

The committee has planned and announced comprehensive hearings on the entire subject of the Selective Service Act, beginning near February 1, 1970. That seems to be acceptable, under the circumstances, for this year, and I hope the bill can be passed following the discussion on the question of the nomination of Judge Haynsworth. Of course, it is up to the leadership as to when the bill will be considered on the floor of the Senate. It needs to be passed and sent to the President so that plans can be made for its operation.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1969**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA ON MONDAY**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, immediately following the prayer and the disposition of the

reading of the Journal, the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON MONDAY**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the speech by the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) on Monday next, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business as in legislative session, to extend until 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Will the speech of the Senator from West Virginia be as in legislative session or in executive session?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The speech of the Senator from West Virginia will be in executive session. It will be with reference to the nominee on the Executive Calendar.

**ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1969**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in

executive session, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 17, 1969, at 10:30 a.m.

**NOMINATIONS**

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 14, 1969:

**U.S. MARSHAL**

Harry Connolly of Oklahoma to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years, vice Doyle W. Foreman.

**PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE**

Dr. Jesse Leonard Steinfeld, of California, to be medical director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, for a term of 4 years.

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 14, 1969:

**IN THE AIR FORCE**

Maj. Gen. Royal B. Allison, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**PLYMOUTH, IND., PILOT NEWS ENDORSES FULL FUNDING OF CLEAN WATER ACT**

**HON. JOHN BRADEMAS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent. I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the October 6, 1969, issue of the Plymouth, Ind., Pilot News strongly endorsing full funding of the \$1 billion authorized under the Clean Water Restoration Act of the current fiscal year for programs to help support State and local pollution control programs:

**LET'S HEAR IT FOR CLEAN WATER**

Striking while the iron is hot is a maxim that has political as much as, if not more than, any other application.

In American politics, this would appear to be a vintage year for striking on some longstanding and basic issues.

Currently we have the drive to abolish the Electoral College in favor of direct popular election of the president. With the near-disaster of the 1968 election still reasonably fresh in the public mind and the political climate therefore favorable as perhaps never before, the House has passed and President Nixon has now come out in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment. There is now just the faintest chance that the procedure for electing the American president may be rescued from the 18th century and brought into the 20th by 1972.

Earlier we had taxes, the rare spectacle of congressmen in numbers exercising themselves not, as usual, over raising more but

over simplifying, even easing, the citizen's burden. With the signals of an imminent taxpayers' revolt flashing all over the horizon, it was clear that the time for tax reform had clearly come. The final results aren't in yet, but both Congress and the administration have taken advantage of the mood of the moment to tackle the most far-reaching overhaul of the tax system in recent history.

In this grab bag of issues, there is yet another item, not as exciting perhaps but probably even more important in the long run, where, hopefully, Washington will show itself equally willing to follow where public opinion leads.

For a long time now pollution has rivaled the weather as a subject generating a great deal of talk but precious little action. We all know by now what we are doing to our environment, the dire predictions for the near future and how far we are falling short in taking the steps necessary to prevent them from coming to pass.

The public is clearly in favor of action. A recent Gallup Poll reported 85 per cent of the population concerned about water pollution and 73 per cent ready to spend money—i.e., taxes—to combat it. Washington also seemed to be in step with the passage of the Clean Water Act back in 1966, which was supposed to channel a steady flow of federal funds into state and local pollution-control programs.

Unfortunately, the flow has been more of a trickle. Actual fund appropriations have consistently fallen short of clean-water authorizations. In 1968, \$450 million was authorized and \$203 million finally appropriated. In 1969, it was \$214 million appropriated against \$700 million authorized. In the current budget, the administration has again asked for \$214 million, while Congress authorized a round billion.

It appears, however, that public sentiment, as expressed through a Crusade for Clean Water waged by a coalition of na-

tional organizations ranging from the League of Women Voters to the United Steel Workers and the Izaak Walton League, instead of the administration may have its way on this one.

It is sorely needed. Without the promised federal funds, the cleanup program would eventually collapse despite efforts by local governments, which have passed bond issues to raise their share of needed funds, and even, increasingly, industry. And that, with the consequent accelerated deterioration of our water resources, is something we can much less afford.

**RARICK REPORTS ON SUPREME COURT'S "NEVER-NEVER" STANDARD**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I reported to the people of my district, explaining to them the "never-never" standard of freedom which the Supreme Court has imposed in our country. The Americans are never right; and the Communists are never wrong.

I submit the following report:

I'm John Rarick, your Representative with another report to you from your nation's capital.

As we Americans watch what is taking place in our country, many wonder who or what is in control—and responsible.

I've had the opportunity to make several trips to Louisiana recently. It is always refreshing to get back home where people

still think, talk and act like free men. But, here in Washington it's something else. It's unbelievable—like being in another country. We're suffering from a moratorium sickness. For weeks before the moratorium crowd began assembling here in the nation's capital, everyone knew that these disloyalty demonstrations were called by the fifth column—the non-uniformed troops of the enemy of our people.

Last month, the premier of North Viet Nam wrote a letter to those he called his "dear American friends" wishing them success in this, their Fall offensive. The names and backgrounds of the Communists and Hanoi's "dear American friends" who are running this show have been published time and time again for the news media people and for government officials to see. If you were being given the full story, you, too, would have seen these names and subversive connections. There can be no other conclusion but that the moratorium crowd doesn't want peace. They want a Communist victory in South Viet Nam.

The enemy's demonstrators have, in a disgraceful play, stooped so low as to exploit the names of our heroes who gave their lives for their country—desecrating their memory in order to help the enemy propagandists. The American Gold Star mothers have courageously defended the memory of their dead sons by refusing to permit their names to be misused. Even their wishes have been denied.

Here it was known at mid-week that every extremist organization in the country with a reputation for violence was assembled in Washington, planning more violence. Nevertheless, brainwashed by some extreme Supreme Court decisions regarding right of dissent, the Administration knuckled under to a militant minority and has turned our capital city over to this conglomeration of Communists, kooks, dupes and cowards.

But now let's consider the contrast with the way the courts and the Nixon Administration treat loyal and patriotic Americans—some of his silent majority—here in the South including us in Louisiana.

The single biggest crisis facing us is the safety, the welfare and the education of our children. While the Washington crowd leans over backwards to placate and give extra freedoms to known commies and other subversives, we in the South are even denied freedom of choice for our children.

I have pointed out on numerous occasions to people all over the country as I have spoken, that what is being promoted by the Washington bureaucrats as "the law of the land" is flagrantly unlawful and dictatorial tyranny—they grant freedom only for those who would deny us all freedom.

So long as Americans are free, we will continue to act as free men.

In 1954, the Supreme Court under Earl Warren made a political decision designed to destroy Southern education. It had nothing whatsoever to do with law, but it pretended to interpret the Constitution. The Court said in the Brown case that no one could assign a child to a school, solely because of his race. What the Court held was that children could attend whatever school they or their parents desired without regard to race. This was freedom of choice—pure and simple. Many did not like this outside interference in our state school system. We did not think that it was legally or morally correct. However, as loyal Americans, we learned to live with it.

The people in the South showed far more intelligence than the scheming bureaucrats. Free to choose, most white parents chose to continue educating their children with members of their own race. The same thing occurred with the parents of Negro children. Most of them chose to consider the well-being of their own children and continued to educate their children in schools with a

majority of their own kind—and we continued to live in peace.

The Constitution hasn't changed since the Brown Case in 1954. The members sitting on the Supreme Court have hardly changed. But this month, the Supreme Court suddenly imagined that the Constitution was wrong again. And that freedom of choice in Southern schools was illegal because it did not achieve—in over 15 years—what the Supreme Court considers a proper proportion of race-mixing. The Louisiana and Mississippi decisions would have you believe that judges are all-powerful—that they have a sacred mission: To assign children to schools based solely on race to achieve a theoretical thing called "racial balance."

Here's the Washington Post for Friday, November 14. Here's what a Maryland County Commissioner says about the move to forcibly overcome racial imbalance in schools just outside the District of Columbia:

"A Prince Georges commissioner lashed out at plans to integrate the county's last two all-Negro secondary schools and change the boundaries of 16 others.

"At the same time, school board staff members released estimates that 1,600 students will be bused to implement desegregation, and another 1,000 who now ride buses will have to ride farther.

"The commissioner said the board had approved a plan 'abhorrent to all facets of the community, black and white' and that the solution provided was only temporary. 'In a matter of a few years the problem will be before the school board again,' she said."

Let's discuss how all this came about in the first place.

In 1954, a controversial Supreme Court decreed freedom of choice; then, in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Congress passed a law which defined "desegregation," specifically stating it shall not mean the assignment of little children to schools simply because of their race to overcome the obsolete cliché, "racial imbalance." This was thought necessary because the northern politicians and bleeding-heart do-gooders continued to read into "desegregation" a meaning of compulsory integration. Desegregation as defined by Congress in the 1964 Civil Rights Act can be taken no other way than establishing freedom of choice as the law of the land.

In 1968, when the Congress appropriated money to operate the Department of H.E.W., Congress made the law to prohibit H.E.W. from using any of your tax money to illegally assign pupils to schools solely on the basis of race, and against the wishes of their parents, for the purpose of overcoming racial imbalance. But these all-powerful unelected justices on the Court continue to ignore the will of the vast majority of the people and the laws of Congress by setting up their own opinions as if the law of the land.

The Constitution itself spells out in Article 6, Paragraph 2, what the law of the land is. It says nothing about giving law-making powers to the Supreme Court or any other court. In fact, the Federal courts aren't even authorized by the Constitution their own rules of procedure. It clearly says that this Constitution and the laws enacted by Congress are the law of the land. This should clearly emphasize the tyranny so brazenly employed by the Supreme Court to belittle our Constitution and enthrone itself above our people.

The Department of H.E.W. misused your tax money appropriated to it by preparing the illegal guidelines. The Department violated the law twice. First, it broke the law by using federal funds to pay for setting up racial guidelines. Then, it again broke the law in establishing the racial guidelines themselves. The courts, ignoring these illegal acts, ordered them enforced as if law. At this point, the Nixon Administration, which has pretended to be a friend to the people of the

South, immediately announced that it would promptly enforce what it called "the law of the land,"—that is, the unlawful decision of the Supreme Court based upon the illegal H.E.W. guidelines.

This decision is not the law of the land. It is against the law of the land. It purports to enforce, as law, bureaucratic guidelines made in defiance of the law enacted by Congress. In denying us freedom and equal protection of the law, it has trampled the Constitution under foot. This is judicial tyranny in its most extreme form.

As one of our friends, Richard Cotten of Conservative Viewpoint, has said, "We are becoming more and more a 'never-never land,' where Americans are never right, and Communists are never wrong."

Compare the facts of our situation in Louisiana with those in our nation's capital—both made reality by court action and both under the name of freedom. In Louisiana, we have been deprived of our freedom of choice. Here in Washington, the enemies of our country—the American friends of Hanoi—have been granted freedom to occupy and roam at will in our nation's capital.

In the recent Louisiana decision the Supreme Court, by refusing to act, endorsed destruction by the Fifth Circuit of freedom of choice. In so doing, they defeated their announced intent to destroy dual school systems, and actually only destroyed public education. As a consequence, they have laid the groundwork for another dual school system—one, public, for the poor; and one, private, for the rich.

The Supreme Court has simply ruled that only the children of wealthy and affluent parents retain freedom of choice in the school they would attend. Their parents have the means to take care of them and see to it that they receive a quality education. Knowledgeable Americans have known since 1954 that polarization of the classes as well as destruction of public education were the prime objectives of the racial agitation. The class war was sought and is now one step closer.

Affluent parents, who are the taxpayers and who have been funding our once proud public school system, can not be expected to finance a dual school system—a superior private system and an inferior public system. Just as suburban parents in the North can no longer see the wisdom of voting for bond issues and paying taxes to support inferior public education in the cities, we will now find disillusioned southern parents rejecting judicially wrecked schools. Taxation without representation has a history of unpopularity in this country.

It is truly unfortunate that the men temporarily occupying the chairs of the Supreme Court would prostitute the law and betray their trust to give the color of legitimacy to tyranny. They set dangerous precedent.

But of this I am sure. Freedom is the law of the land so long as this is the United States. Tyranny such as sought to be imposed by the Supreme Court only brings the judges a step closer toward a direct confrontation with the true sovereign of this land—the American people.

Ultimately, the people—not judges—will hand down the final decision.

DO NOT BE MISLED

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Standard, weekly newspaper of

the archdiocese of Washington, had some sage advice in its issue of Thursday, November 6.

The Standard, in a page 1 editorial, cautioned its readers to avoid the week-end's demonstrations in Washington.

The Standard stated—

The situation could be extremely critical—The more people there are on the streets, for whatever reason, the more dangerous the situation. The best way to avoid creating a danger for yourself and others is to stay away.

Mr. Speaker, I hope many take this advice and I would urge each of my colleagues to read this factual editorial.

#### DON'T BE MISLED

Responsible officials, including those directly concerned with the preservation of law and order in the nation's capital, are deeply concerned about the strong probability of serious civil disorders during the three-day peace demonstrations scheduled in Washington next week. It is apparent that the organizers hope to attract between 250,000 and 500,000 persons from outside the city.

While it is impossible to predict how many will respond to the call for the massive demonstrations, it is no secret that the promoters are leaving no stone unturned in their concerted efforts to draw the crowd. Certainly there will be enough demonstrators to tax the resources of the police and other law enforcement agencies. Crowd control alone will be a real problem. But that isn't the whole story.

The promoter of what is in fact a massive march on Washington is the so-called New Mobilization Committee to End the War. Its steering committee, the controlling body, is a mixed bag of mature, experienced organizers and activists drawn together in a coalition for resistance against any meaningful search for peace, other than on their own terms.

The steering committee of this coalition has made it absolutely clear that their demands, which parallel the positions of the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) in Paris, do not support our efforts for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. They call for the immediate and unilateral withdrawal of all American and allied troops and logistical support from South Vietnam. It is their position that there is only one issue to be negotiated at Paris: reparations to the Vietnamese people for damage done to that country by the United States.

And who makes up the steering committee of this unholy alliance? It runs the gamut. Beginning with hard-core professional Communist Party leaders, passing through the traditional Communist front organizations and special interest groups, it also includes a few of the altruistically minded peace organizations. However, it is heavily weighted in favor of the hard core professional and militant left wing activists.

Included on the membership of the steering committee are 12 Communist Party members or persons closely associated with its activities, eight or ten participants in the demonstrations at the Pentagon and five members of the SDS. It also includes representatives of the Trotskyites (Socialist Workers Party) and its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance, as well as other, but less publicly identified, left wing activist groups.

It is a matter of public record that several members of the steering committee have met with the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Peking, Paris, Hanoi and Stockholm. Unquestionably there have been other contacts and meetings to coordinate the efforts of the "peace movement" in the United States with the plans of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Paris and Hanoi.

The New Mobilization Committee also has opened the door for participation in the demonstrations by violence-prone elements of the New Left. The Weatherman faction of the SDS, a violently activist group, has announced its intention to participate. This, in turn, undoubtedly will stir up a reaction from some of the militantly active right wing groups. One or more of these groups can be expected to appear on the scene.

All the elements for violence and disorder will come together in Washington next week. The presence of a large crowd with divergent ideologies and interests, sprinkled with experienced and dedicated left wing activists and combined with the catalyst provided by the presence of extremist groups from both sides could easily create very serious disorders.

We realize that many, if not the majority, of the participants will have no desire for violence. But their intentions cannot control the actions of those who will want to react violently. When violence begins, in any form, those responsible for the maintenance of peace and order will be hard put to distinguish between the good and the bad. The innocent will be indistinguishable from the guilty.

We strongly urge our readers to avoid whatever crowds may appear in Washington for the demonstrations next week. The situation could be extremely critical. The more people there are on the streets, for whatever reason, the more dangerous the situation. The best way to avoid creating a danger for yourself and others is to stay away.

#### RHODESIA'S PRIME MINISTER WRITES FRIENDS OF RHODESIA

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, November 11, was Veterans Day here in the United States. Ironically, it was also the fourth anniversary of Rhodesian independence.

As the persecuted and suppressed people of Rhodesia continue their united struggle to progress against external tyranny and intervention, it is interesting to compare the retrogressive policies and deterioration of those mighty powers who would destroy her. Certainly, her leaders need only look at the decline of our culture in the United States, and the self-destruction of the British Government to reassure themselves that Rhodesia's policies are correct and the only solution to her domestic peace and prosperity.

Our colleagues know first hand our domestic turmoils and the attitude of the party in power toward Rhodesia. So that they may be apprised of the intemperate and unrealistic attitude of the British, as expressed by their Foreign Minister in the UNO and that country's intimidation of a loyal Rhodesian. I include Mr. Stewart's speech, several news clippings, and related material following a report to his friends from the Honorable I. Douglas Smith, Prime Minister of Rhodesia:

#### SPEECH OF PRIME MINISTER OF RHODESIA

It is a great pleasure and privilege for me to join our many Friends of Rhodesia in celebrating the fourth anniversary of our Rhodesian Independence.

The road has been hard and at times the going tough but every increase in pressure against us has had the reverse effect from that expected by our enemies. The unity and determination of the people of Rhodesia to be masters in our own house has grown from strength to strength and was recently demonstrated to the world by the overwhelming verdict of the electorate at the Constitutional Referendum. The solidity of the foundations on which our national economy has been built was shown in the Budget Statement by our Minister of Finance, Mr. J. J. Wrathall, on July 17th, when he said that there had been an increase of five and a half per cent at current prices and a real increase of three per cent in the gross domestic product for 1968.

Our manufacturing industry has continued its remarkable progress as a result of the opportunities for import substitution.

Agriculture, on which the burden of sanctions has fallen most heavily, is recovering ground. Although many farmers have had to move from tobacco into other crops, production has been maintained at most satisfactory levels, and following the good season last year, agricultural exports are making a notable contribution to our foreign earnings. Mining output has reached a new high, and an upward surge has taken place in fixed capital formation expenditure.

All these factors, and the substantial inflow of foreign capital, have enabled us to achieve the aim of securing our balance of payments and avoiding inflation.

Viewed against the background of sanctions, one of the worst droughts in living memory, followed by a disastrous frost—this has indeed been an impressive achievement.

Our continued economic strength is shown in the fact that except for an initial setback in 1968 our economic activity has been more than well maintained with the gross domestic product increasing by eleven per cent since 1965.

Economically, problems brought about by external forces still remain to be overcome. We are confident that in time these difficulties will be successfully resolved.

But there has been an even more striking success than our material achievements since Independence—it is the dramatic development of unity of purpose among our people. Harmony between the many races that make up our population has never been better, and the desire for closer understanding and national unity is a major force in Rhodesia today. This feeling has been demonstrated on numerous occasions, through the support the African people have given to our Security Forces in dealing with terrorist attacks from across our northern borders. Without the outstanding co-operation and assistance of the people living in the areas in which terrorist activities have taken place, the task of the Forces would have been infinitely more difficult.

Independence Day, celebrated as a national holiday in this country, is the most appropriate occasion for me to express, on behalf of my Government and the people of Rhodesia, our deep appreciation and gratitude for the wonderful material and moral support, and sympathy which our friends from countries all over the world continue to give us in our determination to preserve our Independence.

The material aid which has been provided so generously in our country's battle to overcome the effects of sanctions, has been of great value to our hospitals, schools, the Security Forces, the mining industry and other sectors of our economic life.

Important though this material aid has been, it is the spirit in which all this help has been given that has created such a deep and lasting impression amongst our people.

Seldom a day passes without some message of goodwill to sustain and encourage us in

our struggle to develop Rhodesia's potential for the benefit of all our people.

To you, your friends and families, I would simply say this: "For the support which has been such a great inspiration to us all, we thank you."

[From the Rhodesia Herald, Nov. 6, 1969]  
SICK AFRICAN DETAINED IN UNITED KINGDOM  
OVER PASSPORT

An African businessman who was once host to the British Commonwealth Secretary, Mr. George Thomson, was placed in detention recently when he flew into London en route from America—because he refused to exchange his Rhodesian passport for a British one.

During his ordeal, Mr. Henry Mpumulo Ncube (55) of Gwanda District, suffered a recurrence of a heart attack which first struck him during his American visit, says a Ministry of Information Statement.

Mr. Ncube was detained as he was being pushed in a wheelchair from the transatlantic flight at London Airport.

"I was taken to a small room and questioned about my Rhodesian passport. Officials asked me whether I realized that Rhodesia was an enemy of Britain, and said that I had no business having a Rhodesian passport," he said.

"When I told them that as far as I was concerned Rhodesia was not an enemy of Britain they suggested I change my passport for a British one.

"I refused to do this because I felt it might cause trouble when I got back to Rhodesia."

Mr. Ncube was then wheeled to a waiting car and driven to the nearby Skyway Hotel, continues the Ministry statement.

"They took me to a room and kept me under detention for three days. I had to share the room with two uniformed officials who took it in turns to guard me," he said. "Whenever they went out they locked the door and removed the key. I felt like a criminal."

Among the documents confiscated on his arrival in London was a letter from a doctor describing his heart complaint and instructing that he should not be worried or exerted.

Soon after he was detained, Mr. Ncube suffered the second attack. A doctor was summoned the following morning, and he was given treatment. He was also permitted to have some friends in London to visit him after the attack.

On the third day after his detention, Mr. Ncube received a telephone call from the Chief Immigration Officer who told him that he was free and that he would be allowed to visit his friends before leaving for Rhodesia.

But he was later warned by a woman in uniform that unless he caught the plane the following day he would be arrested.

"I was very upset by this. I have no political affiliations and I just could not understand their attitude, especially since I entertained a British Cabinet Minister, Mr. George Thomson, in my home last year."

The statement says Mr. Ncube contrasted the treatment he had received in America—where he had been on a four-month lecture tour as a guest of the Brethren in Christ Church. "I have nothing but praise for the way in which I was treated in the United States. It was very different in London," he said.

On the day of his departure, his documents, including his Rhodesian passport, were returned to him.

But in his haste to depart, he left behind two items of photographic equipment—a gift from his friends in the United States.

Mr. Ncube is now convalescing at his home among the granite kopjes of the Gwanda District.

"It is wonderful to be back in Rhodesia with my wife and children," he said.

EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH MADE BY MR. STEWART,  
BRITISH FOREIGN MINISTER TO THE U.N.  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON SEPTEMBER 22, 1969

In Rhodesia, the illegal regime remains in power, having rejected the repeated offers made by Britain of terms designed to secure an honourable settlement. It remains in power, a tyranny, unashamedly based on racial doctrines. All tyrannies are odious but at the present point in history those based on racial doctrines are the most odious and the most dangerous. Mankind is distinguished from the brutes by his capacity for compassion, for justice and for reason. To tyrannize over anyone is to depart from compassion. To deny anyone his political rights is to depart from justice. But to do these things on the basis of bogus theories of racial supremacy is to depart from reason as well.

But although this regime remains at present in power, it lives in isolation from the world, earning the detestation of the world and cut off by the operation of sanctions from the bright economic future which should be the birthright of its peoples but which is denied to them by the operation of racial doctrines. We in the United Kingdom have made very clear the legal and diplomatic nature of this isolation. The Governor, Sir Humphrey Gubbs, having served most valiantly, has now rightly resigned his office. We have recalled our mission from Salisbury. Rhodesia House in London stands empty. These were right and necessary measures. What more needs to be done?

I know there is a body of opinion in this Assembly which believes that the United Kingdom should use force to bring down this regime. But to light the torch of war in southern Africa would lead to every kind of terrible consequence without any guarantee whatever that the outcome would be swifter or politically more desirable than could be achieved by the present course of action, that is to say, the steady and resolute application of sanctions. This is why I have spoken of the importance of observing Security Council resolutions. There stands on our records resolution 253 of 29th May 1968. From the resolution sprang a Committee charged with the supervision of sanctions. All Member states should do everything in their power to co-operate with that Committee. The Government of the United Kingdom, mindful of its special responsibility, has given maximum assistance. We have so far submitted over fifty reports of cases of suspected sanctions breaking. The action taken by the Committee on these reports has been encouraging and in an increasing number of cases has frustrated Rhodesian exports. It is on these lines we must proceed. To pass resolutions demanding the use of force, or demanding a total economic confrontation with other States in southern Africa, is to commit the error against which you, Madame President warned us in the passage of your speech which I quoted earlier. It would be particularly foolish to commit this error when we have near to our hands a practical and effective way of proceeding, which is to see that the important resolution 253 (1968) is rigorously observed both in letter and in spirit.

RHODESIA UNITED IN FACE OF TERRORISM  
AFRICANS AND EUROPEANS CO-OPERATE FULLY  
AGAINST OUTSIDERS

"One of the most impressive achievements of the present Rhodesian Government has been its ability to enlist all members of the nation in the counterinsurgency struggle." This was stated in evidence before the House Subcommittee on Africa on November 7 by Walter Darnell Jacobs, Professor of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland. He explained how revolutionaries based in Zambia had failed in their aim of organising resistance against the Salisbury Government mainly because the African pop-

ulation of Rhodesia had co-operated with Europeans against outsiders.

"This demonstration of loyalty to Rhodesia without racial qualifications may represent a new chapter in the history of Marxist-Leninist wars of national liberation," said Professor Jacobs.

ZAPU AND ZANU COMMUNIST

Professor Jacobs categorically described ZAPU and ZANU, the two political organisations which are banned in Rhodesia, as extensions of the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and China. In support of his contention, he quoted a statement by R. Ulyansky in *Kommunist* Nov. 11, 1969 which continues the praise from Moscow of ZAPU. ZANU is mentioned as "a Maoist breakaway type organisation."

"In the Western press," continued Professor Jacobs, "these two organisations, ZAPU and ZANU, are frequently described as 'freedom movements' or 'liberation groups' or even 'nationalist political parties'. In fact, they are local extensions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or of the Communist Party of China. The failure of ZAPU and ZANU to gain support inside Rhodesia would have signaled their demise long ago had it not been for the international patronage available from Moscow or Peking.

"The threat of guerrilla warfare in Rhodesia remains acute. It is acute because of the Soviet support of ZAPU and the Chinese support of ZANU.

"It is not acute because of any native Rhodesian support of the would-be guerrillas."

RHODESIA IS A STATE

Professor Jacobs also had some comments on the new Rhodesian Constitution which was overwhelmingly endorsed by a referendum of voters in June, 1969.

"The Government in Salisbury," he said, "maintains that it has earned the right to elaborate a constitution for the country. It has, it is argued, made good its revolution against Great Britain; it has established its sovereignty over the national territory; it has maintained domestic peace; it has been able to protect the state from outside enemies and it has won the allegiance of its citizens. These claims may be open to some dispute but few can deny that the government in Salisbury does meet the minimum standards of international law for definition as a state. Other members of the world community may disapprove of the Rhodesian type of government but they must admit the factual existence of an operating state system there. This operating state system is factually independent of the United Kingdom. It meets the norm necessary to be called a state.

"As a state, with a government elected by legally established electoral processes, Rhodesia imputes to itself the ability to elaborate and promulgate a new constitution."

KEEP CONSULATE OPEN

Professor Jacobs concluded his testimony by referring to the primary objective of the hearings—the question of the presence of the U.S. Consulate in Salisbury.

"I would suggest in all humility," he said, "that nothing is to be gained by removing our consular representation in Salisbury. It is there. It serves our national interest in some small respects at least. It would seem to be a part of minor wisdom to retain it there and assign it the mission of watchful observation, thoughtful reporting and simple presence.

"Our national purpose," he said, "is not the influence of the internal affairs of other nations. We do, nevertheless, need and deserve the best possible information on the course of events in all areas of the world that may—in whatever eventuality—affect our interests."

Professor Jacobs in introducing his evi-

dence explained that he has based his knowledge of Rhodesia on study and two visits to that country during which he was able to talk to Mr. Ian Smith, Mr. Jack Howman (Minister for External Affairs), Mr. Desmond Lardner Burke (minister of Justice) and other members of the government and Rhodesia Front. He said that he was also able to talk with private citizens, with persons opposed to the governmental policies and generally with representatives of all races and cultural groupings inside Rhodesia.

**RHODESIAN SANCTIONS COUNTER PRODUCTIVE: UNITED NATIONS AND UNITED STATES BOGGED IN FUTILITY**

Charles Burton Marshall, Paul Nitze Professor of International Politics at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies told the House Subcommittee on Africa that he had told a friend at the time Rhodesian sanctions were originally proposed 4 years ago that the notion of effecting a political transformation by applying commercial restrictions and punishments of the sort under contemplation struck him as bordering on fantasy. "By credulously attempting that course," he said "the United Nations, and the United States along with it, would in all probability succeed only in producing unintended and contraproductive results and find themselves bogged in futilities."

Professor Marshall said that results projected in applying sanctions to Rhodesia were deprivation and economic dislocation, compounding of internal difficulties to a degree making it impossible to continue governing, erosion and destruction of a political base, then either a popular upsurge to supplant the regime, or its capitulation and finally a contrite submission to British terms.

"At the outset," he said, "the British Prime Minister forecast realization of these results in a matter of weeks. More recently, in a T.V. interview, he has observed that, 'Appomattox has been a long time coming.'"

"According to an analysis in the Johannesburg Financial Mail, for August 22, 1969," continued Marshall, "the mid-year data indicate a probable gross domestic product of 429m. pounds (\$1200m.) for this year compared with 352m. pounds (\$986m.) in 1965 and 389m. pounds (\$1089m.) in 1968. Discounted for inflationary factors, the rate of increase this year is projected at 8 to 10 percent. The political base of the regime appears to have been drastically strengthened. I believe the governing apparatus is administratively much stronger than it was at the onset of sanctions. The last juridic moorings to Britain have been cut."

Professor Marshall noted that these developments and the fact that Rhodesia is going ahead with a new Republican constitution were surely a departure from what the U.N. Security Council had in mind when it chose the economic weapon.

**BRITISH GOVERNMENT MISLED**

"Surely," said Marshall, "the British Government was misled, and in turn did some misleading about the technical aspects of sanctions. The theme is expounded in a column by C. Gordon Tether in The Financial Times of London for June 13, 1969. One fallacy, he observes, was in assuming that policing .25 per cent of international trade would be easy merely because of the small volume involved. The assumption turns reality upside down. Technically a small volume of trade is much harder to impinge on by embargo than a large one."

Professor Marshall said that Hansard (the verbatim report of proceedings in the British House of Commons) and British literature abounds with evidence of the fallacy that sanctions have forced the Rhodesian economy into passivity. "Such," he said, "is not the way things work out in practice. The affected economy adapts. That is what

has happened in Rhodesia. Its productive plant has developed versatility previously undreamed of. An expertise in patent infringement has sprung up. Some 150 products previously imported are reported to be made locally now. My own belief is that the figure is probably not far off truth and may even be accurate."

**EFFECT OF ISOLATION**

Marshall referred to former Under Secretary of State George Ball's remarks in his book, "The Discipline of Power," in which he thinks the idea of influence through ostracism is a fatuity.

"I agree," said Marshall. "My own observations in a week's visit in Salisbury a year and two months ago convinced me that the lessening of communications between ourselves and Rhodesia has done no good whatsoever for our purposes and has probably done harm. George Ball's metaphors about the advantages of ventilation in preference to closed windows applies here. To altogether too great a degree, Rhodesians' contacts with western outsiders, especially since sanctions, have been with people whom I would categorize as far-right dogmatists and the result has been to add to right wing proclivities."

He illustrated other effects of ostracism and beleaguering by recalling a conversation with a Rhodesian whose role in the frustration of sanctions has been an important one. "He had been an opponent of the Rhodesia Front and the unilateral declaration of independence, disposed to emphasize British ties rather than Rhodesian identity. The British government's action in summoning the whole world into economic hostilities against Rhodesia, and Britain's failure to assert on the local scene the authority which it claimed before the world to have, had altered that. He recalled the content of the coronation oath, and drew a parallel to the case of James II. He felt absolved from British allegiance, and thereupon, as he expressed it, devoted his energy and imagination to ways of beating sanctions. That response, multiplied many times, has been a factor in solidifying the regime's political support and in building up its administrative effectiveness."

**BRITISH ASSESSMENT OF SANCTION EFFECT ERRONEOUS**

Professor Marshall drew attention to the November 3rd meeting of the U.N. Trusteeship Committee. "The British spokesman," he said, "was reported as saying that it was the policy of his government to maintain the pressure of sanctions and international isolation in order to create a new situation in Rhodesia." He went on to declare anew Britain's aversion for using force in the area. He acknowledged that sanctions had not exerted the required degree of pressure to bring the regime to the point of settlement on terms which would be acceptable to the British government and world opinion. On the other hand, he went on, they had had very important effects in other directions in that they had denied Rhodesia the degree of development and outside capital investment essential to the territory's economy if it were not to stagnate. So long as sanctions were maintained, he concluded, Rhodesia's economy would never attain buoyancy.

"His prognosis is subject to doubt, for British assessments of the effects of sanctions have been consistently in error for four years. That, however, is not the point. As he put the matter, so long as sanctions were maintained, Rhodesia's economy would never attain buoyancy. So the awesome powers of chapter VII are employed not for the purpose envisaged—that is, the preservation of peace—but for the retributive purpose of preventing a certain economy from attaining a degree of bounce or vitality. I know of no precept in the charter to justify such a purpose."

**NYERERE BOWS TO ZANZIBAR PRESSURE**

(By Roy Lewis)

President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania is one of those leaders thrown up by the former colonial empire who, as national figures in their own countries, have been able to take a strongly moral line—not only about the proper behaviour of States, but about the proper behaviour of politicians, officials and others.

He broke with Britain because of its "double standards" in respect of Rhodesian independence compared with the independence to other colonies.

In his Arusha declaration he laid down extensive standards of public morality. In many of his speeches and lectures to his own people as "Mwalimu" (the teacher) he has emphasized the importance of a just society.

His admirers will be the more anxious for a fuller explanation of the circumstances which have led to the handing over to the Zanzibar revolutionary Government of three former Ministers in its Revolutionary Council—Othman Sharif, Kassim Hanga and Ali Mwanga Tambwe.

**NO JUSTICE**

Dr. Nyerere, of course, knows perfectly well that there is no formal system of justice or courts in the Zanzibar regime led by Abeid Karume, First Vice-President of Tanzania.

This is underlined by the announcement that when courts are constituted there will be no appeals from them to the Court of Appeal for Eastern Africa.

In these circumstances, all that we know about the results of a recent trial of 16 men for plotting against Mr. Karume is that four were put to death, 11 given 10 years' imprisonment, and one acquitted.

But I have no doubt that Othman Sharif and Kassim Hanga are among those killed. I am told there is "irrefutable evidence" of their guilt, but it is all secret and cannot—as yet—be released to the world.

Othman Sharif, until a few weeks ago, was in fact living specifically under President Nyerere's protection, though he was worried about the rumours going round about him.

Kassim Hanga, formerly Vice-President of Zanzibar and the Minister of Union Affairs in Dar es Salaam, was actually in receipt of a pension from the President, which he was given after being released from detention.

He returned from Guinea in 1967 (his wife is Guinean) with an understanding that he, too, had Mr. Nyerere's protection and with a letter from President Sekou Toure.

**FRIGHTENED MAN**

He was detained two days later. Othman Sharif, like Mr. Hanga, was a member of the Revolutionary Council which took over Zanzibar from the Sultan in the coup of January 1964. He was Minister of Education, and a frightened one—as I saw when I visited him in his house in those days.

He was relieved to become Zanzibar's High Commissioner in London when Mr. Sandys recognized the regime, and then, when the two countries united, to be sent as Tanzania's ambassador to Washington.

When Mr. Nyerere broke relations with the United States, he did not wish to return.

**ILL-TREATED**

President Nyerere persuaded him to do so in 1965, just before leaving on a world tour.

While the President was away, Mr. Karume was in charge in Tanzania and had Mr. Sharif taken to Zanzibar, where he was threatened and ill-treated in prison until he signed a "confession" that he had plotted against the Council.

When he was told of this, Mr. Nyerere was appalled. He intervened, and had Sharif brought to Dar es Salaam, where he lived for some time in State House under guard.

He was assured of the President's personal protection, and finally went to London to bring his two wives and family home.

Even then he hesitated, but got a further guarantee of his safety, and finally settled down as a veterinary officer (for some time with a police guard). Everyone who met him (as I did) knows how keen he was to keep out of politics—and how he feared that Mr. Karume was after him.

In the past year, however, much has been happening in Tanzania. A trial of a number of officials, once close to Mr. Nyerere, is in the offing, and perhaps more will emerge then.

All that is known is that a few weeks ago, Mr. Karume demanded Othman Shariff, Kasim Hange and Ali Mwange Tambwe from Mr. Nyerere, who at first refused to hand Shariff over.

Finally he promised to do so if Mr. Karume could give him irrefutable evidence of his guilt. In a day, Mr. Karume flew to Zanzibar and back, and produced what is said to be that proof.

#### ORDER SIGNED

The President then signed the order that consigned Shariff to his fate.

It must be borne in mind that President Nyerere is shackled with the impossible situation in Zanzibar. But the island's association with the mainland, far from restoring Zanzibar to normality, appears to be spreading Zanzibar's arbitrary rule to Tanganyika.

The importance of the Chinese in Zanzibar, and now in building the Tanzania-Zambia railway, may afford some explanation.

### MORATORIUM-HANOI AXIS—22 MORE AMERICAN DEAD

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the casualty list from the new Communist offensive in South Vietnam is morbid proof of the close liaison of the Reds in Hanoi with their "dear American friends" leading the moratorium in the United States.

Monday of this week, a Vietcong document captured near Saigon revealed that the Red enemy was ordered to make intensive attacks in that region to support the antiwar protest on Washington.

Last night's papers showed that in the new offensive, spurred on and encouraged by the moratorium, 22 American fighting men have been killed and 53 wounded.

It is a strange freedom of speech and dissent to kill your own people. And there can be no doubt about it, these American casualties were killed by the peace fakers of the moratorium mob just as certainly as if they had pulled the trigger themselves. In these deaths, the North Vietnamese Communists have become the agents of their "dear American friends."

The guilt—the blood of these American casualties—is on the hands of every moratorium participant. The fifth column should take off its mask of peace and parade in their black pajama uniform.

I include several related news clippings:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 10, 1969]

#### VIETNAM: FOE ORDERS ATTACKS TIMED TO U.S. MARCH

SAIGON.—A Viet Cong document found 30 miles east of Saigon calls for intensive attacks in that region this weekend to support the anti-war protest march on Washington Saturday, official sources said today.

The sources said the document was taken last Tuesday from the body of either a courier or a liaison officer who was killed in a firefight with Australian forces.

The directive, believed to have been issued by the Viet Cong's local headquarters at Vung Tau, was dated Oct. 27.

It said: "In support of the upcoming struggle of the American people for peace of South Vietnam and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam, we are to launch intensive attacks in all aspects on the enemy on Nov. 14-15."

The directive called on Viet Cong forces to kill officials representing the Saigon government in hamlets and villages "to gradually break loose the administrative grip and to accelerate the annihilation movement in support of the struggle campaign for peace which will be initiated by the American people on Nov. 15."

The allied sources said the directive may have been issued only for propaganda and psychological purposes to boost the morale of the Viet Cong and that the attacks may not be made.

North Vietnamese troops kept up their pressure in the Mekong Delta and in the Central Highlands. In the delta they ambushed a South Vietnamese convoy and mauled a platoon of militiamen. In the highlands they attacked an American airfield.

Nine militiamen were killed and seven wounded when a North Vietnamese force overran an outpost manned by 35 men near the district town of Tri Ton in the Seven Mountains region. There was no word of enemy casualties.

The North Vietnamese at the same time shelled Tri Ton and another militia position nearby, wounding 11 civilians and three militiamen.

South Vietnamese headquarters said 51 of the enemy were killed in the ambush which occurred yesterday in the same general area near the Cambodian border 125 miles southwest of Saigon. Damage to the convoy included three soldiers killed, seven wounded and six trucks destroyed.

#### REDS SET OFF MINES

Two North Vietnamese regiments which infiltrated deep into the delta last summer have lost 221 men killed in five days of fighting in the Seven mountains area and farther south at the edge of the forbidding U Minh Forest.

Government casualties total 52 killed and 178 wounded in the two areas since Thursday.

The truck convoy was shifting 155 mm. howitzers in the Seven Mountains region six miles east of the Cambodian border when the North Vietnamese set off mines and then attacked with rocket grenades and machine guns.

Armored personnel carriers accompanying the convoy returned the fire with .50-caliber machine guns, and American helicopter gunships swooped down on the enemy troops firing rockets and machine guns. Thirty-two of the North Vietnamese dead were credited to the helicopter fire.

About a dozen North Vietnamese commandos firing rockets and grenades broke into the big American helicopter strip at Ban Me Thuot, a major military operations center in the southern part of the Central Highlands 160 miles northeast of Saigon.

Eight Americans were wounded, and one truck was destroyed. But 30 helicopters

parked along the asphalt runway escaped damage when U.S. security forces quickly drove off the enemy sappers.

The body of one North Vietnamese was found inside the base, and there were numerous blood trails left by wounded enemy soldiers who managed to get away. The purpose of the attack apparently was to knock out American helicopters supporting government troops who have been fighting North Vietnamese troops in nearby areas along the Cambodian border for the past two weeks.

Elsewhere, only small clashes were reported.

The U.S. Command said there were 16 enemy rocket and mortar attacks last night, and nine caused casualties or damage.

In Saigon, police sources said police had raided a house in Cholon, Saigon's Chinese quarter, and arrested 13 members of a Viet Cong sapper squad who were planning to assassinate Army Chief of Staff Gen. Cao Van Vien and his family. The sources said they found a 57 mm recoilless rifle, 10 Chinese pistols, four rifles and about 85 pounds of explosives in the house.

Officials in Saigon said Viet Cong terrorists killed 64 persons last week, wounded 143 and kidnaped 37 others in increased attacks across South Vietnam. Twenty-three of the dead were reported to have been national police, village militia or village officials.

The U.S. Command said American troop strength has been cut to 490,700—only 6,700 over the goal of 484,000 to be reached by Dec. 15 under the current withdrawal timetable. It is the lowest U.S. troop strength since Dec. 31, 1967, when there were 485,000 Americans in Vietnam.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 13, 1969]

#### GI'S SLAIN AT DMZ IN BIG RED ATTACK

SAIGON.—North Vietnamese forces mounted their biggest single ground assault along the demilitarized zone since the U.S. bombing halt more than a year ago, losing 105 troops but killing 22 Americans and wounding 53 others, military spokesmen reported today.

Two American helicopters also were shot down. The American casualties included one helicopter crewman killed and four wounded.

The 17-hour battle—fought six miles southwest of the allied outpost at Con Thien and 3½ miles below the demilitarized zone—lasted from yesterday afternoon until dawn today.

One American company—reportedly outnumbered as much as 3 to 1 when an estimated 500 North Vietnamese soldiers attacked their night bivouac in the predawn hours today—suffered 17 men killed. The company beat off the attack with the help of tanks, armored personnel carriers, artillery and helicopter gunships.

More than 100 miles to the south, in the populous coastal lowlands south of Da Nang, 130 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong were reported killed and 58 captured in the heaviest fighting in that region in 2½ months. Allied casualties in eight actions in the area were seven Americans and three South Vietnamese killed and 26 Americans and 13 South Vietnamese wounded.

#### FIGHTING IN MEKONG DELTA

Another battle, on the edge of the U Minh forest in the Mekong Delta, brought total enemy casualties reported in the past 24 hours to 251 killed and 58 captured.

The allied commands in their weekly casualty summaries reported that the number of Americans killed in action last week totaled 97, a slight increase over the previous week, while South Vietnamese and enemy fatalities were the highest in two months. The summaries listed 476 government troops and 2,476 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese killed. Another 698 Americans were wounded.

"Enemy activity last week increased by

100 per cent compared to the previous week," said the communique from the Saigon government.

The weekly report brought the total American combat dead reported since Jan. 1, 1961, to 39,329 and the total reported for the enemy to 568,989 in that period.

Since the enemy kicked off his winter-spring offensive on Nov. 4, his attacks have been concentrated in the southern part of the central highlands and the Mekong Delta, and a spokesman for U.S. Command termed the attack yesterday afternoon below the demilitarized zone "an isolated action."

"It is something to watch," he added, "but as of now, we couldn't attach any significance to it."

The fighting broke out shortly after noon Tuesday when troops of the 1st Brigade of the U.S. 5th Mechanized Infantry Division searching an area where there had been fighting Tuesday crashed into North Vietnamese forces.

Heavy machine-gun and rifle fire was exchanged, and the Americans blasted away with 90mm guns on tanks and heavy machine guns mounted on armored personnel carriers. Helicopter gunships and artillery also pounded the North Vietnamese positions.

#### U.S. FIREPOWER SUPERIOR

The fighting continued until dusk, then the enemy troops pulled back under the superior American firepower. But shortly after midnight, an estimated 500 North Vietnamese attacked under the cover of a mortar barrage and smashed into the night bivouac of the American forces with rocket grenades and dynamite bombs.

Again the Americans fought back with their armor, helicopter gunships, artillery and a twin-engine AC47 gunship, and "no enemy penetrated the perimeter," a U.S. communique said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Thursday, Nov. 13, 1969]

#### BROADCAST PUTS AUTHOR BARNET AT HANOI TALKS

Hanoi Radio named Washington author and historian Richard J. Barnet yesterday as a participant in a meeting to register support of "massive (American) demonstrations against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam."

The meeting, in Hanoi Tuesday night, was held by the Vietnam Peace Committee and the Vietnam Committee For Solidarity With the American People. Hanoi Radio said the chairman of the latter group, identified as Prof. Hoang Minh Giam, "warmly hailed the planned massive antiwar demonstrations of the American people . . ."

Barnet, who served in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the Kennedy administration, is co-director, with Marcus Raskin, of the Institute for Policy Studies here.

#### TO LEAVE FRIDAY

According to informed sources, Barnet arrived in North Vietnam last Friday, and is expected to leave there this Friday. Raskin said Barnet's mission is "to inform himself of the specific negotiating position of North Vietnam," and also to write about his trip there. Few Americans have been granted visas to enter North Vietnam in recent years.

Barnett is on the advisory board of a newly formed news agency named Dispatch, formed to provide "in-depth reporting on important issues and events for national newspapers and the collegiate press."

He has been highly critical, in writing and speaking, about U.S. policy in Vietnam. His latest book, *The Economy of Death*, is an analysis of U.S. defense spending and concepts.

#### REMARKS PARAPHRASED

The Hanoi broadcast identified Barnet and William Meyers (a New York attorney) as "the American lawyers delegation now visiting Vietnam." Their remarks at the meeting were reported only in paraphrased form.

Hanoi Radio said Barnett and Meyers "expressed the American people's solidarity with the just struggle of the Vietnamese people and urged an immediate and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. They affirmed that the Vietnamese people's struggle against the U.S. war is in conformity with the aspiration and interests of the American people."

Neither Barnett's associates or family here could supply any independent account of the remarks attributed to him in Hanoi. Barnet is expected back in Washington early next week.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,  
Nov. 14, 1969]

#### SOVIET PRESS PRINTS DETAILS OF ANTIWAR MARCH HERE

Moscow.—The Soviet press today published detailed accounts of U.S. Moratorium demonstrations against what it called the "dirty war" in Vietnam.

Tass, the Soviet news agency, transmitted bylined articles from its Washington and New York offices, including a report on the "March Against Death" at Arlington Cemetery.

"The muffled beat of drums heralded the demonstrations at Arlington Cemetery," Tass said. "The echo of this grievous and alarming sound swept over Arlington Cemetery where many of those who died ingloriously in the Vietnamese war were buried."

The agency also quoted a variety of speakers including Dr. Benjamin Spock, and said that "protest meetings against the dirty war in Vietnam were held during the day in front of government offices and in city squares."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Nov. 14, 1969]

#### HANOI PRAISES PROTESTS AGAINST WAR IN THE UNITED STATES (By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG, November 13.—North Vietnam has hailed the American antiwar demonstrations scheduled for this weekend as the largest and broadest in the history of the United States or any other "imperialist" country.

An editorial in Hanoi's authoritative newspaper *Nhan Dan*, transmitted here today, also accused President Nixon of accelerating a "war of aggression" in Vietnam despite his pledge to end the conflict.

Commenting on the President's Nov. 3 speech, the editorial said that instead of coping with "the waves of indignation of the the American people," it "further exposed his obdurate, bellicose and aggressive stand on the Vietnam issue."

The editorial went on to praise "genuine Americans" who have "courageously spoken out in the name of the conscience of America and vehemently condemned the immoral, illegal and losing war." It added:

"The patriotic struggle of the Vietnamese people is precisely the struggle of the American people for peace and justice."

#### ATTACKS INCREASING

The *Nhan Dan* editorial came amid a rising number of recent Vietnamese Communist statements attacking the Nixon administration and praising the opponents of the President's Vietnam policies.

Reflected in all these statements is the apparent conviction of the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front (Vietcong)

leaders that growing pressures in the U.S. against White House policies will eventually force Mr. Nixon to make concessions to the Communists.

In many ways, observers here believe, the Communists regard the expanding American peace movement to be similar to the disaffection with the Indochina war that built up in France before 1954, when the French government agreed to come to terms with the Vietminh.

These observers point out, however, that the major difference between the Indochina war and the current conflict in Vietnam is that the Communists defeated the French army at Dienbienphu. In Vietnam at the moment, the Communists are far from a military victory.

#### AMERICAN QUOTED

Still, evidently hoping to contribute to the erosion of the Nixon administration, prominent North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front spokesmen have been holding meetings within the past few days to encourage U.S. antiwar activists.

An official Vietnam News Agency dispatch received here today, for example, reported that a Hanoi meeting on Tuesday featured Richard J. Barnet, co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies—a private institution that concerns itself with public policy matters—and William Meyers, a director of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam.

The dispatch quoted Barnet as having said at the meeting that, "while war is raging abroad, our cities are falling apart, race is spurred against race and our youth continue to despair."

According to the Hanoi agency, Barnet concluded with the message that "the Vietnamese will continue to fight against the aggressors, the same aggressors that we will continue to fight in our own country."

In a dispatch transmitted here yesterday, the National Liberation Front's Gia Phong news agency cited an "open letter" sent to the "progressive" American people last week by the Rev. Joseph Marie Ho Hue Ba, a Catholic priest in the Vietcong Central Committee.

Stressing a theme often used by the Communists, the letter said that "once the United States has put an end to its war in Vietnam and taken all its troops home, good conditions will be created for the friendship between the Vietnamese and American peoples to develop fruitfully."

Now 71, Ho Hue Ba is a veteran nationalist activist who claims to have been a member of the Vietnamese Catholic hierarchy. Catholic officials in Saigon say, however, that there is no record of his having held a church office.

Today's *Nhan Dan* editorial simultaneously criticized President Nixon's "Vietnamization" plan as being aggressive and scorned it as potentially ineffective.

On the one hand, the editorial said, the aim of the plan is "merely to make Vietnamese fight Vietnamese and carry out the U.S. neo-colonialist policy in South Vietnam by means of the puppet army and the Saigon puppet administration."

At the same time, the editorial went on, the plan is "not the way to end the war" since "how can the puppet army stand on its feet once the American expeditionary corps has withdrawn."

The editorial also charged the President with threatening antiwar demonstrators with "downright repression" and, among other things, menacing Sen. J. W. Fulbright in "McCarthyite style." It said:

"It is clear that those who are dishonoring the United States are not the Vietnamese people who are defending their independence . . . but actually the Nixon ruling clique."

SMU STUDENTS TAKE POSITIVE  
APPROACH IN EXPRESSION

**HON. JAMES M. COLLINS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, a program is underway at Southern Methodist University which was activated by the students. Led by Randall Krelling in the law school, these students had rather express themselves this way than through sensationalism. They are forming a group known as the University Community Caucus which will have regular meetings with a cross section of business and community leaders. Their interest is in working for constructive change and having the benefit of an interchange of ideas. It goes back to the motto of the great Texas hero Davy Crockett who said, "Be sure you are right, then go ahead."

There is a feeling among students today that any change is an improvement. A few generations ago we were interested in seeing our youngsters being provided with shoes and being able to give them a haircut. The new expression is to go barefooted and let your hair grow long because this is a change. But the question comes up, is it an improvement?

Too many college students are quick to tell us what is wrong with all of our communities. All of their time is spent in criticism and negativism, but they do not pause to add what is right or how we can constructively build a better society.

Southern Methodist University has one of the highest academic standards in the Nation. It makes it difficult for the in-

stitution to qualify star athletes for entrance, but I am delighted to see the fine caliber of students such as Randy Krelling of Peoria, Ill., who have such an excellent commonsense approach.

The future belongs to the younger generation, but they must face the challenge with responsible programs for development.

SMU has started something with the University Community Caucus.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats—well over two-thirds of the Members of the House of Representatives—have sponsored the resolution supporting the President in his efforts to bring about a just peace in Vietnam.

I share the President's pride in the fact that this House can—for the moment—shed its partisan differences, close its ranks, and stand by the Chief Executive in a time of crisis. In the words of the President:

As one who has been a Member of both bodies, I understand and respect differences of opinion in both foreign and domestic policy. . . But I also know this—and this goes back to that 22 years ago—I do know that when the security of America is involved, when peace for America and for the world is involved, when the lives of our young men

are involved, we are not Democrats, we are not Republicans, we are Americans.

The President remembers his days in this body and his feeling of kinship that still exists with its Members is apparent. Consequently, he knows how very much we appreciated his personal appearance before this body thanking us for our support.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT

**HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the massive support of President's Nixon's program for peace in Vietnam, in my opinion, marks the turning point in this country's efforts toward an immediate and honorable peace.

I am proud to have taken part in the bipartisan resolution sponsored by over 300 Members of the House of Representatives, voicing approval of Mr. Nixon's proposals for peace.

Additionally, the great ground swell of support and encouragement from the American people, in their unswerving determination to "stand up and be counted," can only serve notice to the North Vietnamese and Vietcong that those misguided people calling for an immediate withdrawal of American forces do not speak for the majority of Americans.

I predict that the next 12 months will bring a drastic change in the Southeast Asia picture.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, November 17, 1969**

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*With my whole heart have I sought Thee: let me not wander from Thy commandments.—Psalm 119: 10.*

O God, who art the loving Father of all mankind, make Thy presence known to us through the hours of this day. Merge our moods and our motives into Thine own mold that honesty, integrity, and uprightness shall mark all our endeavors. Grant unto us the peace of those who put their trust in Thee, the strength of those who obey Thy commandments, and the love of those who walk in Thy way.

Give our citizens everywhere the mind and heart to heed the call of patriotic duty, to love our country with undying devotion, and to so live that the accent of our actions shall be in the spirit of co-operation. While there may be dissent let there not be dissension; while there may be differences of opinion may there not be differences in relationships, and while there might be disagreements let them not develop divisions among us.

Out of the agitation of these days may there come into being a unity of spirit which will strengthen our efforts for peace with justice, peace with honor, and peace with freedom for all.

In the spirit of the Prince of Peace, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 13, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4293) entitled "An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2577. An act to provide additional mortgage credit, and for other purposes.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES  
OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas to testify on Wednesday, November 19, 1969, in San Antonio, Tex., in the criminal case of the United States of America against Albert Fuentes, Jr., and Edward J. Montez.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send the subpoena to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Subpena To Testify—U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. ALBERT FUENTES, JR., AND EDWARD J. MONTEZ—No. SA 69 CR 74

To Henry B. Gonzalez, 238 W. Kings Hwy., San Antonio, Texas or through his administrative assistant, Luz Tamez, Federal Bldg., San Antonio, Texas.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the