demonstrate that America was a police state. . . . Following out their scheme to promote a continuing confrontation between growing numbers of people and the police—they figured that the Chicago officials would respond by bringing in more police and troops, and so make clear to all those looking on that Chicago was an armed camp and America was a police state—the radicals talked enthusiastically about little acts of violence, like a stink bomb in the hotel, or dirty words on some walls, to provoke the police and manipulate the liberal McCarthy youths into their own ranks. In effect, the idea was to stimulate a little guerrilla war. . . ."

Tom Hayden, a leader of the Mobilization Committee To End The War In Vietnam, was not satisfied with the violence he and his group had managed to provoke in Chicago. Addressing a rally in Grant Park, he urged youths to go home and create "One, two, three hundred Chicagos." Hayden cried:

"If they want blood to flow from our heads, the blood will flow from a lot of other heads around this city and around this country. We must take to the streets, for the streets belong to the people. . . . It may well be that the era of organized, peaceful and orderly demonstrations is coming to an end and that other methods will be needed."¹⁵

While the New Left militant seek violence, and the overthrow of the established order of society, it is important to place the movement in a proper and balanced perspective. What the militant leaders want is one thing; what the alienated young people who follow them want is something else entirely.

The fact remains, however, that the movement has turned more and more toward the acceptance of violence as a proper and legitimate tactic. It is a tactic which they openly proclaim, and which society must learn to cope with if anarchy and disorder are to be prevented.

FOOTNOTES

¹² U.S. News and World Report, May 20, 1968.

¹³ New York Times Magazine, May 26, 1968.

P. 90.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Washington Post, June 30, 1968.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ New York Times, May 27, 1968.

¹⁸ Quoted in *The New York Times Magazine*, May 19, 1968, p. 104.

¹⁹ National Guardian, May 11, 1968, p. 4.

²⁰ The New Republic, May 11, 1968, p. 9.

- ¹⁰ Human Events, June 15, 1968.
¹¹ Ramparts, June 15, 1968.
¹² Human Events, June 15, 1968.
¹³ Intelligence Division Report, Chicago Police Department, August 2, 1968.
¹⁴ The New Republic, Sept. 7, 1968.
¹⁵ U.S. News and World Report, Sept. 9, 1968.

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE: NOT FOR SOVIETS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union at the U.N. has three votes.

Poor Ukraine and Byelorussia each have one vote, but the voice of their vote is stolen by the Russian Bolsheviks.

This is one reason why self-determination must be extended to the citizens of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, and other minority countries occupied by the Russians.

If the people are permitted to hold free elections then, and only then, will their representatives speak for their people.

Until then, Russia controls three votes to our one, but there are none for Ukraine and Byelorussia.

I include a U.N. report for January 25, 1969, as part of my remarks:

SOVIET SATELLITES ECHO MOTHER RUSSIA

(By Tom Hoge)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—A diplomat once described the Ukraine and Byelorussia as being like the Soviet Union only more so.

The members of the Soviet bloc all echo the Moscow theme and vote down the line with the Russians. But other members of the Russian symphony have shown a recent tendency to take off on an occasional unscheduled solo.

No such alien note has been heard from Byelorussia or the Ukraine; at least not in recent years.

The speeches made by representatives of the two satellites sound so similar to those of the Soviet Union that there has been suspicion that they are not only cleared by the Soviet mission, but probably composed by Russian speech writers.

If the two countries ape Moscow, it is understandable. Although admitted to the United Nations as independent nations because of their World War II role against Germany, the two are actually political divisions of Russia like the 13 other Soviet Socialist republics.

When Henry Cabot Lodge was chief United States delegate to the United Nations, he made it a practice to listen closely whenever the Russians spoke. But he usually walked out of the assembly hall as soon as either of the two lesser republics took the floor. Lodge sometimes walked out on other bloc members, if it became apparent they were merely parroting the main Communist line.

When Nikolai T. Fedorenko was chief Soviet delegate, he used to stroll into the delegates' lounge every morning during the assembly session, followed by envoys of Byelorussia and the Ukraine, and sometimes other bloc members. The group would sit at a long table in the coffee bar silently, taking notes while Fedorenko made what seemed to be an impromptu speech from the head of the table.

After about 20 minutes, someone apparently gave a signal and the group stood up with military precision and waited respectfully while Fedorenko collected his papers

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and brief case. Then the group silently filed out of the lounge with Fedorenko in front, usually flanked by the two senior members of the satellite group.

The Ukraine and Byelorussia have never played much more than a shadow role in debate, but in the early days they were represented by more colorful personalities, perhaps to maintain a semblance of independent identity.

In 1946, Ukrainian Foreign Minister Dmitri Manuilsky, an old-line Bolshevik, headed his delegation and was named chairman of the General Assembly's main Political Committee. Kuzma V. Kislev, veteran Foreign minister of Byelorussia, attended a number of Assembly sessions.

Occasionally one of the two republics has put in a resolution, but it has plainly been done at the dictate of the Kremlin.

Although they play a minor role, neither republic is a microstate in any sense. The Ukraine with 45 million people, is bigger than most of the UN members. Byelorussia has a population of 8½ million.

The arrangement actually gives the Soviet Union three votes, to one for every other member, but no one has ever registered any objection.

"After all, we have our faithful followers, too," commented one Western source.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT N. GAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. GAIMO. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of the free and independent Ukrainian Republic. I am proud to join with my colleagues on this occasion, in honoring the courageous people of the Ukraine.

Culturally an independent people, the Ukrainians have their own language, their own customs, their own traditions, and their own history. Yet, they have been subjugated by Russia for centuries. The rulers of that empire have changed from czar to commissar, but its oppressive policies remain unaltered. Equally as unalterable as Russian domination has been the Ukrainian people's continued desire for independence and self-determination.

The 51st anniversary of their period of independence that we salute today was short lived. Since 1920 the Ukraine has remained under the totalitarian regime of Russian communism.

However, almost 50 years of domination has failed to break the spirit of the Ukrainian people. For, they are a people who while subjugated continue to maintain human dignity; they are a people who while tyrannized continue to maintain a sense of pride and a measure of human decency; and, they are people who while oppressed continue to maintain the ideals of freedom and justice for all men.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the deep-rooted spirit of freedom inherent in the Ukrainian people and their continuing hope for national independence. And so, through the observance of this anniversary, we pay tribute to the Ukrainian people who, despite their oppression, have contributed so greatly to the traditions of free men the world over.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON POSTAL OPERATIONS—NO. 1

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House, which I had the honor to be the chairman of during the last session of Congress, conducted extensive hearings from coast to coast across the United States. I will be making, from time to time, a series of reports to the Congress by insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering the activity of the subcommittee and what appear to me to be the problems facing the postal service, among which is an abundance of bad publicity.

An eastern newspaper, in discussing the appointment of Mr. Blount, stated that the Post Office Department was the "sick man" of the Federal Government and that "nothing was done right" in the postal service. Mr. Blount, according to the article, was going to set all of this straight. This type of article is neither helpful to the postal service nor to Mr. Blount, and it most assuredly is a crushing blow to postal morale. The article mentioned one problem; it skipped almost all others. It stated that postal supervisors were unable to transfer from post office to post office. This is a problem for some individuals and the Post Office Department. But the postal service, under the leadership of Richard Murphy, Assistant Postmaster General for the Bureau of Personnel, has initiated an experimental program in the Seattle region, made up of the States of Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Idaho, and Montana, in effect which requests that supervisors eligible for promotion agree to serve in any promotion vacancy in the Seattle region. This is about as far as you can get from the Congress of the United States. I became interested in this program and directed my staff counsel to study it. Preliminary hearings were held in Boise, Idaho, chaired by the Honorable JAMES A. McCLEURE, and in Missoula, Mont., chaired by the Honorable ARNOLD OLSEN, as well as a round-table discussion meeting with union leaders in Seattle, Wash.

This project, called the Seattle project or the career development program, attempted to meet this problem of transferability head-on. It set up a system in the Seattle region whereby supervisors eligible for promotion would be asked to waive residence voluntarily prior to consideration for promotion. Up until now, supervisors have only been considered for openings in their home office or the mailing area in which they are stationed.

The Seattle project sounds like a good program; but as well intended as it seems to be, it starts reform at the wrong end of the scale. It reminds me of the economy campaigns periodically conducted by the Defense Department. They always start by taking light bulbs out of the barracks. This program starts by placing the burden of change on the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1969

shoulders of employees. Some men were promoted even though they refused to waive residence. In a few cases, supervisors were promoted after they signed the waiver and transferred to other post offices in the Seattle region. There has been a storm of protest from postal workers. I understand further that these individuals who have been transferred and promoted, in one case from Anchorage, Alaska, to Portland, Oreg., at a multiple-grade increase, are themselves unhappy, according to officials of the Postal Supervisors Union. Why, I asked, could something that sounded so sensible cause such an uproar?

The reasons are simple enough.

First. The raise in pay on promotion to the next postal supervisory level in the vast majority of cases only amounts to about \$600 a year. When an individual transfers from a smaller city like Boise, Idaho, to Seattle, he is losing pay—not gaining in pay—because of the higher cost of real estate and other items. Let us suppose that this program was, in fact, a nationwide program and a postal supervisor was transferred from Missoula, Mont., to New York City. New York policemen and firemen have been asking for an average salary of \$12,000 a year to meet the costs of living in that city. The average postal employee in that city, regardless of seniority, makes about \$8,000 a year. This transfer would be a tremendous loss.

Second. Postal supervisors are men either in middle age or approaching middle age. This is true because 85 percent of the people in the postal service, regardless of years of service, whether 20 or 30 years of service, are never promoted to a supervisory level. Those who are promoted have generally almost 20 years of service. The transfer to accept a new promotion will, in any case, probably mean the end of promotions because a man will probably not have enough time in service left to wait the length of time necessary for another promotion. What is more, he moves into a strange situation and the natural resentment of employees who have been waiting many years for promotion in the gaining post office. In return for one promotion, a man must uproot his family, sell the home he has been paying for, perhaps at loss, and very probably move to a community where the cost of living is higher.

Third. What is more, the program, as it turns out, works in a discriminatory fashion. In small post offices where supervisors and employees know each other very well, the job ratings of supervisors is very high. In larger post offices, like Seattle, in an impersonal setting, supervisors never receive a perfect rating. Yet the supervisors in large offices must compete on a point system with employees who receive better scores in smaller offices. These point scores are compared in an impersonal manner by a complicated system and the total score is reviewed by a board on which officials from regional office sit and have a controlling voice.

Fourth. This program has been compared to the promotion procedures of

private industry. It is not a good comparison, because the programs in private industry do not reach down to the foreman level. Only individuals at an executive level are forced to move. They are promised even greater advancement and their pay on transfer is adequate to the area in which they are assigned.

Fifth. The Seattle project has unintentionally raised the prospect of political manipulation of promotions in that the influence of the regional office dominate the program. Employees of regional offices are chosen in many cases on the basis of the personal discretion of regional office officials. The regional offices justly or unjustly have the reputation among postal employees of being dominated by politics. Because of the domination of this program, under the name Career Development Program or Seattle project by regional offices, it is regarded by employees as a clash between seniority in local post offices and regional office political considerations. Although seniority is not the most important consideration under the present local promotion plan, it does receive some consideration today as a matter of tradition.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?

I believe that the present ratio of supervisors to employees of one supervisor to 35 employees is too low, and should be a ratio of at least one supervisor to 25 employees, and probably a ratio of one supervisor to 20 employees. If this were done, restrictive practices on job promotion would wither away. If budgetary problems prevent this, let us put the blame where it belongs, principally in the Bureau of the Budget where the biggest cuts in postal appropriation requests come. The Committee on Appropriations and the Congress has had to take the blame for budget cuts for too long.

I believe that the pay gap between supervisors and employees is too low, and asking a man to transfer long distances for a \$600 a year increase is ridiculous.

I believe that future promotion and transfer programs should be limited to top management positions in local post offices, rather than disrupting the hope of all employees for local promotion. There is no reason to suppose that in lower supervisory grades that men capable of filling supervisory positions are not available. They have been available up to now. They are also available in industry which restricts transfer promotions to persons at the executive level.

As chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, I will do all in my power to see that realistic and beneficial programs are instituted within this session of Congress. I want to thank Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN and Congressman JAMES McCLEURE for their great work in bringing these facts to light. They are hard working and dedicated men. I am proud to serve with them. I hope that together we can improve the postal service, and work in the great nonpartisan tradition of our committee during this next Congress.

I will, in the next few weeks, make a series of reports on the postal service in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD based on our investigations during the 90th Congress.

A NEW LOOK IS NEEDED AT USIA SETUP

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the major assignments in the new administration which has been generally unnoticed is that of Frank Shakespeare, Jr., to head the U.S. Information Agency.

One man who has made an extensive study of the agency is the noted international columnist of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol, who in an article in the January 20 Joliet-Herald News reviews the valedictory comments of former agency head, Leonard H. Marks:

A NEW LOOK IS NEEDED AT USIA SETUP
(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"I can report proudly that the exhibits, broadcasts, telecasts, films, books, pamphlets and periodicals produced by the U.S. Information Agency are now regarded as models by professionals engaged in the arts and crafts of persuasion," said Leonard H. Marks, director of the agency in his valedictory report to Congress.

It sounds great. It sounds as if America was winning the global propaganda war.

The only trouble is, it isn't so.

To Americans who have traveled abroad in the last few years, the Marks report will read like the "Tales of the Brothers Grimm." Too much of it is nothing but a clumsy attempt to whitewash a USIA operation that too often is inept, incompetent and inefficient.

How can Marks call his operation a "model" when the American image abroad has sagged to its lowest ebb in history?

In his report Marks chose to disregard criticism at home and abroad against his agency.

"The image of the U.S. abroad has obviously worsened in recent years," Lloyd S. Free, director of the Institute for International Social Research, told a congressional subcommittee last summer. "We are on the verge of a public relations debacle . . ."

The presidential directives to USIA are "to help achieve U.S. foreign policy objectives by . . . influencing public attitudes of other nations," Marks wrote.

Anyone traveling through Europe knows that we are far from attaining this goal. On the contrary, while the United States was losing friends and prestige, the Soviet Union has been gaining strength even among our allies. Moscow has even begun to recover from its black eye.

In Paris, the French elder statesman, Ambassador Andre Francois Poncet, said: "Your propaganda . . . is zero."

"We are just not selling America," I wrote on Sept. 17, 1968, after an extended tour of Europe. "USIA officials themselves admit failures in Western Europe . . . It is about time President Johnson awoke to the fact that his points are just not getting across . . ."

What kind of man or woman goes to work for USIA?

"A very special kind of individual," says Marks. "In his makeup are elements of missionary, teacher, publicist, diplomat . . . rugged individualist and loyal organization man."

Not everyone would agree. USIA has many highly competent people, but is also plagued with low caliber workers who fall to comprehend their mission, or simply ignore it.

Many of them have been outspoken in their opposition to our Vietnam policy—a policy they are paid to explain and defend.

One high official who came to the agency from a highly successful business career inspected USIA posts overseas and returned in disgust. He told friends that he would only retain less than half if USIA was a profit-making organization.

Despite Marks' self-serving essay, the new Nixon administration should make a thorough review of the USIA and similar operations like Radio Free Europe. It would be interesting, for example, to find out why competent writers and editors from Eastern European desks have been set aside—because of their anti-Communist opinions—while Communists from those countries have been hired to broadcast from American stations.

A CALL TO COMMITMENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the address made by the Honorable Jed Johnson, Jr., to the American Gas Association on January 22, 1969:

A CALL TO COMMITMENT

The Scriptures tell us a house divided against itself cannot stand.

The Kerner Commission has warned us that we are moving toward two separate and distinct societies.

The greatness of America has been its capacity to change to meet changing conditions.

The real question today is whether we have the will, the capacity, the determination, the faith to meet and solve the problems of our society.

I believe we do.

I believe that Government cannot do it alone. Without the effective and serious co-operation of business, our social crisis cannot and will not be solved. With serious and sincere commitment of business, labor and government, we cannot fail.

What is the crisis and why is it there?

We all know of the discrimination in education. We know that until fairly recently, a black man, if he wanted to be a journalist, could not enroll in many of the journalism schools. We know if a black man wanted to be a lawyer he could not enroll in many law schools. My own state of Oklahoma did not permit a black man in the University of Oklahoma Law School until 1948. We know that until 1954 "separate, but equal" was the law of the land. We know that until 1964 public accommodations were not public to the black man. We know also that it took the death of Dr. Martin Luther King by an assassin's bullet to prod Congress into enacting an open housing law.

We also know that until the voting rights bill of 1965, there had been widespread disfranchisement. The most basic right in a democracy, the right to vote, a right guaranteed one hundred years ago by the 15th Amendment, the very essence of a democracy, was systematically denied. Yet the call of the American Revolution was "no taxation without representation." We know that there has been and still is gerrymandering to keep black representation to a minimum. There are still three states with substantial black population, Alabama, South Carolina and Arkansas without a single black member of their state legislatures.

As a former member of Congress and as one who appreciates the importance of political power, I looked up the record of black

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

membership in the U.S. Congress. I found an incredible thing.

If you start with the election of 1900 you have to go from 1901 to 1961, thirty years without a single black representative in either House of the U.S. Congress.

Then in 1931, in the 72nd Congress, Oscar DePriest was elected from Illinois.

There was only one black member of Congress from 1931 to '45.

From 1945 to 1965 there were only two.

In 1955, there were only three.

In 1965, in the 89th Congress, when I served there were six out of a total of 535 representatives and senators.

Today there are 10 out of 535, including one U.S. Senator.

Now what do these facts tell us?

A great deal, I think.

For one thing, the black man has been caught in a syndrome of discrimination. Denial of educational opportunities helped prevent advance in employment. Denial of voting rights helped prevent protection of Constitutional rights by lack of political representation. Denial of political representation prevented the black man from influencing his own destiny in education, housing, health, employment, etc. So there has been a vicious cycle.

The cycle is now being broken, and broken it must be.

What I am saying is that this is where we have been. The question now is where are we going and how are we going to get there.

A hundred years ago it was a daring thing for Abraham Lincoln to sign the Emancipation Proclamation. But it was right and today no one in our society would advocate slavery.

In the 1930s the Anti-Lynching Law was controversial, yet today no one would tolerate lynching.

Today, there may be those of you who would hold back on taking affirmative action programs, because of criticism or the fear of change, but by tomorrow no one will seriously take such a position.

What I am asking is that we simply be true to ourselves, to our country and the values that we profess to hold—equality of opportunity, human dignity and freedom.

America has to solve her problem of race or she cannot survive. And the only lasting solution can be a just one: to right the wrongs of the past. The purpose of society is not to perpetuate injustices. It is to provide lasting remedies to correct those injustices.

Let us turn our backs on the discrimination of the past and face the future, and make sure that future is a decent and just one for all Americans.

Now how do we go about doing that, specifically as it relates to ending patterns of discrimination in employment within one's own industry or company.

The first requirement is a personal commitment, or the will to do this and seek ways of fulfilling the spirit of the law, rather than ways to avoid it.

Now why an affirmative action program? Why should you go to them? Listen to the words of the late John F. Kennedy. This is what he said on January 17, 1963:

"It will require some effort on your part. I don't think it is just a question of signing the certificates and indicating a willingness to accept people if they have the talent. I think we probably have to do more than that. You really have to go out and look for them because they won't be out in sufficient cases to find you. I think you have to find them . . . I hope . . . you will make a deliberate effort, that you will assign people in your company to really see if in a period of six months or a year we can really statistically improve the situation in every company."

The second ingredient is to find the tools of an effective affirmative action program.

These include:

One, a clear-cut policy statement on equal employment opportunity from the President of the company.

Two, the appointment of a high-level company person responsible for the implementation of an affirmative action program.

Three, an active recruitment program at educational institutions with large minority populations.

Four, a quarterly feed-back system from each department measuring the improvement over the previous quarter.

Five, review selection, testing and promotion procedures. These are among the things you can do. There are many others. They are as varied as your initiative, imagination and situation.

The fact is that many blacks and other minorities will not apply for a job because they believe they are not wanted based on past experience.

Let me tell you two stories to illustrate this point.

In a pharmaceutical plant in New Jersey they had never had any Negro employees. They undertook an affirmative action program, hired three blacks and within weeks were inundated with applications. They found that people in the ghetto thought the building had been painted white as a symbol to stay away.

A second story will suffice, in a utility company in an eastern inter-city which had employed blacks in substantial numbers since during World War II, they undertook an affirmative action program aimed at the Spanish Americans. They found out that the reason the Puerto Ricans had never applied for jobs in the company was that they thought they were "not allowed in the building."

This is not to say that all problems are merely ones of communication, but it is to say that without meaningful communication to the minority community, there can be no successful affirmative action program.

In closing, I wish to bring to your attention a couple of quotations. On June 19, 1963 the late John F. Kennedy said:

"I ask you to look into your hearts—not in search of charity, for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans: a sense of justice. In this year of the Emancipation Centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquility—but above all, because it is right."

Because it is right. Because if you get involved, really get committed, you'll never regret it. I have seen the twinkle in the eye of some of the businessmen who have really become concerned, who have really become involved, who really do care. Who know that they are doing something not only big for their company. And they are doing something for themselves.

I tell you this, you will know that you have got hold of something important, that you are helping to be a part of the solution, rather than to be a part of the problem.

As President Richard Nixon said in his Inaugural Address: "To go forward at all is to go forward together."

PAUL FORNSHELL SCHENCK

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 23, 1969

MR. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sorrow that I learned of

the passing of my former colleague in this body, Paul Fornshell Schenck.

We Ohioans were proud of the fine record that Paul Schenck made as an educator, businessman, and U.S. Representative. Born in Miamisburg, Ohio, some 60 years ago, his family moved to Dayton, Ohio.

He served that city well as an educator, president of the board of education, and president of the Dayton Safety Council. He also was a most successful realtor and was elected president of Dayton Real Estate Board.

He served in this body in the House of Representatives, beginning with the 82d Congress. A man of great integrity and ability, we who served with him remember well the fine measures that he supported here. He brought with him a great background of knowledge in the field of education and his contributions to legislation in that field were many.

Paul Schenck was dedicated to his work and we who had the good fortune to work with him benefited greatly from his guiding spirit.

ROBBING THE POOR—PART I

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is understandable why public confidence in the antipoverty program, heralded with such fanfare several years ago, has steadily dwindled. Either through outright fraud or mismanagement, funds allotted for the alleviation of the disadvantaged are diverted from intended recipients. The New York Times of Sunday, January 12, featured a comprehensive treatment of the New York City antipoverty and welfare program under the heading, "Millions in City Poverty Funds Lost by Fraud and Inefficiency," compiled by Richard Reeves, Barnard L. Collier, Richard Phalon, and Richard Severo. Their findings illustrate that more than a meritorious purpose and the allocation of money are required in coping with our social ills.

The Human Resources Administration, created in August 1966, sought to merge the antipoverty and welfare programs, along with their related agencies, under a single administrative agency to centralize the programs. Unfortunately, this administrative overhaul could not prevent the diversion of funds, and at the present time the situation in the H.R.A. is serious in the extreme, if the Times article is any indication:

Multiple investigations of the city's \$122-million-a-year anti-poverty program are disclosing chronic corruption and administrative chaos that have already cheated New York's poor of uncounted millions of dollars.

In addition to the offices of the district attorneys of New York County, the Bronx, and Brooklyn, investigations of H.R.A. have been conducted by the O.E.O., the Department of Labor, and the GAO on the Federal level. The Times authors estimate that—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

At least 100 representatives from these offices have been involved.

The above-mentioned article is quite lengthy, and for this reason I ask that it be inserted in the Record in two parts on succeeding days.

Part I of the article follows:

BILLIONS IN CITY POVERTY FUNDS LOST BY FRAUD AND INEFFICIENCY

Multiple investigations of the city's \$122-million-a-year antipoverty program are disclosing chronic corruption and administrative chaos that have already cheated New York's poor of uncounted millions of dollars.

"It's so bad that it will take 10 years to find out what's really been going on inside the Human Resources Administration," said an assistant district attorney who has spent the last four months studying the superagency. It was formed 27 months ago to run the city's antipoverty and welfare programs.

District Attorney Frank S. Hogan of New York County, the city's Department of Investigation and Federal agencies have discovered that the mismanagement and internal dishonesty still exist—that while auditors and detectives were studying the H.R.A. last month some persons were carrying out a \$1-million embezzlement plot.

Alleged wrongdoing in the superagency has also been investigated by the District Attorneys of the Bronx and Brooklyn, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor and the Federal Government's General Accounting Office. At least 100 representatives from these offices have been involved.

As late as last Dec. 19 a confidential survey by the United States Department of Labor—which largely finances H.R.A.'s Neighborhood Youth Corps—reported:

"Unless vast changes are made, it is the opinion of this office that H.R.A. cannot possibly cope with the many additional problems that will be brought about by the substantial increase in enrollees under the summer programs."

An inside investigation—a staff memorandum last May to Mitchell I. Ginsberg, the superagency's administrator—warned that in some cases management failures had "more than negated the impact of the antipoverty program in local communities."

The outsiders—from Washington and Mr. Hogan's office—have charged that some city officials are destroying important H.R.A. records and are reluctant to cooperate. The city has informed the outsiders that less than \$1.5 million has been stolen from H.R.A., but independent investigators say the actual figure will be much higher.

For the last three months reporters of The New York Times have interviewed dozens of former and present city officials, investigators and some of the men and women under investigation.

Those interviews have disclosed cases of apparent corruption either compounded or encouraged by chaotic administrative practices.

The cases, which follow, appear at this time to be unrelated, except that they indicate problems in the H.R.A.

A complex plot, discovered three weeks ago by suspicious bankers, to transfer four checks totaling more than \$1-million from H.R.A. accounts to a secret bank account in Zurich, Switzerland.

Two former officials of the agency and a high-ranking official still on the job are being investigated on suspicion that they embezzled funds and took kickbacks.

The alleged theft of at least \$1.75-million in nine months by a group of young H.R.A. employees from Durham, N.C. who call themselves "the Durham Mob"—suspected of rigging city computers to produce fraudulent paychecks.

The District Attorney and Department of Investigation are looking into the disappear-

ance of Social Security payments withheld from thousands of Neighborhood Youth Corps paychecks, but never forwarded to the Federal Government.

One city fiscal officer "intercepted" Federal checks intended for the City Comptroller and, without authorization, deposited more than \$6-million in an H.R.A. account. The officer then made cash withdrawals to pay overtime salaries, records of which never appeared on the payroll records or in the records of the Internal Revenue Service.

A bizarre scheme, hatched five weeks ago, to steal \$52,000 in H.R.A. funds by the purchase of a Los Angeles house with a check made out to an apparently fictitious man who "identified" himself by writing a false license plate number and the unlisted phone number of a movie star on the back of a stolen H.R.A. check.

A plan submitted to the Labor Department to "safeguard" Neighborhood Youth Corps Funds was developed last August by two H.R.A. officials who were arrested a month later and charged with Youth Corps thefts.

JUST A SAMPLING

These situations are only a sampling of the problems of the Human Resources Administration—problems that could multiply as more Federal investigators come into the city and produce reports such as the April 24, 1968, document produced by Labor Department auditors. That was titled "Absence of Fiscal Responsibility in the Human Resources Administration, City of New York."

And the problems of New York are in many ways those of the nation, not only because internal corruption is now being investigated in the anti-poverty programs of other cities, including Los Angeles and Detroit, but because that corruption could influence the attitude of the new Nixon Administration toward all programs to aid poor people.

Mr. Ginsberg, former associate dean of the School of Social Work at Columbia University, is aware of that danger.

"Even with all the inefficiencies and mistakes coming to light—and they are serious—the [Youth Corps] and other programs like it have made an important difference to the poor and they must not be destroyed," he said recently.

"We are a fantastically big business," he said yesterday during an interview in his office at 40 Worth Street, in which he was asked about information turned up by The Times' investigation. "We improvise and hope we will get through," he said.

ORDER COOPERATION

In the interview he said: "I'm not suggesting there was no dishonesty. But I don't think it is a massive problem."

He said he had ordered full cooperation with investigators, but conceded there might have been occasions when lower-ranking officials at first resisted supplying information and records.

H.R.A., in fact, has problems—gigantic size, explosive growth and inexperience.

The superagency was established by Mayor Lindsay on Aug. 15, 1966, to combine the old Department of Welfare and the two anti-poverty agencies: the Manpower and Career Development Agency, which manages job training programs and the Youth Corps, and the Community Development Agency, which coordinates the varied programs of * * *.

Both confusion and corruption were a problem in city antipoverty agencies before the Lindsay administration took office.

Mr. Ginsberg made it clear yesterday that his major interest was in getting programs moving, not in building rigid financial controls.

"If we had better controls," he said, "we wouldn't have had the programs."

That point of view got the city in trouble with the United States Department of Labor, which reported that Youth Corps irregulari-

January 27, 1969

ties in New York were made possible "because all payroll safeguards used in the past were disregarded."

The Labor Department added that high city officials had given instructions to payroll and fiscal personnel to disregard all controls "to get the enrollees paid."

The city's reason for paying quickly, according to members of Mayor Lindsay's staff, was that there appeared to be danger of race riots if slum-area teen-agers were not put to work and paid.

The Labor Department, on the other hand, was worried about the \$19.9-million it had provided for the Youth Corps, and other Federal agencies are worried about the money flowing from Washington to 100 Church Street, the H.R.A. headquarters.

Last September the Labor Department threatened to cancel the city's sponsorship of the program because of fiscal irregularities that led to the intensive scrutiny of the Manpower and Career Development Agency.

Most of the disclosures to date have concerned the Youth Corps, according to one Federal investigator, "simply because that's where we're looking at the moment."

SPONSORSHIP CONTINUED

A Federal decision last week to extend city sponsorship of the corps for five more months was interpreted by Mr. Ginsberg as a "vote of confidence" in the Human Resources Administration.

But Labor Department memorandums on the decision reveal that city sponsorship was continued because "of the inherent difficulties in securing new sponsorship."

In fact, the Federal investigators studying city sponsorship, concluded last Dec. 18:

"The present staffs of the H.R.A. fiscal office, Manpower Career Development Agency and Neighborhood Youth Corps Fiscal Office do not possess the qualifications to implement a management system, however well designed."

Federal investigators had concluded three months earlier that:

"There is substantial evidence to indicate that employees of New York, staff employees of delegate agencies and even NYC [Neighborhood Youth Corps] enrollees have either conspired or engaged in wholesale larceny, theft through fraud or embezzlement of funds advanced to New York City by the United States Department of Labor."

IN NEIGHBORHOODS, TOO

Those reports are evidence of the cloud of corruption that plagues the Human Resources Administration. Whether they are well-informed or not, employees of the agency tend to say such things as "Oh, yes, he's stealing too."

Dishonesty in neighborhood antipoverty offices also taints the entire agency. Bronx District Attorney Burton B. Roberti found "ghosts" on the payroll of the Hunts Point Community Corporation in 1966.

A Federal auditor in a written report has said that when he informed Robert Shrank, who was Youth Corps director in 1967, of irregularities, "Mr. Shrank informed this auditor that he was a liar and destroyed the report."

"STOP-PAYMENT" ORDER

Mr. Shrank, who is now an urban-affairs consultant to the Ford Foundation, said yesterday that he did not destroy any report and had only accused the auditor of "exaggerations."

A confidential report by Federal auditors to United States Attorney Robert M. Morgenthau asserts that Mr. Shrank reacted to information that stop-payment orders would be issued on a batch of stolen checks by calling his staff together "to tell them that if any of them had the stolen checks they should not cash them since a 'stop-payment' had been issued."

"I did warn anybody who attempted to cash the checks." Mr. Shrank said yesterday

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

when informed about the report. "After all, we were paying \$42,000 a week in checks. I'm not saying it's forgivable, but I don't know how you can ever stop the stolen-check problem."

In another area of investigators, the charge of destroying records was heard often in the last three months. But a more common complaint by Federal and District Attorney investigators was that city officials refused to volunteer information or were tardy in producing requested material.

The one official who generally escaped that kind of criticism was Mr. Ginsberg, who was praised by both Federal and local investigators for his sincerity and cooperation.

One aspect of corruption in H.R.A. that has not been mentioned in any report but is often discussed by employees is that the persons arrested to date have all been black. Most employees of the poverty program are Negroes who have been brought into the mainstream of city government.

And the mainstream, in the words of a man who has been at City Hall for 30 years, "has always included taking a little now and then."

"Tweed was a WASP [white Anglo-Saxon Protestant] and the Irish and the Jews followed him," he said. "Now the Negroes are getting their chance and everyone thinks it's a new thing."

"Yes," agreed a Negro who has been arrested. "It looks like some of us have moved up to the white man's thing."

ROBERT F. WILLIAMS, OF RAM-BLACK PANTHERS—NEW AFRICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, from Communist Tanzania comes the report that fugitive-from-justice Robert Williams has returned from Africa to Red China to continue his "hate America" programs.

The interesting aspect is why and on whose orders did the U.S. Embassy office in Dar-es-Salaam rendezvous with Williams to give him a new and valid passport?

Under unanimous consent I submit the report by a Richard Gibson of Dar-es-Salaam which appeared in the January 18, 1969, Herald Dispatch of Los Angeles for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

ROB WILLIAMS RETURNS TO CHINA AFTER AFRICA VISIT

(By Richard Gibson)

DAR ES SALAAM.—Afro-American exile leader Robert F. Williams recently wound up a three-month visit to Tanzania and sailed back to China, bearing a valid U.S. passport for the first time in years.

Mr. Williams had not been able to obtain a valid passport since he fled from his Monroe, N.C. home in 1961 to avoid kidnapping charges arising from violent racial clashes in that Southern city.

He first sought refuge with Fidel Castro's government in Cuba, but left there for China in 1966, charging that some of Cuba's white leaders were themselves racist bigots.

Mr. Williams, who traveled to Tanzania from his exile headquarters in Peking on a Chinese Aliens Travel Document, was accompanied on part of his tour by his wife Mabel.

Shortly after Mr. Williams boarded a ship in Dar es Salaam to return to China, an official of the U.S. Embassy presented him with a new American passport.

Mr. Williams' Tanzania visit was the first trip he has made outside China since he moved there and his first visit to any part of Africa.

Recently, he was denied the right to visit Sweden and France. Although both countries profess to support the civil rights struggle in the United States and both had welcomed Stokely Carmichael earlier this year, neither has given any explanation of the ban on Robert F. Williams.

In Sweden, student groups at the universities of Uppsala and Lund are still appealing the ban in the hope that Mr. Williams may speak at their schools.

But some Swedish leftist organizations have refused to pay more than lip-service to the appeal, because they strongly disapprove of Mr. Williams' criticism of the lingering racism in Cuba and his support of Communist China's Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

Mr. Williams conferred in Dar es Salaam with attorney Milton R. Henry of Detroit, Brother Imari (whose "slave name" was Richard B. Henry) and Mrs. Mae Mallory, a militant black mother from New York, who is still under indictment on the same kidnapping charges as Mr. Williams.

In conjunction with Mr. Henry and Brother Imari—in his capacity as Minister of Information of the black separatist "Republic of New Africa," Mr. Williams held a press conference in Dar es Salaam at the beginning of June to publicize the group's demands for an all-black independent and sovereign republic to be carved out of the present Southern United States.

Earlier this year, Mr. Williams had been elected in absentia at a Detroit meeting, the first President of New Africa, and Mr. Henry was chosen as First Vice President.

Denying that he planned to remain in exile permanently, Mr. Williams confirmed reports that he hoped to return to the United States to clear himself of the charges against him, which he vehemently maintained were a complete fabrication.

But he set no date for his return, which he said would take place only "when the time was ripe."

Before his departure from the East African country, Mr. Williams expressed gratitude to the government of President Julius K. Nyerere and the people of Tanzania for the hospitality and kindness shown him and Mrs. Williams.

While in Dar es Salaam, which is also headquarters of the African Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity, Mr. Williams met privately with many African freedom fighters, including top ranking leaders of the militant Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (South Africa).

A FORWARD MARITIME POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, at a luncheon sponsored by the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department at the Statler-Hilton Hotel last Wednesday, a very timely and thought provoking address was delivered by Dr. James D. Atkinson, professor of government, Georgetown University.

There has been too much delay in giving to our almost nonexistent merchant marine, the very serious consideration it should have.

Dr. Atkinson's remarks bring out the need for taking immediate action to

remedy this neglect while there is still time. I strongly urge their careful reading by all of the Members:

A FORWARD MARITIME POLICY FOR THE
UNITED STATES
THE STRATEGIC NAVAL BALANCE
The naval balance study

In early December 1968, the House Committee on Armed Services published a study entitled "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance: U.S.S.R. vs. U.S.A." This study was prepared for House Armed Services by a special committee of the American Security Council on which I served. This carefully researched paper pointed out that the burgeoning Soviet merchant marine served to enhance Soviet attainment of strategic objectives on the oceans of the world and that this constituted one of the significant developments of our times. The study emphasized that the Soviet effort was both qualitative and quantitative and noted that "four out of five Russian merchant ships are less than 10 years old, whereas four out of five of the U.S.-flag vessels are of World War II vintage or older!"

Continued Soviet momentum

Since the publication of this report, the trend has been for continued upward movement of the Soviets on the high seas. There are many examples of this continuing Soviet thrust at sea, but these are especially interesting:

(1) On 26 December 1968 the official Soviet news agency Tass stated that "the Soviet Merchant Marine has firmly taken the world's sixth place this year" and that one more line had been added "to the score of regular services. It links the ports of the Baltic with Australia."

(2) On 6 January 1969 Tass stated that meetings had begun that day between the Soviet Union and East Germany in order to coordinate their maritime policy including that "on the international freight market." With the recent example of Soviet rate cutting on Australian cargoes, this report is highly suggestive for future Soviet and bloc policy.

(3) On 9 January 1969 Moscow Radio announced that ten ships of the Soviet merchant navy had arrived in Havana, Cuba, and that a record number of Russian ships would be plying the sea route to Cuba this month.¹

(4) On 14 January 1969 press reports revealed an historic first for the Soviet merchant marine. It was stated that the first regular shipping service by the USSR to North America's Pacific Coast had begun with the over 14,000 ton *Ostrogosch* (built only 4 years ago), one of three Soviet ships to be in service from British Columbia to Japan. Significantly, this is a third country service, not a Soviet home port operation.

PROJECTIONS FROM THE NAVAL BALANCE STUDY
There are, of course, a number of projections which could be made from "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance." The following, however, appear to have special relevance to the fields of merchant marine, oceanography, and fisheries:

General projections

(1) **Maritime Psychological Gap:** Of prime importance is the closing of the maritime psychological gap. For too long the American people have been told—by the prophets of gloom and doom—that it is useless for the United States to make a maritime effort, because other countries can build and operate more efficiently. A logical examination of this claim leads, of course, to a re-

¹ In another part of the world, the Mediterranean, the Soviet capability—greatly assisted by merchant shipping—for exploiting trouble spots was indicated by the statement in Pravda on 11 January 1969 that "the USSR has always taken a firm position of supporting Arab peoples."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1969

diction *ad absurdum*. For, if we accept this kind of defeatism, it follows that, very shortly, we cannot make an effort in the fields of electronics, in steel, or in textiles. All of these fields are challenged from overseas as is our marine enterprise.

Furthermore, a recent example indicates that American labor and management in the maritime field are performing far more efficiently than the critics would have us believe. I cite the sad case of the *Queen Elizabeth II*, not as a criticism of the grand maritime tradition of Britain, but, rather, as, by contrast, emphasizing what America is doing and can do at sea.

The London Daily Telegraph stated (1 January 1969) of the *Queen Elizabeth II* that there were "minor defects, mainly electrical, in 900 of the 1,000 cabins." Their correspondent went on to say that "plumbing is bad in several cabins and one can wade in inches of water. Shower attachments are missing. The taps on baths are also missing. In some cases attachments in bathrooms have come away in people's hands." Far more serious were the faults in two turbines. The Daily Telegraph of 8 January 1969 reported these were even more serious than it was first believed and that the chairman of Upper Clyde Shipbuilders "refused to give a completion date for the ship."²

(2) **National Need vs. Cost-effectiveness:** Closely associated with the maritime psychological gap is the myth of maritime cost-effectiveness. A myth, because the U.S. maritime posture should, in truth, be related to national need, not to cost-effectiveness alone. The U.S. merchant marine has been steadily deteriorating. And the British merchant marine—upon which many of our exporters and importers have placed reliance—now appears to be headed towards a sharp decline. Can we believe that the Soviet Union will be so conscientious that, in future, it will refrain from taking advantage of what will be a geopolitical fact of life? If this should come to pass, would the American voter ask whether the policy had been cost effective? Or would he ask why was not something done?

Specific projections

(1) **Merchant Marine:** In the "Changing Strategic Naval Balance" we point out that "a vital factor in the Russian merchant marine expansion is the total of national resources devoted to this oceanic enterprise. In 1965, the Soviet government devoted more than \$600 million to the construction of merchant vessels. The United States spent only \$150 million in the same year. These figures make clear the different priorities that the Soviet Union and the United States assign to a vital segment of sea power."

It would appear, therefore, that a minimum program by the United States to restore the merchant marine balance would be the building of 50 ships per year for the four-year period fiscal 1970 (calendar year beginning 1 July 1969)—fiscal 1973. This is a minimum program; indeed, in view of the growing magnitude of the Soviet effort, it may be necessary to review this number and project a total of 250 instead of 200 U.S. built merchant ships, that is, 50 in each of the first two years and 75 each in the latter two years. Based on national need, 50 per year for the four-year period would certainly appear to be a minimum number.

(2) **Oceanographic:** The arrival in Leningrad last October of the new oceanographic research ship *Akademik Vernadsky* is in many ways symbolic of what needs to be done to redress this part of the maritime balance. This ship, built in East Germany for the U.S.S.R. was reported to have made its first voyage (and where it may still be operating)

² The British are not alone. The Daily Telegraph of 17 January 1969 reported that "a faulty turbine in the West German passenger ship *Hamburg*, 23,500 tons, has delayed its test run and speed trials for two weeks . . ."

not in seas adjacent to Russia, but in the Atlantic Ocean. The *Akademik Vernadsky* becomes one of an increasingly large fleet of oceanographic ships given the task of both basic and applied research on the seas of this great globe. For the Russians realize that while outer space is, of course, very important, the liquid space of the world's oceans is in the long run of equal importance and, in the short run, may be—at various times—of even greater importance.

A modest program in oceanography, therefore, would be the tripling of the present approximately 3700 people in the field of oceanic studies and the building of four oceanographic ships—exclusive of undersea research ships for here we should, perhaps, have a crash program—per year over a four-year period from fiscal 1970 onward.

(3) **Fisheries:** The magnitude of the task facing us here is too well known to require more than brief comment. A comparison with Soviet priorities is relevant. In the past fourteen years the U.S.S.R. put \$4 billion into its fishing fleet-shoreside plant complex. In the same period, a goodly part of the U.S. fishing fleet became museum pieces. It would hardly be imprudent to suggest that we either directly spend or indirectly use tax incentives to provide, over a four year period, at the very least, one-half the average yearly amount of the Soviet expenditure.

SUMMARY

In short, what is at stake is not only a significant industry—and important the maritime industry certainly is—but, much more, a vast sector of the U.S. national security. This sector embraces the interrelated mix of naval, merchant marine, oceanography-marine resources, and fishing fleet-shoreside plant complexes. If the American people can be shown the overriding importance of this maritime complex, the evidence indicates that they will ask, indeed, may even demand, that their country adopt and implement a forward maritime policy.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON POSTAL OPERATIONS—NO. 2

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, this is a second of a series of reports based on staff studies of the Postal Operations Subcommittee. Our subcommittee held hearings during the 90th Congress in Philadelphia; Camden, N.J.; Washington, D.C.; Boise, Idaho; and Missoula, Mont. Special studies were made on the Pittsburgh, Pa., Post Office; the Nantucket, Mass., Post Office, and the Seattle, Wash., Post Office. In short, our subcommittee studied postal problems from lands end on the Atlantic side at Nantucket, Mass., to lands end on the Pacific side at Seattle, Wash. Once again I would like to thank all the members of the subcommittee for their work and Congressman JAMES McClure, who did such a brilliant job during the Boise, Idaho, hearing.

There have been a rash of newspaper stories during the past several years as to how badly the Post Office Department, which delivers over 80 billion pieces of mail a year to the American people, has served the United States.

I have been curious about the decrepitude of an organization of 700,000 people who have rendered such service and con-

tinute to render that service. For instance, letters and correspondence on the Seattle project was mailed from Missoula, Mont., by regular mail during our fall hearings and arrived at our subcommittee offices the next day after a 2,400 mile trip.

I asked that a study be completed by the subcommittee staff in cooperation with the Post Office Department as to progress in the postal service from 1961 until now. It is a record that is enviable. A new administration very often starts out in a swashbuckling manner, with statements as to great improvements that can be expected. In fact, an eastern newspaper that is very close to the new administration printed an article praising Mr. Blount in glowing terms, but in doing so stated that there was nothing good about the Post Office.

I include at this point a résumé of postal progress from January 21, 1961, to the present in the RECORD:

POSTAL PROGRESS SINCE JANUARY 21, 1961

SERVICE IMPROVEMENT

City mail delivery service extended to about 10.1 million additional families and businesses.

Rural delivery extended to serve an additional 1,366,156 families.

Free postage to servicemen in combat zones established along with the greatest air-lift of mail to military personnel in history with special lower rates.

Liberalized size and weight restrictions on parcel post packages mailed between first-class post offices.

Restored six-day window and parcel service upon receipt of funds from Congress.

Authorized some 914,862 households to receive mail delivery at the door rather than the curbside service formerly provided.

Pledged significant improvement in mail service for New York City (Manhattan) with construction of new Franklin Delano Roosevelt Postal Station, Murray Hill Station, and the central truck and terminal and bulk mail processing plant. The latter to be the largest postal building in world history, constructed at a cost of \$100 million. This new Annex will supplement the present Morgan Station, which was badly damaged in a fire during Christmas 1967.

Proceeded on a working optical scanner, capable of reading ZIP Codes and sorting mail at the rate of 36,000 letters an hour. Ten machines are now installed, two each in Detroit and Houston, and one each in Boston, San Francisco, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and the Church Street Station in New York City.

553 mailing massing Sectional Centers established to speed mail flow.

Post Office vending machines installed as a test in several locations, including public buildings, selling stamps at face value.

At the behest of the Postmaster General, President Johnson directed all government agencies to adopt machine-compatible envelope and mailing pieces, so as not to jam the high-speed mail processing equipment.

Issued new rules to provide more convenient mail delivery service in local post offices where lock boxes are in short supply, insuring uniformity of handling for volume business mail which is customarily called for at the local post office.

Announced that the Department would continue to service postal savings accounts beyond June 30, 1968, the date originally set for transfer of all accounts to the Treasury Department.

Installed 24-hour self-service postal units in shopping centers, college campuses, and in the lobbies of larger post offices: 167 now operated in 122 cities, serving about 13 million customers.

Tested new approaches for delivering mail to suburban communities. For example, at

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Columbia, Maryland, kiosks containing lock box clusters serve patrons in residential areas and in the town house areas; mail service centers contain locked boxes, parcel post compartments and self service stamp vending equipment.

Formulated plans for installing 251 integrated mail systems—that code letters at first handling for sorting machine to carrier sequence—for mail in the 75 largest post offices handling 56% of our mail at a cost of \$52 million.

In April 1968 began a system of programmed distribution aimed at reducing congestion of over-crowded facilities at the selected points of origin, and minimizing payment of overtime at offices handling excessive volumes with inadequate complements. The system allows accomplishment of secondary distribution at the state of destination in offices not faced with a recruitment problem and which realize a higher rate of productivity than that experienced at the office of origin. It also affords the opportunity to obtain increased utilization of mechanization during off-peak hours at stated distribution centers, and provides better makeup of mail into more direct packages at or near destination points by concentrating volumes for the destination state at the office performing secondary distribution. To date, this system has been implemented for originating mails at Chicago and New York, and when fully effected would be on a selective basis at 20-30 of our largest offices.

A fully-automated mail testing program augmented by random sampling techniques as a part of the National Service Index. Statistics on the postal service efficiency nationwide are now available through the new improved program.

Established the Customer Complaint Analysis Program in all post offices and the regional offices to provide management with a barometer on the opinion of our customers on the efficiency of their postal service and to assure that customer complaints are given maximum attention and corrective procedures taken when necessary on contributing causes to service irregularities.

ZIP Code system was created and implemented as an integral part of the address.

The Customer Relations program was established at Headquarters, the Regions and in the field.

Established NIMS program.

EMPLOYEES

Salaries increased in 1964, 65, 66 and 67 to bring full comparability with private industry by 1969.

Five-day work week provided for postmasters.

Moving and storage expenses provided for employees.

Retirement benefits increased and lump sum payments granted for retirement.

Positive program of Equal Employment Opportunity set up, including EEO for women.

Discrimination of employment on the basis of age prohibited.

Career appointments permitted for certain employees of the Postal Field Service.

Employment of the handicapped rose by 174.5 per cent.

Employment of mentally retarded in jobs they are competent to handle increased by more than 1,729.3 per cent.

Employment of women in the postal service jumped by 181 per cent and in the upper grades (level 12 and above) by 287 per cent.

Employment of Negroes rose by 48.7 per cent since 1965.

Employment of minorities in supervisory and executive positions (level 11 and above) increased by 406 per cent.

After an unprecedented use of mediation to resolve impasses arising out of three months of collective bargaining, the Postmaster General and heads of postal unions with exclusive recognition over 620,000 workers signed the fourth National Agreement

since 1963, to run for two years from March 19, 1968.

Enunciated a new Equal Employment Opportunity Plan of Action, emphasizing equality in promotions, reaffirming EEO in hiring, and encouraging postmasters to participate in local non-postal activities aimed at the elimination of bias from education, housing, and any other aspect of American life.

Employees instructed to "dress appropriately, from the standpoints of appearance and safety, for the position held and duties performed."

Regulations reaffirmed prohibition of possession or use of alcoholic beverages by employees on official duty.

Announced that more than 300,000 postal employees will be eligible to take supervisory examinations in the fall of 1968, after having self-instructional material made available to them for the first time. In addition, tests have been revised in an attempt to eliminate difficult language and other factors that would work to the disadvantage of those persons with limited education.

Up to 3 days of excused absence granted to members of the National Guard called to service during times of civil disorder. Previously, postal employee-Guard members were required to use vacation time or leave without pay to answer a Governor's call during an emergency.

A streamlined new system announced to measure work productivity in major post offices, involving less paperwork and eliminating immediate measurement of individual employees.

Resolved all key differences between POD and its employee organization involving negotiability which had held up signing of more than 1,200 post office labor contracts, thirty-three major issues being settled after a conference in which Postmaster General Watson met personally with chief spokesmen for 7 exclusive employee organizations representing more than 600,000 postal workers throughout the nation.

MECHANIZATION AND MODERNIZATION

A Bureau of Research and Engineering established and a new subcabinet position of Assistant Postmaster General created.

More funds were granted for Research and Engineering activities than ever before in the Department's history.

Biggest modernization and mechanization program ever undertaken by the postal system launched, to provide better mail service for all Americans at a cost of \$437 million in 1967, 1968, and 1969.

The first major segment of a \$33.5 million new postal source data complex, began operating August 1, 1967, and is now serving 22 Eastern cities through the Teleconcentrator Switching Centers at Paramus, NJ and Washington, DC and through the Automatic Data Processing Center, at Paramus, NJ. Construction on the Western sector centers—the Teleconcentrator Centers at Chicago, IL, and San Francisco, CA, and the ADP Center at St. Louis, MO—is completed and will be functioning by January 1969. The Department's 75 largest post offices will be served eventually under the postal source data system.

Installed a new management information center, hooked into the Postal Source Data System, to provide the Department with an immediate grasp of all the problems in the major post offices. The Center can be used for telecon to all regional directors for conferences and will display an up-to-minute chart of major post offices, as well as a large map which will electrically light-up problem areas for discussions at top level.

Opened the Worldwide Postal Center at Los Angeles International Airport, the largest of the nation's airport mail facilities.

Exceeded the Department's vertical Improved Mail goal for 1968. 335 Office buildings already using or being committed to use this faster business mail service to make a firm's mail available right in its own build-

ing as soon as it opens for business instead of waiting for carrier service.

Readied for the drawing boards a concept for a test post office where new machinery and new techniques can be employed under actual working conditions prior to their use in post offices.

Ordered more than 24,000 vehicles in 1969 for use by city letter carriers. 10,000 of the new vehicles will replace presently owned government vehicles, and the other 14,000 will be used for new routes, conversion of foot routes to mobile, and for replacement of leased vehicles.

POSTAL QUARTERS

Increased postal space to approximately 185 million square feet. 25 million square feet over the less than 110 million square feet of space occupied in 1961. Also, a comprehensive plan to complete the modernization of the postal service has been developed. It recommends the acquisition of 45 million square feet of new space and replacement of more than 40 million square feet of space presently occupied in anticipated quarters.

STANDARD BUILDINGS

Developed standard buildings suitable for an estimated 10,000 of 12,976 third class post offices. Preliminary designs are now available and under consideration for 20,000 of the approximately 25,000 presidential post offices.

REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Increased Regional responsibility for construction programs to cover all building improvements and construction for postal quarters up to 50,000 square feet. Previously projects of 25,000 square feet of space or more were handled at Headquarters. This action permits greater concentration at Headquarters on the large mechanized Postal Plants.

PREVENTION OF DAMAGE TO MAIL PROGRAM

Implemented a Prevention of Damage to Mail Program which has minimized mail damage in the hundreds of mechanized Postal Plants.

HEALTH UNITS

Provided 80 health units in 69 cities which serve an estimated 268,000 postal workers.

MAIL HANDLED BY MECHANIZATION

The percentage of mail handled by mechanization increased from almost zero to nearly 50% over the last eight years. In the program to modernize and mechanize the postal service, the Department has of necessity developed all but a few items of mechanization through Research and Development contracts and the development of suggestions of its employees.

MAJOR MECHANIZED FACILITIES PHASED IN SINCE JANUARY 1961

Philadelphia, Pa., November 1963.
Harrisburg, Pa., June 1963.
Omaha, Nebraska, January 1964.
Buffalo, New York, January 1965.
Cincinnati, Ohio, October 1965.
Toledo, Ohio, January 1966.
San Francisco AMF, November 1967.
Chicago O'Hare, July 1967.
St. Paul, Minnesota, March 1964.
Oklahoma City, June 1966.
Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1966.
Greensboro, N.C., August 1966.
Houston, Texas, 1963.
Portland, Oregon, 1963.
Sioux Falls, S.D., 1966.
Sioux City, Iowa, 1965.
Phoenix, Arizona, May 1968.
Columbus, Ohio, August 1968.
Binghamton, New York, July 1968.
Milwaukee, Wis., October 1968. Phase I.
FDR Station, New York, October 1968.
Phase I.

Lehigh Valley, Pa., 1963.

Los Angeles World Way, July 1968.

*Los Angeles Term Annex, October 1968.

Sacramento, Calif., 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

San Bernardino, Calif., September 1968.

*South Suburban Chicago, October 1964.

*Memphis, Tennessee, October 1965.

*New York Yale, October 1967.

*Pittsburgh, Pa., June 1968.

*Honolulu, Hawaii, July 1968.

AIRLIFT

Began an entirely new transportation network of small aircraft, known as air-taxis, to connect the smaller cities and towns of the nation with major postal centers through flights from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m. The goal is to expand areas of overnight delivery of mail to whole states and groups of states and to provide no later than second-day delivery for a maximum volume of letter mail nationwide. The Department's airlift on a space available basis is now approaching 100 percent for all first class mail capable of being moved more rapidly by air.

Announced plans for a new service offering air transportation on a space available basis for second-class mail.

Began an international "airlift" at regular postage rates for first-class letters from the United States to Canada and Mexico. This international airlift is for letters paid at ordinary domestic postage rates, on a space available basis.

TRAINING

Inaugurated the Postal Service Institute, the Department's first school in its 192-year history. The Institute teaches a wide variety of courses from maintenance and mechanization to social problems affecting the Department. The Institute began operations in January 1967 at its temporary headquarters in Bethesda.

Completed training for approximately 30,000 employees under Postal Service Institute auspices at the national training center in Bethesda, Md., the University of Oklahoma, and the larger post offices throughout the nation.

Since the inception at Fort Knox in June 1965 of "Project Transition", the President's program to provide servicemen with a path to productive careers, the Department has trained approximately 10,000 employees in up to 40 hour postal courses and has increased the number of participating bases to over 100. 1,052 veterans have been hired by the Department.

In consultation with craft unions, developed a new standard orientation and craft training system. For the first time in its history the Post Office has uniform, national training procedures to equalize opportunities for all postal employees instead of the uneven locally originated training programs of the past. Implemented in the 100 largest post offices, with favorable evaluation the system will be extended to other post offices in the months to come.

Inaugurated a \$1.5 million pre-promotion supervisory training program for an estimated 5,000 supervisory candidates of all races and both sexes. Those eligible for the 80-hour, on-the-clock course are persons who have passed supervisory examinations and stand high on the register for promotion, usually within the top 15 percent.

Under the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign, hired an estimated 17,300 young people from low income families for summer postal jobs in 1968.

Held special training classes for deaf mutes in Washington, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and Detroit. 255 persons without speech or hearing took the examinations and 115 qualified for postal employment.

SAFETY

Asked Labor Department experts to make safety surveys of the nation's 100 largest post offices in a move to reduce accidents and costs in the postal service. Safety professionals will make detailed studies of major postal facilities and give evaluations of ac-

*Mechanization placed in existing facilities.

cident prevention techniques, working conditions, and safety supervision.

In an extension of the Postal Service Institute, a management safety training program will be launched. More than 37,000 postal supervisors are scheduled ultimately to attend 16 hour courses in the technology of fire prevention and industrial and vehicular accident reduction in more than 1000 classes held in 82 cities throughout the United States.

Began one of the nation's swiftest and most comprehensive programs for electronic analysis of accident and injury data. The ADP system will return statistics within 30 days on an accident, instead of the five months previously required under manual processing.

Created a special labor-management committee on safety, related to the letter carriers' craft—one of the first permanent committees of its type in the Federal Government.

GENERAL

Created an Office of Planning and Systems Analysis to provide the postal service with an overall view of operations from the present and future standpoints.

Examined the structure and organization of the Post Office Department in light of President's study by the Postal Organization Committee and made plans for the future.

Required presorting by ZIP Code by bulk mailers and increased usage of ZIP Code on all categories of domestic mail to over 80 percent, thus saving millions of dollars and increasing efficiency of the postal service.

Eliminated the need to prove intent in cases involving use of the mails to defraud.

Prohibited pandering advertisements in the mail.

Regulated mailing of master keys for motor vehicle ignition switches and authorized postal inspectors to serve warrants and subpoenas and make arrests for certain offenses.

Permitted postage stamp color reproductions.

Stepped up the drive against consumer frauds resulting in a 67.8 per cent increase in arrests, while overall arrests for postal law violations rose by 23.7 per cent.

Enhanced the Department's active cooperation with businessmen, especially large mailers.

The first National Postal Forum, following a series of 15 Regional Forums in 1967, drew 2,300 persons to Washington for two days of discussions on postal matters. The forums added to the continuing dialogue between business mailers and postal officials carried on through Mail Users Councils with a membership of 55,000 serving on 690 Councils.

National Postal Forum II in 1968 brought 2,400 top business and civic leaders, as well as postal authorities, together for two days of creative dialogue on mutual problems.

A comprehensive upward adjustment of postal rates, effective January 7, 1968, will shift almost \$1 billion of the annual cost of running the postal service from the taxpayers to the users of the mails.

Proposed legislation to revise the laws relating to transportation of mail to give the Postmaster General greater flexibility and authority in this area and enable the Department to handle its mail more expeditiously and at a lower unit cost.

Received independent authority to construct postal buildings.

Revised postal regulations to prohibit delivery by postmasters of any firearms without prior notification to law enforcement officers, and issued regulations that all firearms shipped through the mails be clearly labeled with the word FIREARMS before being accepted in the mails.

Sent a four-man team headed by Deputy Postmaster General to Southeast Asia to plan for the speedy delivery of Christmas mail to U.S. Troops.

Instituted a massive campaign to improve

appearance and housekeeping standards in the nation's first and second-class post offices.

Issued regulations requiring the presorting of articles mailed at the special fourth-class rate and at the library rate as follows:

Effective October 1, 1968: Mailings of identical pieces in quantities of 1,000 or more in a single day must be presorted and sacked by three-digit ZIP Code areas. Effective January 15, 1969: In addition to the presort above, nondenotical pieces must be presorted and sacked by States of destination.

Announced proposed regulations to establish requirements for use of a detached label mailing procedure for merchandise samples mailed in quantity for distribution on carrier routes.

STATISTICAL BACKUP FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

	Jan. 20, 1961	January 1969	Net change	Percent change
City mail deliveries.....	44,318,542	54,420,460	10,101,918	22.8
Rural mail deliveries.....	9,198,848	10,565,004	1,366,156	14.9
ZIP code usage (percent).....	10	81.6	71.6	716.0
Self-service postal units (people served).....	0	13,800,000	13,800,000	(0)
Employment of handicapped persons.....	5,285	+14,508	9,223	174.5
Employment of mentally retarded.....	58	+161	160	1,729.3
Employment of disabled.....	44,000	+123,252	79,252	11.1
Employment of women (level 12 and above).....	31	+120	89	287.1
Employment of Negroes.....	92,275	+132,353	40,078	48.7
Employment of minorities (level 11 and above).....	65	+329	264	406.2
Airlift (by certified carrier) (1st-class pieces per year).....	1,919,000,000	17,000,000	15,081,000,000	785.9
Postal Service Institute (in-service training).....	0	29,346	29,346	(0)
Project transition:				
New hiring.....	0	9,942	9,942	(0)
Veteran hires.....	0	1,052	1,052	(0)
Mail users councils' membership.....	15,500	54,700	39,200	252.9
	Calendar year 1963	Fiscal year 1968	Net change	Percent change
Consumer fraud arrests.....	600	1,087	407	67.8
Arrests, postal law violations.....	11,593	14,339	2,746	23.7

^a Not available.

^b Latest figures available, September 1968.

CHRONOLOGY: 1962

January 17—E.O. 10987, E.O. 10988.

March 25-April 12—Seven Workshop Orientation Sessions staged for 600 Postmasters from major cities which employ 80% of Department's postal workers (See Press Release #30).

April 24—Federal Personnel Manual #700, "Implementation of E.O. 10988."

April 30—Area Conference material—sent to 600 largest offices. Contains Postmaster General's statement, background, public policy and labor-management relations; forms of recognition, mail ballot procedure.

May 5—E.O. Conference (also includes notes on Civil Service Commission Conference on EEO of Feb. 15, 1962).

June 16-July 1—Mail Ballot Election (Press Releases #54 and #82).

August 10—Briefing for Departmental Officials on E.O. 10988.

August—"Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service"—Basic Training Materials, Civil Service Commission.

September 5—Six organizations attain national exclusive recognition and results are certified.

October—Negotiations with Six Employee Organizations began (continued into March 1963).

CHRONOLOGY: 1963

January 6-February 2—E.O. Training Conference at Norman, Oklahoma.

January 13-19—Oklahoma Postmasters Conference.

February—"Progress in Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service" (Report to President and Background Information on First Year of Operation, Civil Service Commission).

February—Organization of Regional Labor Relations Councils completed.

CXV—122—Part 2

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Made changes in the handling of registered mail that has provided greater security.

Eliminated unnecessary steps in indemnity claims processing and consolidated payments in one Data Center so as to speed up payment.

Conducted a campaign for improved packaging that has diminished damage to parcels.

Arranged with next of kin to send Christmas gift parcels to members of the crew of the USS Pueblo held in Pyongyang, Korea, and to U.S. pilots captured in North Vietnam.

Eliminated 21 inland Customs Mail Bureaus and gave Customs treatment to a larger percentage of inbound mail imports at first point of arrival in the United States.

"Guidance and Advice on Employee-Management Cooperation, Programs and Problems."

June 18—Second National Agreement signed.

June 19-28—Hearing Officer Training Programs (2 work books—E.O. and Adverse Action).

June 23-24—Postmasters' Conference—Baltimore, Maryland.

June 25-26—Washington Conference for 15 Special Assistants for Employee Relations to define their role under the new agreement and to prepare postmasters for local negotiations.

July 1—Second National Agreement becomes effective.

July—First monthly Labor-Management Meeting under Second Agreement.

July 9—Prepared and distributed material to regions on "Orientation Prior to Local Negotiations" for use in regional Postmaster training programs.

July 17—Civil Service Commission Bulletin #711-7 "Guidance and Advice on Employee-Management Cooperation Programs and Problems."

July 30—Established Procedures for Interpreting National Agreement.

August—Regional Offices conduct orientation seminars for Postmasters.

September 1—Local Negotiations begin.

September 1—Instructions on Procedures in Handling Impasses at Regional Level.

October 3—Completion of Negotiations at Local Level.

October 20—Instructions for Processing Invalidations in Locally negotiated Labor-Management Agreements.

October 30—Submission of Impasses to Headquarters.

November 5-15—Conducted Mail Handlers Election.

November—December—Staff Field trips to Regions re effectiveness of Labor-management functions.

November 30—Won Sacramento Advisory Arbitration Case on Determination of Appropriate unit for recognition under E.O. 10988.

December 8—National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers and Group Leaders (AFL-CIO) were certified National Exclusive Recognition.

December 15—Submission of Invalidations Report to Headquarters.

CHRONOLOGY: 1965

January 1—Procedures for Obtaining Formal, Formal and Informal Recognition at local level were put into effect.

February 18—The provisions of the National Agreement were extended to the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers and Group Leaders, AFL-CIO, by their becoming signatory to the National Agreement.

March 31—Signed a new Supplemental Agreement between the Department and the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers and Group Leaders, AFL-CIO.

April 6—Negotiations on promotions began as provided in Article XXIII of the National Agreement.

June 4—Procedures for Winning Exclusive Recognition (via election) at Local level issued.

June 24—Promotion Agreement signed to become effective July 1, 1965.

July 1—Simultaneous with the effective date of the Promotion Agreement, the Department placed into effect new procedures for "Promotions to Supervisory Positions in the Post Office Branch of the Postal Field Service."

July 7—Instructions and Procedures to Supplement the National Agreement in Phasing out of Gateway Post Offices (Regional Letter 65-11).

Sept. 15—Signed extension of National Agreement from October 31, 1965 to April 15, 1966.

February—First Meeting to Establish Ground Rules for Negotiations.

March 15—National Negotiations Begin.

April 1—Determination and redetermination of recognition in 1,203 post offices.

May 4—Civil Service Commission #711-6

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1969

CHRONOLOGY: 1968

February 23—First Ground Rule Meeting for Negotiations to begin May 2.

March 4—An agreement was reached with seven exclusive organizations on the application of seniority on a one-time basis for implementation of Public Law 89-301.

March 17—Negotiated a Supplemental Agreement with clerk craft governing railway post offices and highway post office duty Assignments since the P.L. 89-301 abolished compensatory time for all field service employees in or below PFS-7 salary level.

May 2—A negotiation period was agreed upon for negotiating third National Agreement.

July 25—Last full session of negotiations.

August 31—Signed third National Agreement with 7 organizations with exclusive recognition at national level.

September 24—Effective date of New National Agreement to run until October 31, 1967.

October—Dues Check Off—a projection was made of the annual amount of the total dollars sent to each employee organization which totaled \$9,560,498 covering 391,291 employees.

October 10—Negotiations began at the local level and concluded on November 5.

CHRONOLOGY: 1967

January 17—Fifth anniversary of living under Executive Order 10988.

January 19-26—Boston, Massachusetts, clerk craft election (NPU—2,283; UFPC—2,038 votes) UFPC charged misconduct; Department requested advisory arbitration.

January 30—February 21—Staged five area conferences for postmasters to solicit information to aid in negotiation sessions.

June 5-6—SAER Conference, University of Oklahoma.

July 24-26—Boston Arbitration hearing on clerk craft election.

September 12-2-hour seminar held in Atlanta, Georgia to train vehicle maintenance supervisors in labor-management relations.

September 13—Beginning of negotiations for 4th national agreement.

September 21-2-hour seminar on labor relations conducted for vehicle maintenance supervisors in Lyons, Oklahoma.

September 22—Arbitrator issued advisory opinion that UFPC allegations should be overruled and NPU certified as exclusive representative for clerk craft in Boston, Massachusetts.

October 4—Department certified NPU as exclusive representative for clerk craft in Boston.

October 26—Division Director delivered statement before President's Review Committee on E.O. 10988.

December 5—Last full session of negotiations.

December 5—National Agreement expired. Two Articles (X, XII) sent to mediation.

CHRONOLOGY: 1968

January—Utilized services of mediator.

February 6—Postmaster General O'Brien accepted in full mediator's recommendations regarding impasse items.

February 9—Fourth National Agreement signed by 7 exclusive organizations and the Postmaster General.

January, February, March—University of Oklahoma Training Conference for postmasters and supervisors in the art of negotiating a local contract.

April 1—Local negotiations commenced.

May 17—Local negotiations expired.

May 23—Local agreements extended until July 1.

June 27—Local agreements extended until October 1.

September 19—Non-negotiable items in local negotiations resolved.

October 3—Regions and Department to resolve impasses from local negotiations.

SEX EDUCATION: FOR FAD FOR PROFIT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the sex education fad continues to pick up momentum seemingly because it is profitable.

An informative and analytical comment on the subject, pointing out the dangers of these programs to the normal development of small children and ultimately to the human race, appears in a letter from Rhoda L. Lorand, Ph. D., psychologist, in reply to an inquiry from a concerned parent. The letter is endorsed by Sandor Lorand, M.D., professor emeritus, Department of Psychiatry, State University Medical Center of New York.

Another aspect of the current drive for sex education in the classroom is profit.

Mr. Neil Ulman of the staff of Wall Street Journal has written an enlightening article explaining how this created "need" for teaching material will provide publishers and manufacturers of classroom audio-visual aids with a vast and very lucrative market.

I include the above-mentioned letter from Dr. Lorand and Mr. Ulman's article following my remarks:

JULY 20, 1968.

Mrs. A. G. WEINER,

Belmont, Calif.

DEAR MRS. WEINER: I have read the scripts for the Family Life and Health Education Program entitled "Time of Your Life", which was created by Dr. William H. Ayres and Mrs. Marilyn McCurdy, and can well understand why you are so distressed by them.

The entire program is inappropriate for the age groups to which they are being presented. The first part, program 1-10 might be of interest to adolescents because they enjoy being introspective and philosophical. To encourage introspective thinking in children of the 4th, 5th and 6th grades disturbs them because they are still in the period of reinforcing parental standards of rights and wrong, and becoming expert at learning the concrete and the predictable. They need to be allowed to accomplish this, so that in adolescence they have a solid base from which to take off into other realms of thought and theory. It forms a sounding board against which they test new and foreign ideas and beliefs. Without it, they are defenseless against the confusing and conflicting drives of adolescence.

As for program 10-15, the whole thing is tragically mistaken: the timing is wrong (children too young), the setting is bad (presence of the opposite sex), the presentation of material is overwhelmingly disturbing (the magnified graphics). It will overwhelm, embarrass, upset and excite the children, forcing them in turn to then repress all of these troublesome feelings, and this may lead to learning difficulties. It very likely will lead to sexual difficulties later in life. Dr. Ayres seems to be making the error so many doctors and nurses in the field of sex education make, namely, they attempt to bring about in the young child and the adolescent the detached attitude towards the human body which doctors and nurses must acquire in order to treat the sexual parts of the body without emotion.

But this is not a normal, natural or healthy attitude to inculcate in the growing

child. In the developing young person, sexuality and emotion should never be divorced. It is not a subject that can be treated like arithmetic or spelling, which have no relationship to the deepest love relationships, and, therefore, can be openly discussed in coeducational classes without emotion.

Further, Dr. Ayres' statement: "Children are best able to learn about sex and development before they are exposed to the anxieties of adolescence" is completely mistaken. Child analysts have, during the past 25 years, accumulated incontrovertible evidence demonstrating that it is a mistake to interfere with the latency period (6 to 10), when the major portion of sexual energy and curiosity is normally redirected into learning academic subjects and physical skills. The body development leaves the young child in peace—nothing special is happening. He is not preoccupied with his body and the temporary repression of sexual curiosity and activity leaves him free to learn in school and behave in a reasonably sedate and controlled manner.

Dr. Ayres has overlooked the well-known fact that when the biological drives of adolescence surge up, a certain amount of anxiety is unavoidable. Explanations long in advance only cause the child to worry ahead of time. The period when the sexual drives are worrying the young person is the appropriate time to provide him with information about them. Nature herself is focusing his attention on sex and he is, therefore, ready to listen and learn. Child analysts have learned that cooperation with the specific development phases and respect for the child's feelings bring the best results.

Displaying a Kotex pad to a coeducational class of any grade is an appalling invasion of girls' privacy and can only seriously embarrass everyone. The graphics of the penis spouting semen, and the head-on view of the vagina enlarged for screen viewing will unquestionably excite and frighten many, if not all, the youngsters. This sort of display is much more damaging than the suggestive ads which seem to so upset the SIECUS people.

To violate the child's age needs and need for peace and privacy by forcing him to consider this inappropriate material in the presence of the opposite sex, is appallingly mistaken. Analyzed parents learned this a long time ago through following a similar erroneous course. Existing evidence clearly indicates that the only appropriate sex education in elementary school is for 6th graders in separate sex groups to be told the fact of puberty.

It is apparent that the program given in Sweden is the "inspiration" for those of Dr. Ayres. However, in checking the results of the Swedish program as reported in *Sex and Society in Sweden* by Birgitta Linner (Pantheon Press), we find that 35% of all brides are pregnant on their wedding day (page 30); there is an increase in the incidence of venereal disease (page 86), even 13 year olds and 14 year olds are found to have gonorrhoea, with the number of girls exceeding the number of boys (page 49); approximately 20% of those reaching adult age never marry (10% for U.S.), (page 29), and in summary, "In Sweden . . . a traditionally low marriage rate, a high average age at first marriage, a relatively high divorce rate, and a high incidence of prematurely conceived children [despite sex education in contraception] and births out of wedlock [$\frac{1}{2}$ of teenagers who have coitus do not bother to use contraceptives] are some characteristics of marriage as an institution within the larger societal context." (page 29)

When to this we add the facts that Sweden has one of the highest suicide rates and one of the highest in alcoholism, do we not have to be insane to regard Sweden as anything but a tragic example of how sick a civilized society can become?

Healthy and responsible sexuality, and the meaning of masculinity and femininity are learned only through the child's sensing love and devotion between his parents, their joy in sex-defined roles, and experiencing their love for him. To attempt to teach such things in school is a waste of time. They can only be learned wordlessly, through identification and experience.

You and your group are performing a valuable public service. Only the parents, by indignantly demanding an end to these programs, can reverse this disastrous trend.

Sincerely yours,

RHODA L. LORAND,
Ph. D. Psychologist.

THE FACTS OF LIFE: MORE SCHOOLS INTRODUCE SEX EDUCATION, OFTEN AIMING AT VERY YOUNG—OPPOSITION PROVES LIGHTER THAN EXPECTED; PUBLISHERS SEE A MAJOR NEW MARKET—BUT ONE PRINCIPAL BACKS OFF

(By Neil Ulman)

With varying degrees of confidence or trepidation, thousands of teachers across the U.S. are introducing a new classroom subject this fall—sex.

Typical is Montgomery County, Md., which borders Washington, D.C. Twenty of the county's junior and senior high schools started sex education programs last fall; all 39 junior and senior highs will teach the subject this year. "Some of the teachers starting this year are apprehensive," says Mrs. Mabel W. Wedberg, who taught one of the pioneer classes. "The questions that are asked can be embarrassing, especially to the unmarried teachers."

Despite lingering sensitivity over sex, which still discourages many educators from tackling the subject in class, sex education is coming to the nation's schools at a rapid clip. Parent-teacher groups at national, state, and local levels have called for it. The National Education Association and American Medical Association have endorsed it. The Government backed a pledge of support last year with over \$1 million of Federal funds. A new privately supported health agency, the New York-based Sex Information and Education Council to the U.S. (SIECUS), has been established to promote it. What's more, some major publishing concerns are laying extensive plans to capitalize on the trend. Many view sex education as an enormous, untapped market for texts, films and teaching aids of all sorts. Amid all these developments, opposition from parents hasn't been nearly as sharp as had been feared.

WIDESPREAD DEMAND FOR COURSES

Converging concerns over sex ignorance, illegitimate pregnancy, venereal disease and related problems have stirred the widespread demand for schools to teach about sex.

Earlier efforts at sex education dealt primarily with the mechanics of reproduction; such instruction sometimes derisively called "plumbing courses" by educators. Today's programs, however, are designed to give a more comprehensive view of how sex affects personality, the family and society. The goal, says Dr. Mary S. Calderone, executive director of SIECUS, isn't just to lower venereal disease and illegitimacy rates but also to produce "adults who will use their sexuality in mature and responsible ways."

New York City's school system, largest in the nation, is scheduled to introduce pilot sex education programs in at least 167 schools this fall once its teacher walkout ends; officials hope to include similar courses in all the system's 900 schools within a few years. Chicago, which started programs in 27 schools last year, will expand sex education to 108 schools this year; last year instruction was limited to fifth graders, but this year Chicago is adding material for kindergarten, sixth, seventh and eighth grade pupils in several schools. In July, Maryland ordered all state schools to develop sex education curriculums.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

As further indication of the demand, SIECUS reports 50 to 70 inquiries a week from schools, churches and other organizations seeking guidance on sex education. The American Medical Association says it sells about 600,000 of its sex education pamphlets a year, 10 times the volume in 1960. Applications flooded in from teachers and school administrators to attend the more than a dozen workshops in sex education held around the country last summer, mostly under university sponsorship.

AIMING AT THE VERY YOUNG

Sex education increasingly is being aimed at the very young. Educators feel that it's easier to get across the basic facts of reproduction before students are old enough to be emotionally involved in the subject. Thus, first graders in Glen Cove, N.Y., this year will learn that the human baby develops inside the mother. Second graders will be taught the role of the father in fertilizing the egg and that some animals are born live through a special opening in the mother's body. In the fifth grade, according to the Glen Cove course guide, students will study the "role of sex glands at puberty and the body and emotional changes they bring," menstruation and seminal emissions.

Youngsters at Sidwell Friends School in Washington, D.C., learn about sex by watching the school's female cat, named Casey (for K.C., which stands for kitty cat). Casey bears kittens regularly every six months or so. Under their teacher's guidance, fascinated Sidwell pupils watch the birth process.

"She purred all the time, but she was working hard, you could see that," said one first grader after observing. "There were four kittens, and each one was in its own little sack. She washed them, and the sacks came off, and their eyes were tight shut, and they went like this: Mew! Mew! Then Casey nudged them all up, and she rested."

USING SLIDES

A more conventional teaching aid for youngsters, but one that's gaining popularity, is a series of 35 slides dealing with the reproduction of flowers, chickens, dogs and human beings. The anatomy and physiology of reproductive organs are shown in brightly colored representation designed to capture children's attention. A simple written text labels everything with its proper name as chickens and dogs are shown copulating. An "optional" slide shows a man and woman in bed, covered, to illustrate human intercourse.

Educators say they have been pleasantly surprised by the smooth—and sometimes even enthusiastic—reception accorded sex education by large numbers of parents. Things have changed, says Dr. Wallace Ann Wesley of the AMA staff, who delivers several family life education courses at various state 4-H Club "roundups" across the nation. "Now these courses are always requested, but five years ago we wouldn't have dared tackle the subject because of parental objections," she says.

Some schools prepare the community by sending out letters to the parents of children who will be receiving sex education for the first time. Often, parents are invited to preview films and other visual materials so they will be better able to discuss them if the children ask questions at home. Other schools call in representatives from church and other civic groups to explain the program and to seek suggestions.

There hasn't been smooth sailing in every community, though. A recent furor in Abington Township, Pa., a Philadelphia suburb, prompted a school there to back off from plans for sex education for all third graders. The school's principal had previewed slides on reproduction at a Parent-Teacher Association meeting, where the program met a good reception. But when other parents were informed of the school's program, the principal was confronted with a protest petition.

Recalls school district official William R. Hingston: "Parents didn't think it was the school's function to provide sex information. They said that third graders would pass it on to other students incorrectly. Then the local papers ran headlines like 'Controversy over Sex Film!'" As a result, the school abandoned its sex education program.

Proponents of sex education, however, argue that providing students with detailed information about sex is essential. This is the only sound basis, they say, for exploration of the important social problems associated with sexuality.

This fall, for example, ninth and tenth graders at Anaheim (Calif.) high school will discuss "date behavior," including "petting," as well as premarital pregnancy and teen-age marriage. Other topics listed in the curriculum include "the way boys commonly take advantage of girls by appeals to love and promises to marry" and how "some girls deliberately use pregnancy as a marriage trap."

Many educators believe such material should be presented factually, without preaching. "Any kind of fear campaign is resisted," says Mrs. Florence C. Jackson, in charge of health education at Philadelphia's Friends Central School.

Among the publishing concerns hoping to cash in on the demand for sex education material is Harcourt, Brace & World Inc. Through its Guidance-Associates division, the firm plans to invest several million dollars over a number of years to create a sex education curriculum for grades kindergarten through the twelfth grade. "We are prepared to throw everything out and start over again in a new area with no guidelines. It's an extraordinarily expensive publishing program," says Jack Goodman, president of the division. SIECUS is providing consultation on the project.

In June, Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc. plunged into the field with a text called Modern Sex Education. Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.'s visual products division and Science Research Associates, which is the educational arm of International Business Machines Corp. both say they are investing substantial sums in school health programs—texts, visual aids and the like—that will contain considerable sex education material.

Another newcomer to the field, McGraw-Hill Inc.'s Webster division will kick off next year what it calls a "multi-media program" on sex education. It will include texts, audio-visual aides and laboratory kit models and will be aimed at both elementary and high school students.

Spurring the publishers' hopes is the success of a 70-page paperback called A Curriculum Guide in Sex Education, which is designed to help school administrators set up programs. The publisher, State Publishing Co. of St. Louis, has sold more than 10,000 copies since the book first came out 18 months ago. So far this year, sales are running 60% ahead of the 1966 pace, says a company official. If a book aimed merely at educators can sell that well, publishers figure, the market for materials for students is immense.

CLEVELAND COUNCIL OF THE JEWISH NATIONAL FUND TO HONOR THE EZRA SHAPIROS

**HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO**

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, the Cleveland Council of the Jewish National Fund will pay tribute

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to a most deserving couple, Mr. and Mrs. Ezra Shapiro. Sylvia and Ezra Shapiro have dedicated their lives to the advancement of Jewish culture and education. The Cleveland Press, on January 20, 1969, acknowledged their important contribution to our society in a most timely article which I would like to share with my colleagues. The article follows:

FRIENDS OF ISRAEL

Because of their lifelong devotion to community welfare and dedication to Judaism, Ezra and Sylvia Shapiro will be the first husband-wife team ever honored by the Cleveland Council of the Jewish National Fund.

The setting will be the council's 31st annual dinner at the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel on Feb. 2. The Shapiros long have had a mutuality of interest in a Jewish homeland and Jewish culture and education. Principal speaker will be Sir Barnett Janner, Labor member of Parliament and a friend of Shapiros for 30 years. Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld of Fairmount Temple will be honorary chairman.

In conjunction with the testimonial to the Shapiros, it was announced that 10,000 trees will be planted in Israel in their honor. The Shapiros plan to participate in the planting of the first trees in June.

"The Jewish National Fund, conceived and founded in 1903 by Prof. Herman Schapiro, noted mathematician, owns most of the land in Israel in perpetuity for the state and its people," Shapiro said: "I have visited Palestine and Israel 20 times since 1930, and Sylvia has been there 15 times."

"I see a parallel in the ideals and philosophies of American and Jewish traditions. I hope in these critical days that the American Government and the people will stand with Israel in its fight for survival as the only bastion of democracy in the Middle East."

Shapiro, 65, forthright and perceptive, is a partner in the law firm of Shapiro, Persky & Marken. At 31, in the administration of Mayor Harry L. Davis, he was the youngest law director in the city's history. He is a vice chairman of the Community Relations Board, former chairman of the Judiciary Selection Committee of the Cleveland Bar Assn. and past national vice president of the United Israel Appeal and the American Association for Jewish Education. From 1942 to 1954 he was president of the Jewish Community Council here.

Shapiro served as chairman of the national executive committee of the Zionist Organization of America and has been a member of the general council of the World Zionist Organization since 1951. He was first president of the American Jewish League for Israel.

Born in Poland and brought to America when 3, Shapiro graduated from Old Central High School and earned his law degree from Ohio Northern University. His father was a patriarchal rabbi and Ezra became a student of Hebrew language and literature. A Republican, he bolted the party in the presidential races of 1960 and 1968.

Mrs. Shapiro has served as president of Hadassah Central State Region, as national vice president, and is a life associate of the national board. In 1965 she and Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr. received the Cleveland chapter's first Myrtle Wreath awards.

She was chairman of the women's organization and a trustee of the Jewish Welfare Federation and its representative to the Glenville Project. In 1963 she served on the Greater Cleveland Women's Committee for Civil Rights. She is a member of the Bureau of Jewish Education and on the board of the College of Jewish Studies.

The blond, petite Sylvia, a native of New

York, graduated from Hunter College and was with the American Economic Committee for Palestine when she was married. The Shapiros live at 13900 Shaker Blvd., Shaker Heights. They are the parents of Daniel, a New York lawyer, and Mrs. Michael Blumberg, and grandparents of four.

THE NEED FOR PRIORITIES—THE CASE FOR A DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE, RESEARCH, AND TECHNOLOGY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by William D. Carey, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, which appears in the January 3 edition of *Science* magazine. Entitled "The Need for Priorities," the article presents the case for reorganization of science and technology activities within the executive branch.

This article was brought to my attention by Mr. Frank E. Samuel, Jr., an outstanding young attorney in Washington. As sponsor of H.R. 464 to authorize the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Science, Research, and Technology and as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I congratulate Mr. Carey on his thinking and welcome his interest in this important policy discussion.

The article follows:

THE NEED FOR PRIORITIES

If public policies are to be durable and survive the rigors of changing times, they must grow out of the deeply-held beliefs and values of the society. So with public policy toward science. If it is to be strong, it must first be relevant and it must be shown to have relevance.

If R and D is necessary to acceptable national security, or to better health care, or to control crime and violence, or to enrich education and learning, and if these are the central concerns of our society, then science and its advocates must learn to shape R and D accordingly and give it relevance. I suggest that here we find the source of today's support gap.

The Federal Government is at the point where very tough policy choices must be made about R and D. Our opportunities are sadly out of phase with our pocketbook, and it would be hard to think of another area of public action where the problems of choice confronting the Government are more baffling. Is it right, in the sense of good social policy, to underfund programs in education, environmental health, and Model Cities so that we can seize our opportunities in science and technology? Should we require that public investments in R and D meet some reasonable test of social return commensurate with the cost of investment and equal to or higher than the return on different uses of the same money and creativity? I am one who thinks we should. It is not good enough in a rational but troubled age to run a country on the double standard of prudence in private investment and simple incrementalism in public investment. This is

precisely why we have been working at top speed to change and upgrade the Government's decision-making process and to inject better methods into the way Government works out problems of choice and makes up its mind what to do next. And I see no reason why R and D should have immunity from all this.

For the short run, it is going to be very hard to persuade the country and the Congress that R and D is being maintained at a poverty level. The likelihood of a fiscal miracle to extricate R and D from its present plateau is remote.

But if more money is going to be scarce for R and D, there may be some things that we can do to correct some of the deficiencies in the way Government deals with these matters. I think first of the Government's administrative and policy structure for science and technology. If our policies and strategies for R and D are hard to fathom, perhaps it is because we are not well-organized. R and D is decentralized through the Federal Government. It is managed as a network which is held together loosely by the White House science office. It does not have a prime mover. Its decision-making patterns are pluralistic. As an institutional process it is not responsive to standards of balance, purpose, or priorities. Its component elements serve as mission-related conduits for funding research, development, training, and academic science; but it does not function as a system because it wasn't a system to begin with. It seems to me that we need something better, something capable of shaping science goals and strategies with depth and range and visibility. We need answers; we already know the questions.

BOOK ON CONSERVATION CITES RADICAL CHANGES

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

MR. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Attorney A. D. Sutherland, a distinguished and long-time friend of conservation interests in Wisconsin, has published a book entitled "Sixty Years Afeld and Observations on Conservation." I am enclosing a copy of a review of that book which appeared in the Paper, *Fond du Lac*, Thursday, January 16, 1969:

BOOK ON CONSERVATION CITES RADICAL CHANGES

(By Catherine Lewis)

FOND DU LAC.—"It seemed imperative that something be done to preserve these natural resources," stressed Fond du Lac Attorney A. D. Sutherland as the reason for his writing the book "Sixty Years Afeld and Observations on Conservation" published last September.

The book was published by Carlton Press of New York City with a forward by the noted Chicago minister Preston Bradley.

Sutherland, who will mark his 50th year as a Wisconsin attorney in May, indicated how he happened to write the book. "I have a habit of dictating something and filing it away. Last year I took out the file pertaining to conservation."

"It wasn't hard to put it all together in book form. The publisher accepted it without changes."

"The general theme," Sutherland continued, "is that because of outdoor expe-

riences in many parts of the United States and Canada, I had observed radical changes that were affecting our natural resources such as water, soil, air and trees.

"It seemed imperative that something be done to preserve these natural resources, and I joined the efforts of the Izaak Walton League of America in trying to solve some of these problems, because private interests were making a profit by unjustified use of waters, for instance.

"These interests opposed every effort to try to end pollution of our rivers and lakes," he charged.

"By observation, it was apparent that lumber interests had cut every usable tree, covering millions of acres of our northern lands. Branches were left which made fuel for forest fires which destroyed small trees trying to grow," the attorney continued.

"In order to correct these abuses of our resources, it was necessary to have some authority with ample funds to create fire lanes. Equipment to control fires was also necessary and resulted in the establishment of our conservation commission in the 1920 period. This was brought about by the Wisconsin Division of the Izaak Walton League of America," Sutherland pointed out.

He related that in more recent years the conservationists have found that private industries have constructed about 1,200 dams on many of Wisconsin's beautiful streams. The Wisconsin Division of the Izaak Walton League concluded that something must be done to preserve some of the rivers of Wisconsin in their natural state.

"A test case arose when power interests proposed a dam on the Namakagon River." the ardent hunting and fishing enthusiast added: "The Wisconsin Division of the league formally opposed construction of the dam. This led to extended litigation and an opinion of our Wisconsin Supreme Court setting forth public rights to our rivers.

"The case was finally closed when the U.S. Court of Appeals refused to modify an order of the Federal Power Commission denying a permit to build the dam. This case received national attention as being of utmost importance to the public," he reported.

"Another important phase of conservation is the necessity for the public to have access to forests and lakes. The Wisconsin Division of the League years ago promoted the purchase of lands called the Kettle Moraine area, extending for 50 miles, accessible to people in southeastern Wisconsin. The League has ever since followed the development of this area.

"The League also started the program of purchasing areas for public hunting and fishing," Sutherland reviewed. "It is now recognized as necessary because of the great demand on the part of the public for outdoor sports."

His book deals with these and many other problems affecting natural resources. As a result of his outstanding work in conservation, Sutherland has received both of the highest national conservation awards.

He was one of seven selected by the former Nash Motor Co. to receive its award in 1954 for his outstanding work in conservation. The award was presented in Washington, D.C. In 1956 he was elected honorary president of the Izaak Walton League of America.

"The latter award meant something to me because of some of the other men so honored. They include Herbert Hoover, Laurance Rockefeller, Arthur Godfrey and Preston Bradley. Bradley, a friend of many years, wrote the foreword of my book," he commented.

Sutherland dedicated the book to "My good wife who has packed many a lunch and bid me a cheery 'Good Luck' and has pre-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

pared luscious meals of game from jack snipe to bear."

Sutherland, the father of five children, was graduated from Ripon College in 1913 and from Harvard Law School in 1917. He served as a judge advocate with the 10th Army Division in World War I and attended the first officers training school held at Fort Sheridan, Ill.

Sutherland served as a guide on the Yellowstone River in 1912 and frequently would go back into the wooded areas where animals had never before had contact with man.

Listed in both "Who's Who in the Middle West" and "Who's Who in Wisconsin," Sutherland has given talks pertaining to conservation throughout the state and recently spoke to members of the Fond du Lac Writers Workshop and the Fond du Lac Senior Center. His wife, the former Mary Noyes of Maine, studied music and was graduated from Wheaton Seminary and the New England Conservatory of Music, both of Boston.

Sutherland feels the greatest problem facing Wisconsin now is pollution and points out that in his book he shows how it may be ended. The attorney was referring to a federal anti-pollution law enacted in 1899 and which still is in effect.

This law, he cited, makes it unlawful for any industry to throw, discharge or deposit refuse matter of any kind, other than that flowing from streets and sewers, into any navigable water of the United States or into any tributary from which the refuse might wash into navigable waters.

On a national level, Sutherland maintained, there should be no pollution of navigable waters by industry if the public insists on its rights and the Department of Justice enforces the federal law.

Sutherland in his book declares, "Despite all the federal and state laws and the rights of individuals to damages and injunctions, if their rights to public waters have been impaired, the solution to the pollution problem rests with the public."

Treasured along with his plaques honoring his service to conservation and prominently displayed in his law office is a copy of Michelangelo's statue of Moses.

"My father and I saw a sculptor carve this out of a solid block of marble while in St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome," he reminisced. "My father made me very happy when he presented it to me."

One day, Sutherland observed, now that he has his book on conservation and memories of 60 years of hunting and fishing out of the way, he might get down his file on unusual law cases or one of his other files that look back over 50 years of law practice.

"There might be another possible book in those files," Sutherland thought.

WARREN G. HARDING AND HIS NEGRO BLOOD

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR. OF MICHIGAN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article by Louis Martin:

WARREN G. HARDING AND HIS NEGRO BLOOD
(By Louis Martin)

The story that President Warren G. Harding had Negro blood is treated extensively in a new book, "The Shadow of Blooming Grove."

sub-titled "Warren G. Harding in His Times." by Francis Russell.

The author writes of President Harding as follows: "Always in his growing up he would be haunted by this sense of alienation from the world to which he wanted with all his heart to belong—a quite different feeling from being born a Negro among Negroes and identifying himself with the group as such. Since he never felt secure in his group identification, he would demonstrate his right to belong by the strictness of his conformity. 'The Shadow of Blooming Grove' was something that in later years he could scarcely bring himself to talk about. Once he managed to discuss the matter briefly with his old friend James Miller Faulkner, a political reporter on the Cincinnati Enquirer. 'How do I know, Jim?' he remarked finally 'One of my ancestors may have jumped the fence.'"

Reading this reminded me of some of the talks about race that I have had with Dr. Montague Cobb of the Howard University Medical school. Dr. Cobb insists that the Negro American, black American or Afro-American—take your choice—is a new and unique race of mankind, that there is no one like the American brother on the face of the earth.

Dr. Cobb takes the position that the brother has met the test of Darwin's concept of the survival of the fittest with flying colors. The brother met the test during the Middle Passage when the slaves brought him in chains from Africa. He met it during the long night of slavery. According to Dr. Cobb survival in the U.S. required not only physical prowess and animal cunning, but also great intellectual perception and sensitivity.

During this long night of servitude, Dr. Cobb argues that those lusty white boys who robbed the black girls of virtue in the haystacks of Virginia and other colonies were scions of the first families. In short, flowing through the veins of Rap Brown, Adam Powell, LeRoi Jones and most brothers are the genes of the so-called Anglo-Saxon aristocracy.

Most anthropologists seem to agree that every Afro-American, no matter his color or what he looks like, possesses now some admixture of blood and genes that his ancestors did not have when they left Africa. It is the view of Dr. Cobb that the American brother, genetically speaking, represents the best of both worlds, black and white. He comes close to making the brother a superman.

Dr. Cobb's genetic theory may not strike a happy note today when racial hatred seems to be more popular on both sides of the color line than ever before. This theory probably rubs the white extremists and the black extremists the wrong way. It might be disconcerting to dwell on the kinship between the races. The notion might develop that the current widespread violence is, after all, just a family fight.

Dr. Cobb's view that all this genetic mixing has somehow produced a superior race of blacks or Afro-Americans obviously does not apply to some well known brothers. If President Harding had a few drops of African blood in him, the mixture must have misfired. Practically all of the historians seem to agree that Harding was just about the worst President we have had.

Of course, if the literary boys and researchers prove that President Harding was really a brother, Harding's failures and shortcomings will finally be attributed to his ancestry. The popular image of President Harding depicts him as just a good-time Charlie who was lucky enough to win the favors of the famous group of politicians known as the Ohio gang. Perhaps the greatest sin Harding can be blamed for was not his ancestry but his politics. After all, he was a Republican.

THE UNTOUCHABLES PARADE:
HENRY A. KISSINGER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more apparent that regardless of which political party is in leadership the unselected "untouchables" remain in power.

Just new faces, new names, espousing the same old wornout, defunct, anti-American goals.

I include Mr. Capell's January 24 edition of the *Herald of Freedom*, devoted to Mr. Kissinger, and a column from the January 24, 1969, *Wall Street Journal* in the RECORD.

[From the *Herald of Freedom*, Jan. 24, 1969]

HENRY A. KISSINGER

It is becoming distressingly apparent to even his staunch supporters that President Richard Nixon has made some strange appointments to key positions. Even before he officially took office, Henry Kissinger, who will be Mr. Nixon's most important adviser on foreign policy, caused the pro-Nixon Manchester Union Leader to editorially demand that Mr. Nixon "Fire Kissinger!" Kissinger is the personification of all that American conservatives distrust and fear in a political leader. He has been associated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the Bilderbergers and the Pugwash Conferences. All three are highly suspect organizations whose activities are carried on in varying degrees of secrecy. Dr. Kissinger continues the McGeorge Bundy, Walt W. Rostow pattern of individuals with CIA connections occupying the top National Security spot. There is no reason to believe the United States will be any better off with Kissinger doing the planning than it was with Rostow with whom most knowledgeable Americans were most unhappy.

McGeorge Bundy, Kennedy's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, was a former CIA man and an associate of Kissinger at Harvard. Walt W. Rostow, who took Bundy's place under Johnson, came from the CIA-financed M.I.T. Center for International Studies. Henry Kissinger has been associated with the International Seminar and the Center for International Affairs at Harvard, also CIA-financed.

Henry Alfred Kissinger was born in Fuerth, Germany, May 27, 1923, the son of Louis Kissinger and the former Paula Stern. He and his brother, Walter Bernhardt Kissinger, were brought to the United States in 1938 by their parents who were refugees from the Hitler regime. Louis Kissinger, Henry's father, was reportedly a prominent rabbi and Zionist in Berlin.

Henry Kissinger graduated from George Washington High School (N.Y.C.) in 1941 and served in the U.S. Armed Forces from 1943 to 1946, being discharged with the rank of staff sergeant. He served with the 970th Counter-Intelligence Corps and remained in the Military Intelligence Reserve. While in service, he was reportedly investigated by G-2 which opened a case because of Kissinger's reported attempts to reach Germany and contact important personages there. Upon leaving military service, he entered Harvard where he majored in government and received four scholarships, among them the Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship for Political Theory. Kissinger graduated from Harvard in 1950 and received his M.A. degree in 1952 and Ph.D. in 1954 in the Harvard

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Kissinger was married on Feb. 6, 1949 to Miss Ann Fleischer and they were divorced in 1964. The couple had two children.

In 1951 Kissinger had become executive director of the Foreign Student Project which had been started that year by Harvard Summer School. In 1952 its title was changed to International Seminar and it began publishing a quarterly journal entitled, "Confuucius, An International Forum," of which Kissinger was the editor from its inception. In 1953, when the Council on Foreign Relations launched a project allegedly to "seek the answer to the question of the threat of Soviet action against insufficient American initiatives," three subcommittees were appointed and Kissinger was named study director. Out of this emerged Kissinger's book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," published in 1957 by Harper and Brothers. The book created quite a furor and impressed the then Vice President Nixon. According to the N.Y. Times, the book "brought Mr. Kissinger to the attention of scores of politicians, diplomats and military men and became a source book for American policymakers."

Kissinger began his association with the Rockefellers in 1956 when he worked for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. as director of the over-all Special Studies Project (1956-7) "to develop concepts that might be helpful in meeting the challenges America faces today." From 1958 to 1959 he was Research Secretary of a Council on Foreign Relations discussion group.

Under the Kennedy Administration Kissinger was special consultant to President Kennedy on the Berlin Crisis. He has also been consultant to the Operations Research Office; Operations Coordinating Board, Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, Psychological Strategy Board, National Security Council; and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In 1962 he became a full Professor at Harvard, on the faculty of the Center for International Affairs which is CIA-financed. For ten years Kissinger has been chief foreign policy adviser to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, who reportedly "recommended him enthusiastically" to Mr. Nixon. Kissinger was definitely a Rockefeller man, having attended both the 1964 and the 1968 Republican conventions as a Rockefeller aide, hoping his man would get the presidential nomination. He is credited with having pushed the Republican platform toward a more "dovish" position on Vietnam.

The importance of the position now held by Dr. Kissinger was described in an article in the N.Y. Times of December 8, 1968:

"For reasons that are as good and logical as they are unsettling, the power of war and peace in the United States resides in the person of one man. Last month, the country elected Richard M. Nixon for the job. Last week, the President-elect chose the one man who day in and day out will guide and guard him in that task: Henry Alfred Kissinger.

"Dr. Kissinger is to be that someone, as McGeorge Bundy was for President Kennedy and Walt W. Rostow has been for President Johnson.

"That all these men should have come from Cambridge is not entirely coincidental. Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology there helped to propel such policy-oriented academics onto the national scene where the politicians came to know and need them . . .

"Dr. Kissinger's access and accessibility to the academic community must have been an important consideration in his selection, as also was his ten-year advisory relationship with Mr. Nixon's principal rival, Governor Rockefeller of New York . . . He helped to lead scholars and thus government toward an understanding of the political and psychological problems posed by nuclear technology

January 27, 1969

and toward a re-examination of both diplomatic and military assumption carried forward from the age of American invulnerability."

Kissinger was a member of a group at Harvard which began working fifteen months before the presidential elections on a study for the benefit of the new president, whoever he might be. Kissinger wrote the foreign policy section of the report's recommendations and Mr. Nixon was reportedly so impressed with it that he immediately asked Kissinger to see him. (The report will not be made public.) Kissinger wrote the concluding essay in the massive Brookings Institution study, "Agenda for the Nation." The central theme of the essay was that the incoming administration of the United States must deal with a world which is militarily "bi-polarized" but politically "multi-polarized."

Kissinger has written many books and articles and it should be easy to find out where he stands from them, but his writings are difficult to understand, often contradictory. A remark attributed to him recently might explain his attitude. A story in Newsweek of December 30, 1968 concerning an article on Vietnam, written by Kissinger before he was named to be Assistant for National Security Affairs by Mr. Nixon, stated: "It was perhaps significant . . . that after his appointment as a Nixon adviser, Kissinger tried first to persuade the editorial board of Foreign Affairs to drop the article and then, more successfully, to make some changes in the manuscript." The article stated that when a reporter congratulated him on the "boldness" of the article, Kissinger replied: "The last thing in the world I want to be at this point is publicly brilliant."

Kissinger's views on ending the war in Vietnam appeared in the January 1969 issue of Foreign Affairs, the quarterly publication of the Council on Foreign Relations. U.S. News and World Report commented on his "formula":

"The Kissinger formula calls for a series of steps to bring about a phased withdrawal of U.S. and North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam and lay the groundwork for a political settlement between the Saigon Government and the Communist-controlled National Liberation Front . . . Dr. Kissinger did not rule out but called undesirable suggestions that a coalition government with Communist participation be set up to govern South Vietnam."

Newsweek in its article on the Kissinger "formula" commented:

"Like most scenarios for a negotiated settlement, Kissinger's article contained some apparent inconsistencies. Although he stressed that Saigon cannot afford to give even implied recognition to the NLF, his proposal for direct talks between the two adversaries could only—despite his disclaimers—give the Viet Cong added stature . . . And in view of his suggestion that Washington and Saigon maintain the closest possible cooperation, it seemed unrealistic to urge the exclusion of the South Vietnamese from U.S. talks with Hanoi . . . Nixon himself declared through a spokesman . . . that he would neither endorse nor condemn Kissinger's article."

Human events gave the South Vietnamese reaction to the article:

"The South Vietnamese were also known to be perturbed by an article in Foreign Affairs this month by Henry Kissinger, the man who will be Nixon's chief White House adviser on foreign policy."

"While the Kissinger article is complex and warns against imposing any coalition government on Saigon, many diplomatic observers believe his recommendations for ending the war are extremely fuzzy and could be easily manipulated by Hanoi."

"Particularly irksome to some were his proposals for South Viet Nam to deal directly with the National Liberation Front—thus giving the NLF recognition—and to have a coalition commission supervise the political process in the south, including new elections."

It was because of his recommendations on Vietnam that William Loeb, Publisher of the Manchester Union Leader, stated in an editorial: "This first miserable decision by Professor Kissinger should bring about his dismissal from a post to which he should never have been appointed." Mr. Loeb stated:

"There is one man in the Nixon administration who is acting just as this newspaper predicted. Harvard Professor Henry A. Kissinger, Nixon's ill-chosen White House foreign policy adviser, wants to withdraw the troops. He says it will be a signal to Hanoi that the U.S. is ready to begin general withdrawal of U.S. forces if there is reduced fighting.

"This is typical of the Harvard professor type of unrealistic approach that has done so much harm to this nation in the last 30 years. Kissinger doesn't understand that Hanoi, like its Soviet masters, respects only one thing and that is superior force."

Dr. Kissinger's previous posture on Vietnam was described in the N.Y. Times:

"During the Vietnam war he began, at least publicly, as a defender of the American objectives and tactics. But on a series of quiet but energetic government missions, he reached the conclusion much sooner than either Governor Rockefeller or Mr. Nixon that American military prospects were dim, and that Washington's political prescriptions were not working as advertised—he found much fault also with Kennedy and Johnson positions, and especially the running hot-and-cold reactions to Moscow without the planning and strategic purpose that Dr. Kissinger has consistently demanded."

U.S. News and World Report quoted Kissinger as stating: "Ending the war (in Vietnam) honorably is essential for the peace of the world. Any other solution may unloose forces that would complicate prospects of international order." And this is what Kissinger and his intellectual colleagues definitely want: international order, which would consist of world government in a "World of Disarmament." Kissinger recommended a start toward this in "The Troubled Partnership" in 1965 in which he found a need for improved consultation among the allies. He advocated a "united Europe with federal, supernational institutions as the precondition for an Atlantic partnership," or regional world government.

As the N.Y. Times stated, Dr. Kissinger has access to the academic community, both at home and abroad. He participated in at least one Pugwash Conference, being listed as a participant in Part Two of the two part conference held at Smugglers Notch, Stowe, Vt., Sept. 5 to 8, and Sept. 10 to 17, 1961. This was one of a series of meetings which began in 1957 under the auspices of the very pro-Soviet millionaire Cyrus Eaton and which derived their name from his home in Nova Scotia at which the first meeting was held. The name was changed from "Pugwash," however to improve the image of the conferences and an attempt made to disassociate the conferences from Eaton, at least in the eyes of the public.

The Conference attended by Kissinger was the Seventh Conference on Science and World Affairs, part two being on "Disarmament and Arms Control." Among those participating in the conference were Linus Pauling, Paul Doty, Gerard Piel, I. I. Rabi, Louis Sohn, Henry Kissinger and Leo Szilard. At the Sixth Conference, entitled the Conference of International Scientists on World Security and Disarmament, held in Moscow,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nov. 27 to Dec. 5, 1960, Kissinger's predecessor in his present job was present. Walt W. Rostow gave the closing address. Also in attendance at the Moscow conference was Dr. Jerome Wiesner, an important adviser to President Kennedy as was Rostow. The thinking of Rostow, Wiesner and Kissinger seems to be that we must trust the Soviets in order to avoid annihilation in this thermonuclear age.

The general plan is for the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to join forces to police the world under a supranational authority such as an enlarged and greatly strengthened U.N., armed with a nuclear police force. Some of the papers presented at the Moscow Pugwash Conference in 1960 were most frightening in their content but they were not meant for the eyes and ears of the masses, just for those who are planning our future.

It is interesting to note that in January 1967, Nelson Rockefeller (to whom Kissinger was foreign policy adviser for ten years) and Cyrus Eaton, Jr., son of the sponsor of the Pugwash conferences, joined forces to profit by trading with the Communists. International Basic Economy Corp., controlled by the Rockefeller brothers and organized in 1947 under the principal direction of Nelson Rockefeller, and Tower International, Inc., headed by Cyrus Eaton, Jr., announced plans, as revealed in the N.Y. Times of January 16, 1967, to "spur trade with Reds." The article stated: "An alliance of family banking fortunes linking Wall Street and the Midwest is going to try to build economic bridges between the Free World and Communist Europe. . . . The joint effort contemplated by I.B.E. and Tower is seen as combining the investment skills and resources of the Rockefellers and the special entree to Soviet bloc officialdom that Tower enjoys largely as a result of contacts cultivated over the last 15 years by Cyrus S. Eaton, Sr. The elder Eaton has been an outspoken advocate of closer ties between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. He has backed his convictions by visiting Russia and entertaining high Soviet leaders including former Premier Khrushchev."

Kissinger's "foreign policy" advice must have made Rockefeller feel that investments in Communist countries would not be too risky. (Eaton, Sr. observed his 85th birthday in December at Cuba as a guest of Fidel Castro.)

Men of science are not going to have complete control of the new "World of Disarmament," as there are other important people in the world . . . bankers, industrialists, diplomats. These people meet and plan in secret and are called the Bilderbergers. Henry Kissinger has attended at least one of their meetings. His name was on the list of participants at the Williamsburg, Va. Conference, which took place March 20, 21 and 22, 1964. The idea of the Bilderberg meetings originated in the early fifties. The first meeting that brought American and European "leading citizens" together took place under the chairmanship of Prince Bernhard at the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbeek, Holland, from May 29 to May 31, 1954. Although the Bilderbergers claim that they are not a "policy-making body" and that "no conclusions are reached," they surely do not bring important people from practically the four corners of the earth for nothing.

Another group of "unofficial" policymakers is the Council on Foreign Relations, with which Kissinger has long been affiliated. The CFR is believed by many to be the secret government of the United States. After a thorough investigation this organization was declared subversive by the American Legion of California in 1962.

Among the present or past members of the Council on Foreign Relations we find the following: Alger Hiss, Ralph Bunche, Lauchlin Currie, Harry Dexter White, Herbert Mat-

thews, Joseph Barnes, Cyrus Eaton, J. Robert Oppenheimer, John E. Fairbank and Arthur Goldberg, all of whom have had a record of close affiliation with Communists and some of whom were actually identified as Communists.

During the first week of December 1968 the International Association for Cultural Freedom conducted a five-day closed seminar at Princeton, N.J. Ninety individuals attended, among them Henry Kissinger who told those assembled "The doors to the White House will always be open to your ideas." Present to hear this kind invitation were Charles Hamilton, co-author with Stokely Carmichael of the book, "Black Power;" Andreas Papandreou, left-wing leader of the Panhellenic Liberation Movement, exiled from Greece due to his pro-Communist activities; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., McGeorge Bundy and George Ball, among others. Some of the participants were from Communist countries at this seminar financed by the Ford Foundation.

Henry Kissinger has been a friend and associate of John Kenneth Galbraith (who called the appointment of his friend "a good one"), Adam Yarmolinsky (expected to step into Kissinger's job at Harvard, who said "I will sleep better with Henry Kissinger in Washington."), Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. ("I think it is an excellent appointment.") and Robert R. Bowie with whom he worked at the Harvard Center for International Affairs.

Kissinger has been described by a colleague as "impatiently arrogant" and his confidence in his own ability is evident from a comment reportedly made when Rockefeller sent one of his "position papers" to other advisers for comment: "Do you ask a housepainter to touch up a Picasso?" In his new position Dr. Kissinger intends to make some long-range plans for the United States as well as to completely reorganize and restructure the entire White House security planning machinery. This is a very important job to entrust to a man as acceptable to the Democratic left-wing Kennedy Administration as he seemingly is to the Republican moderate Nixon Administration. To what ends will be used the "brilliance" he wishes to conceal from the American people?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1969]
CHARTING THE COURSE: KISSINGER BUILDS
LARGE IN SHAPING U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

WASHINGTON.—Henry Kissinger is off and running. He's pulling well out in front of Bill Rogers, Mel Laird and the rest of the pack—in this first lap of the great race to shape foreign policy for the Nixon Administration.

So it looks, anyhow, to the sporting pros in this town whose game is global affairs. Those selected to work for Mr. Kissinger, next door to the White House, seem already too frantically busy to boast. A good many of the others, in such rival power centers as the State and Defense Departments, frankly admit to nervousness—even "shock"—as they wait and watch.

Consider just one facet of this situation: On Monday, even before Richard Nixon could take his oath of office, the men in Moscow's Kremlin urged that he hurry into negotiations to limit the two superpowers' arsenals of atomic missiles and antimissiles. So the President immediately faces an intricate problem. How fast should he get the U.S. into such dickering? What kind of deal should he seek? How can this jibe with high-priority aims to toughen Western Europe's defenses against the Soviets? How does it tie in with the urgent hope the Russians will cooperate to cool Arab-Israeli hostilities—and with the idea of shoving the Soviets into twisting Hanoi's arm so the Vietnam-

war might come to a quick and acceptable end?

SHORT-HANDED DEPARTMENT

Not much weighty advice on either missile or Moscow can come from Foggy Bottom, where Secretary of State Rogers is still preoccupied with trying to hire good top officials. He and his No. 2 man, Elliott Richardson, though seasoned lawyers, are as yet raw rookies as diplomats. The department's disarmament director, William Foster, has left, so that office is being run on a standard basis by a Hubert Humphrey supporter, Adrian Fisher.

The department's supply of senior Soviet experts is totally depleted, with the retirement of Deputy Under Secretary Charles Bohlen and Moscow Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson. As for the side issues involved in talks with the Soviet, the three Assistant Secretaries who can advise about West Europe, the Mideast and Vietnam are all LBJ appointees merely sticking around a few weeks while the search goes on for replacements.

Across the Potomac River, ex-Congressman Laird is still struggling to fill top civilian slots in the Pentagon roster; the newly named Deputy Secretary of Defense, businessman David Packard, has been concentrating on convincing Senators he has resolved his conflict-of-interest problems. Perhaps worst of all, a new Assistant Secretary for International Affairs is lacking, reportedly because of a raging dispute over whether to fill that crucial post with a "militant" or a "moderate." The military men on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, having done their homework, favor early negotiations. But, not surprisingly, Secretary Laird is asking for time to study up on weaponry and to ponder, before even considering getting into any missile talks.

RECRUITED KISSINGER

But how different it is with Henry from Harvard! As President Nixon's personal adviser on the wide world, and as new executive manager of a revitalized National Security Council, he has enlarged his sector of the White House staff to include over a score of the sharpest intellects in this city. His rush of recruiting has been accomplished, though not all the names have been publicized.

One Kissinger-captured brain can be focused on the missile-task problem is that of Robert Osgood, who has spent years probing the interaction between armaments and international politics, most recently as head of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, an affiliate of Johns Hopkins University. Another is Richard Moore, from the Institute for Defense Analyses.

Not only has Mr. Kissinger outdistanced his competitors in recruiting, he has actually lifted top talent from the rival power centers. Out of Mr. Laird's department, for instance, he has taken Morton Halperin, who was in charge of the Pentagon's arms control policy planning. Out of Mr. Rogers' department has been lured the soft-voiced Helmut Sonnenfeldt, who would otherwise have become its ranking Soviet authority; this youthful yet veteran Kremlinologist was the department's chief intelligence analyst for all Eastern Europe. To concentrate on the crucial converging issue of Vietnam, he has plucked a brilliant young lawyer, Daniel Davidson, out of a key position on the State Department's peace negotiating team in Paris.

IMPRESSIVE CREDENTIALS

Such talent hunting impresses Washington's diplomatic professionals all the more because Mr. Kissinger and his chief lieutenant, Richard Allen, might easily have decided they needed little help in grappling with such problems as Red missile talks. Mr. Allen was a young professor specializing in Eastern Europe studies at Stanford University's Hoover Institution on Wars, Revolution and Peace; as foreign affairs research

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

January 27, 1969

director for the Nixon campaign, he probed deeply into the arms race and developed strong opinions.

As for Mr. Kissinger, his 1957 book, Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy, written at the age of 34, was the pioneering scholarly work in this field. It influenced many a statesman, including Richard Nixon. During his years at Harvard, he moonlighted as a consultant to the State Department's Disarmament Agency and to the Pentagon's Weapons Systems Evaluation Group. And he has kept on writing, over a widening range—most recently on how to unwind the Vietnam war.

So it is not altogether astounding that Kissinger & Co. have already deposited on the President's desk three major studies, all of which are directly or indirectly relevant to Moscow's missile task proposal. One is an assessment of the U.S. strategic posture. Another looks at the potential consequences of a future U.S. ratification of the treaty to prevent more countries from acquiring nuclear weapons. And the third canvasses Vietnam "options" open to Mr. Nixon.

On some issues Messrs. Kissinger and Allen profess less personal expertise and are moving more slowly—but arousing nervousness elsewhere in town nonetheless.

A notable example is the field of international finance, where they are suspected of staking out a claim by getting a head start on Treasury Secretary David Kennedy. They've recruited Yale's Prof. Richard Cooper, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Monetary Affairs, and Fred Bergsten, another expert lately a visiting fellow at the Council of Foreign Relations in New York. Treasury men say either would have been eminently qualified to become Assistant Secretary for International Affairs in their own department, but in fact that post remains filled by an LBJ holdover, John Petty, and the choice of a replacement is still dangling.

The U.S. still faces balance-of-payments problems despite the 1968 surplus; some fresh currency crisis could pop at any time; long-range monetary reform is a hot issue. And the men Mr. Kissinger has signed up are not just technicians; they have their own ideas. Mr. Cooper thinks the new Administration should quickly consider abandoning tightly pegged relationships between national currencies, arguing these damp up distortions until they produce big—and disruptive—devaluations. He suggests sliding parities—a kind of crawling changes in values over the years. A Bergsten proposal is that Americans try creating a dollar bloc, persuading as many lands as possible to promise they wouldn't demand gold for their dollars.

Needless to say, just hiring people and writing up reports does not in itself create any new foreign policy. President Nixon has made it clear he'll make all the big decisions himself, as did Presidents Johnson and Kennedy before him. But Washington old-timers insist this practice can not eliminate contests between rival power centers; it only defines the prize: Influence upon the President's mind.

It is far too early to predict who will eventually win the current race, or to what policy end; previous contests have shown surprising results. When Clark Clifford became Lyndon Johnson's Secretary of Defense, he was clearly identified as a powerful Presidential crony and a mighty Vietnam hawk. Then, as he grappled with facts of the war, he found his own mind changing: he became the ardent peace-seeker who swayed the President slowly and partially, while suffering erosion of his intimacy with the President.

A DISTANCE MAN?

The professionals say that Secretary of State Rogers now has that enormous initial advantage of Presidential trust, respect and friendship—and think that as he completes

his staff and gains diplomatic experience he may well prove a great long-distance runner. Secretary of Defense Laird, once he's squared away, may well capitalize on his mastery of domestic politics, which often determines the fate of foreign policy.

Yet in the jungles of Washington, considerable value is attached to making the splashy start. The diplomatic set recalls that when President Johnson switched Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach over to Under Secretary of State he was expected to shake the place up but never really did achieve great impact. One explanation is that he rather sensibly decided to study up and think a bit before acting, and when he was ready to act discovered he had lost most everyone's attention.

Despite their nervousness, it is remarkable how few functionaries in the State and Defense Departments suggest that Henry Kissinger is deliberately driving for foreign-policy control. They remark that he has avoided the limelight and that he has promised to "stay out of the cable room" and avoid daily interference in operational details (a vow likewise taken by his predecessor, Walt Rostow, but rapidly breached under LBJ's prodding).

Above all, Mr. Kissinger has emphasized that he seeks no monopoly on feeding ideas to Mr. Nixon. On the contrary, he considers it his function to assure that the President has easy access to all significant proposals developed within Government and outside—making sure that all the controversial pros and cons are spotlighted, not blurred in a consensus.

DEVASTATING CRITIQUES

Men who have known Mr. Kissinger for years don't doubt his sincerity or his skill at posing the issues sharply. But they cannot conceive that he will suspend his faculty for sharp and even devastating critiques of offered alternatives or that he will forbid his own fertile imagination from conceiving fresh additional options. Granting his good will does not measurably diminish their concern.

Henry Kissinger inevitably enjoys one obvious advantage that was exploited by predecessor Rostow and before that by McGeorge Bundy: Proximity to the President and daily contact.

Still, the sentiment in rival power centers is not so much that Mr. Kissinger should show his pace as that the Cabinet officers had better hasten theirs. Some of the irritation and impatience expressed in departmental corridors reflects individual ambitions, of course; even career civil servants hate to feel policy power slipping from their fingers. So strong are institutional loyalties, though, that one finds even Democrats who have been held on in the sub-Cabinet fuming because no prestigious Nixonites have been recruited to take their places. Says one of these holdovers: "My office can't get back into the action until it's headed by the new President's own man."

Yet they're not quite sure whom to blame. Some suggest that the current concentration of influence in the White House foreign affairs staff is in part the ironic result of Richard Nixon's desire to shift responsibilities back to the departmental secretaries. For this purpose he chose for most Cabinet posts not specialists but broad-gauge "generalists." Then he granted each the right to pick most of his own subordinates. As non-specialists, some Cabinet members have had to go slow in evaluating which specialists they want to enlist, and then they may have had some difficulties selling the jobs to their candidates.

"Maybe all these posts would be filled by now if Nixon had just told Henry Kissinger to give him a list, and the President himself had got on the phone," muses a Republican global-thinker. "When the President tells you personally it's your duty to come to Washington, it's almost impossible to say no."