

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SWEET ADELINES VISIT HAWAII

## HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, one of my most pleasant recent activities was to welcome the 23d annual International Sweet Adeline Convention and Quartet Competition to Hawaii. Prior to the convention a group of members visited with me to discuss plans and preparations for their visit to my State, and at that time I extended the hospitality of Hawaii to the entire membership.

I was especially pleased that the convention was a great success and wish the Sweet Adelines every good fortune in the future.

The organization is sometimes described as the female equivalent of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America. At this point in the RECORD I am pleased to insert my remarks concerning the Sweet Adelines visit to Hawaii, along with letters to the editor of the Honolulu Advertiser and Honolulu Star Bulletin, published in the November 26 and November 27 issues, respectively:

## STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE PATSY T. MINK

I am proud that the Diamond Head Chapter of Sweet Adelines, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii, will hostess the Twenty-third Annual International Sweet Adeline Convention and Quartet Competition, October 29 through November 2, 1969.

Sweet Adelines, Inc. is an international, non-profit independent, educational and service organization with approximately 20,000 women dedicated to the promotion, instruction and enjoyment of 4-part barber-shop style close harmony for women. Their theme is "Harmonize The World".

Five hundred active chapters exist through the United States, Canada and the Panama Canal Zone. Chapter members attend regularly scheduled chorus rehearsals. Quartets are formed within each chapter.

A community service organization, Sweet Adelines offer their specialized chorus and quartet talent for entertainment at civic events and charitable functions. In addition, the group strives to promote harmony—both vocally and spiritually—among all women.

The members maintain and support a staffed international headquarters at Tulsa, Oklahoma, where the organization was formed in 1947. The International President is Mrs. Helen Ryan of Decatur, Illinois.

Sweet Adelines, Inc. publishes its own magazine, musical arrangements and instructional items. International conventions, competitions, music schools and regional meetings are held on a regularly scheduled basis.

Convention activities will begin on Sunday, October 26, when the 13-women International Board of Directors begins its three-days of meetings held for conducting the business of the organization.

The Regents of each of the 15 geographical regions of Sweet Adelines will meet concurrently for the purpose of exchanging ideas in regard to governing the individual regions. The highlight of the Convention will be

the Quartet Competition for the selection of the 1969 "Queens of Harmony" on Saturday, November 1, 1969. The Quartet Competition will be held at the beautiful Honolulu International Center.

In order to be eligible to compete in the International Quartet Competition, each quartet must have placed first or second in quartet competitions on the regional level. Each of the 15 geographic regions has quartet competition in the spring of each year, producing its regional chorus champions as well as representatives for the International Quartet Competition. This year will see approximately 43 quartets from all over the country vying for the title "Queens of Harmony".

Quartets are judged in the categories of music, sound, expression and showmanship by a panel of organizationally trained judges—one in each category for regional competition. The regional championship chorus is judged in the same categories. For the International Quartet Competition, there are three judges per category.

"Queens of Harmony" is the quartet accumulating the most points during the competition session. All quartets sing in Quartet Finals, Thursday, October 27. The 20 placing highest, compete on Friday, October 28 in the Semi-Finals, and the 10 with the highest scores compete in Saturday's Finals. The "Queens of Harmony", during their year's reign will sing on shows throughout the country, and many of these quartets have entertained our servicemen overseas.

This is the first time a Sweet Adeline Convention has been held in Hawaii. For many of the Sweet Adelines, who represent the women of our Nation, it will be their first look at the beautiful Aloha State. These women, from all walks of life—teachers, nurses, homemakers, secretaries, professionals, all have a common bond: a love of music and harmony.

The Diamond Head Chapter has a membership of approximately 40 active women, whose President is Carmela Blank of Honolulu. The Chorus is directed by Pat Chellin of Honolulu.

The Diamond Head Chapter has worked hard to insure a successful convention and have arranged tours for their sister Sweet Adelines to the many beautiful islands and monuments in our 50th State. I am confident that the Sweet Adelines will leave this Convention with dreams of a return visit.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser,  
Nov. 26, 1968]

## SONG OF APPRECIATION

The 40 women whose views are represented in this letter are among the proudest and happiest residents of Hawaii. We are the Diamond Head Chorus, only Hawaii chapter of Sweet Adelines, Inc., the four-part harmony organization for women that recently concluded its week-long International Convention and Quartet Competition at the Ilikai and the H.I.C. Concert Hall.

As hostesses for the more than 2,000 members and guests who came from the Mainland for this convention, we had told them about the "Aloha Spirit" before they came. We are thrilled and happy to report that the cordial welcome and warm personal experiences they had while here said much more about Hawaii's aloha than all the words we used . . .

Though our medium is normally music, this letter will have to serve as our sincere thanks to your readers for whatever part they may have had in our visitors' enthusiasm. We are enormously proud, grateful and

eager to sing you our thanks next time you hear us.

Mrs. VIRGIL BLANK,  
President.

Mrs. ALFRED STORY,  
General Chairman, 1969 Convention.  
Mrs. RAYMOND ENGLE,  
Cochairman, Public Relations.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,  
Nov. 27, 1969]

## HAPPY ADELINE

Sir: The 40 women whose views are represented in this letter are among the proudest and happiest residents of Hawaii. We are the Diamond Head Chorus, only Hawaii chapter of Sweet Adelines, Inc., the four-part harmony organization for women that recently concluded its week-long International Convention and Quartet Competition at the Ilikai and the H.I.C. Concert Hall.

As hostesses for the more than 2,000 members and guests that came from the Mainland for this Convention, we had told them about the "Aloha Spirit" before they came. We are thrilled and happy to report that the cordial welcome and warm personal experiences they had while here said more about Hawaii's aloha than all the words we used.

Perhaps because Sweet Adelines are singers they are fun to have around. The stories many told us about outstanding thoughtfulness and unusual generosity shown by our people in Hawaii warmed and cheered us and made so proud Hawaii is our home! And their standing ovation when we presented our Salute to Hawaii's Music demonstrated the aloha THEY have for us and for you!

Though our medium is normally music, his letter will have to serve as our sincere thanks to your readers for whatever part they may have had in our visitors' enthusiasm. We are enormously proud, grateful and eager to SING you our thanks next time you hear us!

Mrs. VIRGIL BLANK,  
President.

Mrs. ALFRED STORY,  
General Chairman, 1969 Convention.  
Mrs. RAYMOND ENGLE,  
Cochairman, Public Relations.

PRAYER BREAKFAST ADDRESS BY  
SENATOR TALMADGE

## HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, a few days ago I had the privilege and pleasure of attending a prayer breakfast at which the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) was the leader and speaker.

His remarks were so inspiring and timely that I thought as many people as possible should have the opportunity to read and ponder them. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR TALMADGE

Americans are now in the midst of a time for giving and receiving. But more than

that, this is a time for brotherhood when people the world over pray for peace and good will.

Last week, we sat at the table of great abundance and offered thanks for God's blessings on each of us and on this nation. We took time from our work to recognize that all good things come from God . . . to acknowledge what God has meant to the American nation . . . and to seek Divine Guidance in all the things yet to be done.

From Thanksgiving on, we move into the holy season of Christmas, when we proclaim our faith in the Christ child and in the hope that He brought to mankind.

Thanksgiving and Christmas are times to think seriously of the heritage of America. It is a religious heritage. It is based on the ideal that "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

So it has been since the Founding Fathers first touched these shores. So it is today, when the power and the influence of the United States reaches to every corner of the world.

God governs in the affairs of men and state. During this season . . . especially at this critical period in American history . . . all of us would do well to strengthen our vow never to depart from this principle.

Because these are times that demand courage and conviction, perhaps greater than ever before, let us also pray for a renewal of faith.

And in so doing, may we invoke inspiration from the deeply religious men of God who set the course for this nation, that has come to be the most free and prosperous in all history.

Let us call forth the statesmanship of George Washington, who paid homage in his First Inaugural Address "to the Great Author of every public and private good."

Let us endeavor to re-ignite the patriotism of Patrick Henry, who preferred liberty over life, and who knew that the American colonists could call upon a strength far greater than their own.

Let us nurture the wisdom of Benjamin Franklin, the oldest and wisest of the framers of the Constitution. Major William Pierce, a Georgia delegate to the Constitutional Convention, wrote thumbnail sketches of his contemporaries. He said of Franklin:

"All the operations of nature he seems to understand, the very heavens obey him, and the clouds yield up their lightning to be imprisoned in his rod."

People throughout all the world and this nation could profit today from the reverence of this great man.

The American society has changed much since Franklin's day.

As we continue to grow and prosper, it will always be subject to change, some of it rapid and even drastic. So advanced has our society become, that we can now reach into the very heavens themselves, and just last week men returned from a second voyage to the moon.

But in spite of all of this, the principles in which Franklin believed and to which he dedicated his life and soul are the same today as they were more than 200 years ago when this nation was being founded. In fact, they are the same today as they were when pronounced to Moses atop Mt. Sinai.

Principles of morality . . . personal conduct . . . and individual responsibility . . . of right and wrong . . . Godliness . . . stand like a rock for all ages.

I say this in full recognition of the fact there are movements afoot in this country that have to do with a so-called "new morality." Many of the followers of this doctrine say down with the old, and up with the new.

I say, my friends, that if this country needs anything today, it needs above all to return to what we cherish as the "old morality."

In the midst of record prosperity . . . at

the pinnacle of unparalleled national greatness . . . and for all our freedom I know of no other time in modern history when such strife and discord and even violence, were rampant in the land.

I am reminded of the words of the angel Gabriel when he spoke to the Lord in the play, "Green Pastures":

"Everything what's nalled down is coming loose."

We see moral values falling to the ground. They are being trampled by the high and low—

By prominent figures in government, past and present;

By courts that act like justice means permissiveness and indulgence;

By criminals who have sent the nation's crime rate sky high;

By parents who cannot, and apparently don't even try, to control their children; and

By a great horde whose chief claim to fame is a dirty beard, long hair, and a proclivity for spouting meaningless mumbo-jumbo.

We see lessons of history ignored. We see our national heritage scorned. We see tradition cast aside.

At a time when there ought to be national unity and strength, there is strident discord that has weakened the backbone of this nation. We found it increasingly difficult to deal with national problems. We are foundering abroad . . . in Vietnam and in our relations with other nations.

Such is the state of the American nation today. This cannot be denied or ignored. But to succumb to despair is to further ignore the lessons of the past. To forsake all hope is to back down in abject surrender.

There has been worse trials, and this has never been the way of America. It is not now the way.

The confidence that I have is based on my great faith in the fundamental strength of the American people. My faith is based upon what I know to be the people's faith. The vast overwhelming majority of Americans still subscribe to the ideal that ours is yet a nation under God.

And in this abiding belief lies the well-spring of the strength and determination of the American nation.

A hallmark of the American government and our society has always been this fact:

Out of adversity, trial and tribulation come forth renewed resolve. We have seen this truth become manifest throughout all the history of our nation.

Emerson wrote:

"When it is dark enough, men see the stars."

In crisis after crisis, domestic and foreign, the best in our people has always emerged . . . always under the sure hand of God.

Let us seek consolation in the exhortation of Moses to the people of Israel on their dangerous and difficult journey to the Promised Land.

"When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shalt be obedient unto his voice; (for the Lord thy God is a merciful God), he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he sware to them." (Deuteronomy 4: 30.)

We need but to continue to search for divine guidance. We need but to believe as did the poet, that hope springs eternal.

The Apostle Paul admonished us "to rejoice in the hope of the glory of God." And he also wrote:

"We glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulations worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope." (Romans 5: 6.)

So during this Christmas season, on the eve of a new year, may we find new hope in the strength of the American people. It is derived from faith in God. It can . . . if we

will but let it . . . work wonders, and assure our nation of the triumph of right over wrong . . . of lasting security over dissolution.

But let us never forget, that for all of our troubles, social, economic, and international, we have much for which to be thankful. In the words of the poet George Herbert:

"O God, Thou hast given so much to us, give one thing more—a grateful heart."

## WRONG TIME, WRONG SALE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President recently proposed the ultimate sale of uranium enrichment plants at the Atomic Energy Commission in Oak Ridge and other localities to private electric power interests.

This proposal is not in the public interest and in this connection I place in the RECORD herewith an excellent editorial from the Tullahoma News which points up the importance of retaining these plants as a part of the AEC facilities.

The editorial follows:

[From the Tullahoma (Tenn.) News, Nov. 14, 1969]

### WRONG TIME, WRONG SALE

President Nixon's proposal for the eventual sale of the K-25 gaseous diffusion plant at Oak Ridge and two other plants that enrich uranium for use in atomic reactors is incredible for several reasons.

It is incredible, for one thing, that the President would not realize by now that the American people will not countenance what amounts to giveaways of our national resources to big industry.

It is incredible, for another thing, that the President would not have profited from the Dixon-Yates controversy that erupted some years ago when Mr. Nixon was vice president.

And, it is incredible that, now as President, Mr. Nixon would lack the information he surely must have concerning the taxpayers' investment in the three gaseous diffusion plants and to the potential they continue to hold for future uses of atomic energy.

His proposal calls for the government to continue operating the plants for the present, but for the facilities, which need modernizing, eventually to be sold to private industry. Apparently one reason is that, with the need for nuclear arms declining and with increasing use of nuclear-fired electric power generators, it is supposedly time for the government to divest itself of such atomic facilities.

But it is hardly believable that, with non-military uses of atomic energy still in the developing stage, such a major facility as the gaseous diffusion plants—which achieved a real breakthrough for both the United States and international science in World War II and which are still restricted from public view of their operations—should essentially be abandoned by the nation and turned over to private interests.

Even if the plants are approaching the need for modernization, the fact remains that they have operated for about a quarter of a century with an enviable degree of automated efficiency. Since the job is far from done on the peaceful use of atomic

energy, the plants obviously have not outlived their usefulness; to the contrary, it should seem equally obvious that their role as production and research tools can only be enhanced in the future. They should be modernized as needed and kept as such invaluable public institutions.

As we have said before, the automated gaseous diffusion process, in addition to being a way for producing the material from which atomic power is created, also holds strong promise for pointing the way for making an automated combination nuclear plant that will both produce electricity and efficiently remove salt from ocean water. This has enormous potential for the future of the whole world, and especially for making productive regions out of naturally arid regions like the Middle East.

This is only one example of the type of technological breakthroughs that can benefit all the people, which can be produced by natural resource facilities founded by public investment. There is a direct comparison with the power that has been harnessed from America's water resources, a benefit that might have been lost had not the battle over Muscle Shoals been won in the early 1930's and the Tennessee Valley Authority and other agencies been established.

It is because of the nature of the basic resource in the atom and the power in it that is yet untapped that the gaseous diffusion plants and their companion institutions are among the facilities which are far better developed and operated under public rather than private ownership. Despite the occasional oratory of the far right, this has been shown to be workable and fully compatible with the American economic system.

Top officials of President Nixon's administration have indicated that they are going to go all-out to defeat Sen. Albert Gore in the senatorial race next year, and the leading contender appears to be Rep. William Brock of Chattanooga, a Republican.

But GOP efforts to place a second Republican in the Senate from Tennessee are going to be beaten from the start if the Nixon administration persists in its course of abandoning what is really a priceless atomic energy facility to private business interests.

The Welfare of the country and the realities of the Tennessee political scene show, as both Rep. Joe L. Ewins and Sen. Gore have indicated, that this is the wrong time to come up with another Nixon-Dixon-Yates deal.

#### SENATOR SCOTT HAILS RELEASE OF ISRAELI CITIZENS

##### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased that negotiations to effect the release and repatriation of the two Israelis detained in Syria following the hijacking of a TWA airliner last August have proven successful.

On September 16, I joined 31 other Senators in condemning this criminal and wanton hijacking and in urging the immediate release of Mr. Saleh Mousalem and Professor Samueloff by the Syrian Government.

Due to the efforts of our Department of State, the International Red Cross, and others, these men will be reunited with their families.

#### AFTER THE MORATORIA WHAT'S THE NEXT STEP?

##### HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are unaware of the true implications of the continued revolutionary demonstrations in the streets of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Holmes Alexander, a respected syndicated columnist writing for the Indianapolis, Ind., Star, has provided his readers with a true picture of what went on here in mid-October and mid-November.

Mr. Alexander mingled with the mob here last month and his observations are highly revealing and offer a chilling insight into the purposes and motivations of those guiding these uprisings against our elected Government.

The article follows:

HOLMES ALEXANDER SAYS: AFTER THE MORATORIA WHAT'S THE NEXT STEP?

WASHINGTON.—Jack Knight of the Knight newspapers, a venerable mogul of the press, says that civil disorder has reached the stage of "insurrection." Spiro Agnew, second citizen of the land and privy to all the information that the President gets, compares the uprising to that which eventually overthrew the Russian Czar in 1917. Writing more wisely than I knew a few weeks back, I questioned whether this nation is any longer "governable" by democratic consent.

This month, as in October and November on a rising rate of revolutionary strategy, the capital city will be invaded (there is no other word) by anti-government forces, and invested (the military term must be used) by guardsmen and Federal troops in support of the metropolitan police.

Plain speaking is necessary. Your capital city is in a state of siege and countersiege. This is not how self-government works. It is how self-government breaks down. Month by month, phase by phase, the screws of revolutionary strategy tighten. Only the ignorant deny it. Only the bamboozled take it lightly. Only the collaborators pretend it isn't so.

The country is ungovernable, but not as yet uncontrollable. That was the revelation in the mid-November three-day siege when upward of 300,000 ill-wishers saturated the city and played with this seat of government as a cruel but cunning cat plays with a helpless mouse.

To repeat, during some 36 hours the town was not governed, but it was controlled. The honor system of the Constitution, which pledges free speech and peaceable assembly on the assumption of good faith by the citizens, was mocked and vulgarized. An ad hoc garrison state, a Caesarian deployment of military legions, kept the lid on, and conducted a countersiege, and maintained a strained discipline.

Advance detachments of infantry were entrenched inside of nearly every government building; the White House was barricaded with end-to-end vehicles, behind which troops kept watch on the President's life; reconnaissance helicopters hovered above; reinforcements stood by at the armory. "The ghetto might blow," a Justice Department official had told me, as it "blew" from spontaneous combustion in 1968 when a Negro leader was killed. Herb Klein, the President's communications chief, had that event in mind when he later told a TV panel:

"Had it not been for the highly effective

work of the Washington police, of the National Guard . . . for the reserve forces of the Defense Department and the complete co-operation of all elements of the government . . . the damage to Washington would have been greater than (in) the riots after the death of Martin Luther King."

Thus the insurrection was contained—what choice was there?—by para-military tactics. This—in America? Yes, and the Caesarian legions were able to show "restraint" only because the cleverly led demonstrators refrained from major provocation.

If you were in the streets, as I was, you could watch the cat-and-mouse game of the revolutionaries. They had the numbers to crack the city's vertebrae at will, but meanwhile they were teasing. It was "Yes, sir," with many a cherubic smile amid the greasy hair when I talked with groups on Friday and Saturday mornings. As an experiment, I struck an American flag in my breast pocket and went out again at noon and evening. The showing of the colors made the difference, and now it was "Hi, pop," and "Howzit, dad," and "the kids" were not at all polite to this elderly man. Reporters came in from the cold to eat and drink on these two days, and I heard them tell how well-mannered and non-violent the demonstration was, with a couple of exceptional outbursts by the irresponsibles. Editorialists for next morning swallowed the bait, hook, line and sinker.

Looking toward December, I venture a different report. This insurrection has the planning of a phased campaign. The melange of Gandhi non-violence and Bolshevik violence in one of calculation. The smiles on the young faces were sycophant, not sincere, toward the press. These were not attractive "kids," but unkempt in their persons, ugly in their garbs, licentious in their morals, incredibly and unquotably foul-mouthed, and (as nobody else has said) often scared that their leaders would provoke the "brutality" of nightstick, cannister and gunfire.

Moratorium in October, mobilization in November, and in December and thereafter, what?

#### A DREAM COME TRUE

##### HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last Sunday, it was my pleasure to speak at the dedication of the Ida Long Goodman Memorial Library in St. John, Kans.

For Mrs. Goodman, it was a 28-year-long dream come true.

Mrs. Goodman, who celebrated her 81st birthday anniversary on Saturday, is a good example of the type of person the Nation needs more of: She is dedicated to people.

Her gift to her hometown included the land and more than \$200,000 which made possible the construction of a combination school-municipal library. Attentive to details, she also worked hard to secure the passage of the special legislation required to build the library.

An article published in the December 6 Wichita Eagle-Beacon recounts some of the dedicated work this amazing woman has performed as a teacher and educator. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

**A DREAM COME TRUE**  
(By Elma Byrne)

ST. JOHN, KANS.—Mrs. Ida Long Goodman has had a dream and a goal for 28 years. She has wanted her "home community" to have a library, "a new and beautiful library."

And now that dream has come true as this southwestern Kansas farm community observes the formal dedication Sunday of the \$300,000 Ida Long Goodman Memorial Library.

A native of St. John, Mrs. Goodman said: "My parents were a pioneer family here and lived here all their lives. I had an inherited debt to this community."

But the building of this library was really more than a payment of a debt—it was the further fulfillment of Mrs. Goodman's life which has been directed to education.

Mrs. Goodman was a rural schoolteacher for eight years in the St. John area. "I enjoyed teaching and I realized that to hold a good position I had to further my education," she explained.

And so she received a bachelor of philosophy of education degree from University of Chicago in 1921. After graduation she taught at Bryn Mawr College and Omaha University.

She was head of the training school department of education at Chicago Teachers College and supervising principal of two schools in Elmhurst, Ill.

She has a master's degree from University of Chicago. When she moved to Denver in 1947 she taught for nine years at two independent schools there.

And for nine years she has voluntarily taught English to foreign born adults who are patients at Denver's National Jewish Hospital.

"The reason I became interested in library work was that I recognized when a child was called 'dull' it was because of a reading problem. My philosophy is that there are no dull children," Mrs. Goodman said.

She added, "A child becomes frustrated, confused and discouraged in his reading and consequently there are many dropouts and children who fail. I believe a child can correct his own reading ills through reading library books."

In 1941 when she and her husband, William Roe Goodman, retired to St. John "we tried to develop some kind of library," she said.

But construction on the library was not begun until January of 1969 and then only after special legislation allowing funds for a school-municipal library, Mrs. Goodman explained.

The library is a combined city and school library.

"I never thought this would come about. It doesn't seem true to me. Mr. Goodman would be so proud. He would be sky high," she said with a hint of tears in her eyes.

Mrs. Goodman gave a \$215,000 gift toward the construction of the library which cost \$340,000 when completed last November, according to Evert Garvin, attorney to Mrs. Goodman and the St. John school board.

Garvin said Mrs. Goodman's gift included the site on which the library is built and most of the construction costs. He added that at her death another \$100,000 will be given toward any existing debts on the building.

Mrs. Goodman said that the completion of the library was "a wonderful way" to celebrate her 81st birthday on Saturday.

"This library is the greatest thing that has happened to our school and community in a long time," said George Highfill, superintendent of schools.

Garvin added that the previous library, established in 1925, was housed on the top floor of the old brick city hall building. "It was makeshift, stacked full and there was no people room," he said.

Highfill explained that the some 400 elementary and high school students from the St. John school transported the 30,000 volumes from the city library and 8,000 volumes from the school libraries into the new library in less than a week.

The Ida Long Goodman Memorial Library is dedicated to the memory of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Noah Long, and her husband. It sets on a site one-half block from the town square and directly adjacent to the school.

The most impressive aspect of its brown brick and metal exterior is the antiqued, avocado main door with carvings of the zodiac. At the northwest corner of the library is a brick wall enclosed garden area.

The building is 60-feet by 90-feet, fully carpeted and air conditioned. The main floor walls and carpet are a soft gold tone and the basement is done in red carpet and rose beige walls. The major pieces of furniture are done in matched grain mahogany.

The main floor has an adult and a children's section. The adult section includes a lounge, periodical room, study carrels, a curriculum library and two conference rooms.

One conference room is named the Mater Kansas Room after Mrs. Leslie Mater, longtime city librarian who will retire after the first of the year. The room contains a collection of Kansas history books and artifacts.

The other conference room is the Ida Long Goodman Room and it will contain some of her personal art holdings.

A story well is the outstanding attraction of the children's section and it is for the use of kindergarten through third graders. It consists of four carpeted stairs on which the children sit while they listen to storybook readings from a teacher situated on a stage area.

The basement is more than that as there is a student lounge and community room in addition to the storage and maintenance rooms. The community room is used for meetings and art exhibits. Exhibits can be hung on three of the walls that are covered from floor to ceiling with display board.

Architects for the library were Miller, Hiett, Dronberger, Arbuckle & Walker of Hutchinson, Kans.

Sunday's dedicatory ceremony will begin at 1:30 p.m. and will include an address by Kansas Sen. Bob Dole.

Perhaps the appreciation stated on Sunday's program best expresses the feelings of most of the 1,808 residents of St. John. That is:

"The Ida Long Goodman Memorial Library stands today and will continue to stand as evidence that Mrs. Goodman loved those who preceded her, those who are contemporary with her, and those who are to follow after, and that she wished to make life richer and better today, and in the days to come."

**HAYNSWORTH AFTERMATH**

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of the behind-the-scenes congressional maneuvering, which led to the defeat of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth for a position on the U.S. Supreme Court, is reported in the November 26, 1969, Dallas Morning News by its chief

Washington correspondent, Robert E. Baskin.

The article sums up Judge Haynsworth's defeat with a quote from a leading labor lawyer that "the defeat of Haynsworth was simply a rejection of a man for ideological and sectional reasons. The case against his ethical standards was of no consequence." The article follows:

**LAWYER LAMENTS HAYNSWORTH DEFEAT**  
(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—There are a good many afterthoughts and soul-searchings in Washington on the Haynsworth case.

While perhaps a majority of the liberal-labor element in town is rejoicing that President Nixon's attempt to put a conservative Southerner on the Supreme Court failed, there are others who regard the matter much more soberly.

A leading labor lawyer, who may reflect rather general views in legal circles, expressed dismay over the Senate's rejection of Clement F. Haynsworth by a 55-to-45-vote margin.

The lawyer, who must remain unnamed, has known Haynsworth for many years and had been an adversary lawyer to him before Haynsworth became judge and later practiced in Haynsworth's jurisdiction.

He regards the South Carolina judge as one of the most honest and able men he has ever known in his field.

**CASE OF NO CONSEQUENCES**

"The defeat of Haynsworth," he said the other day, "was simply a rejection of a man for ideological and sectional reasons. The case against his ethical standards was of no consequence."

"I disassociated myself completely from labor's effort to beat Haynsworth and let everyone I know, including Haynsworth, be aware of this."

"I think the Senate's action was a great tragedy for the man and for the law."

**LEGALLY QUALIFIED**

Suggestions have been advanced, particularly by one national newsmagazine, that President Nixon impanel a blue-ribbon committee to examine anew Haynsworth's qualifications and submit its findings to the Senate, in the hope that the body will repair the damage it has done.

Nothing, of course, is expected to come of this. The Senate has worked its will, as the saying goes, and the battle for Haynsworth has been irretrievably lost.

A question arises on whether the Senate has set a new precedent on how it evaluates presidential nominations. Does it base its judgment on qualifications or on ideology?

This issue has disturbed Texas Sen. John G. Tower, a supporter of Haynsworth.

"Traditionally in the Senate," he says, "we have not looked at a man's judicial philosophy but rather at his qualifications. Judge Haynsworth had great qualifications."

Tower points out that he voted to confirm the nominations to the Supreme Court of Arthur Goldberg and Thurgood Marshall, neither of whom agree with him ideologically. But he felt that they were legally qualified to sit on the bench.

The Texas Republican says that from now on "I am going to be more reluctant to vote for Supreme Court nominees who are not of my own philosophy."

President Nixon is expected to appoint another Southern conservative in January, and it may be that the same group of mostly Northern senators will want to fight that nomination on disguised ideological grounds.

But the investigation of the next nominee is likely to be so exhaustive that questions of ethics will be impossible to raise. In that event, it will be interesting to see how many

senators want to oppose the nomination on frankly ideological grounds.

If they do, the Senate, as Tower points out, will have broken its traditional method of considering nominees and will be moving to polarize ideological differences between its members.

#### YOUTH IN 1970: A NEW SOCIETY

### HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Better Living, an employee publication of the Du Pont Co., this month has an issue which is extremely interesting and challenging to the business community.

The entire issue is devoted to the subject, "Youth in 1970: A New Society."

It includes a careful study of the younger generation, a case study at the University of Michigan and an examination of the impact of youth upon the company. Many of the guest authors are residents of Delaware or relatives of Du Pont Co. employees.

I believe the company and Better Living's editor, Mr. Dave Morrison, are to be congratulated for this issue—one which provides a better understanding of the differences between young people and the business community.

I ask that three brief articles from this issue be printed at this point: One written by Miss Elizabeth Cairns, a Cornell University student, entitled "Our Quarrel With the Establishment," and one entitled "Does Business Really Care?" written by Miss Marilyn Mather, a reporter for the Wilmington News-Journal newspapers; and one written by Mr. Jack W. Lewis, a staff member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OUR QUARREL WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT

In colonial times the established order was one to be admired; it was composed of the established economic and civic leaders who were also the great revolutionaries and intellectuals. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the Establishment referred to the eastern financial monopoly that controlled the fiscal resources of the society and, concurrently, enjoyed the political advantage.

The Establishment of the fifties and sixties, now under attack by members of my generation, is a complex system of institutions: financial, governmental, religious, military and educational.

Youth's present view of this Establishment can be suggested by some examples: the city council ignorant of the newest studies of urbanization; the church that cautions its faithful to go slow in its impulses toward social reform; the schools that stifle creativity with inflexible curricula; the military that commands the greatest portion of a democratic government's finances and yet is the most rigid and autocratic system in the country.

Youth have come to believe that the apparatus created for an essentially rural society two hundred years ago and which has evolved into its present form, no longer works. It has become too complex.

Youth's impatience with current methods

of effecting change does not, however, signify a rejection of old values. The young today seek goals that have been the ideals of every generation. We want a country free from want, with absolute freedom of thought, equality, peace, and human dignity.

But we want to find our own way because we have seen that the Establishment is fallible. It has failed at most of its major tests in our lifetime. We have watched a war that only kills; it is our generation that dies there and no one can tell us why. We have seen what began as peaceful pressures for equality turn into a blood-bath of hate, and no one knows quite how it happened. We have seen our last massive try at reconciliation with the Established political order end in the streets of Chicago.

Youth are determined that out of the chaos of the sixties we will find an order that embraces the deals we feel the Establishment has abdicated responsibility for achieving.

#### DOES BUSINESS REALLY CARE?

The trouble with business, many young people feel, is that the corporation has no conscience.

Young people understand that profits are necessary, and that profits do contribute to society.

The criticism is that the almost total focus on profits has resulted in neglect of other considerations Youth believe are too expensive to ignore.

Pollution is one of those considerations. People of all ages are concerned. But young people are willing to make greater noises about it.

Youth ask, for example: "Why didn't industry, with all of its resources—money, brains, and facilities—recognize or admit the problems of pollution many years ago and take the lead in bringing this issue to public attention? Why did industry wait for public awareness to force it to action?"

There also are other areas in which business seems to pursue profits without regard for society as a whole for example:

Auto safety: Despite new legislation it appears that the manufacturers are still dragging their heels.

Price-fixing: The rules seem clearly spelled out, yet several firms and their executives in recent years have been indicted for price-conspiracies.

Marketing products of questionable value: The drug industry which, in effect, markets the health of its customers, recently had to call many drugs off the market because they didn't perform according to the claims for them.

Planned obsolescence: New models of cars, appliances, etc. incorporate changes which are not genuine improvements or else space out improvements so that customers discard former purchases without getting full use of them.

Advertising excesses: The exploitation of sex to sell anything and everything. Youth believe the television industry is too involved in ratings to worry about quality of programming, and accepts social responsibility only because the government requires this.

All of this is what Youth see business doing. And then we look around to see the terrible problems of our society and the world. We look longingly at the tremendous potential of business to do good for society, but we see no one turning to put that potential to use—until forced to by public pressure.

#### THE NEW LEFT

However radical the younger generation's taste in hair styles and clothing, the majority of today's young people continue to conform to traditional political patterns. They get their politics, like their religion, from their parents. And like younger generations before them, they tend to be moderate in

their views and only passingly interested in political issues. Only a small minority belong to the hard core radical groups discussed here as the New Left. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the largest of the radical student organizations, claims a membership of about 30,000 out of a total college enrollment of 7 million. Only 6,000 of these are dues-paying members.

A much larger group are those who share many of the concerns of the radicals but who stop short of their tactics. For the most part, they are inclined to work within the established rules for bringing about change. However, on any given issue, the radical minority has shown a capacity to mobilize this non-New Left activist group.

If the radical fringe has any definable strategy, it is the radicalization of the moderates. As accepted leaders of the broad student base, forming alliances with disaffected groups elsewhere, the radical movement could be a potent political force.

Like radical movements before it, the New Left has little use for capitalism. It looks upon capitalism as an organized system of exploitation which corrupts other power centers—government, the press, the military, the university—in a vast conspiracy to control and manipulate the masses.

To attack capitalism, the New Left has invoked the tactics of confrontation, disruption and violence.

The great weakness of the radical youth movement, however, is that it has no answers to the practical problems of life. Anyone who has tried to discuss issues with these young people knows how vague and evasive are their suggestions for solution.

The strength of capitalism, on the other hand, is its capability for dealing with social problems of all kinds.

First, however, it is essential to recognize what is legitimate in the radicals' list of grievances. To the extent they have focused attention on the declining quality of modern life and the diminishing role of the individual, I believe they have made a great contribution to us all. The task now is to do something about it.

#### COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND DAY CARE CENTER JOIN FORCES

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Senator, one of the major roadblocks to meeting day care needs in this country is the lack of trained manpower available to staff centers. This information was relayed to the Republican task force on education and training recently, by Laurence Feldman, executive director of the National Day Care and Child Development Council of America.

Lane Community College in Eugene, Oreg., has initiated an exceptional new program to help remove this obstacle. I would like to commend to my colleagues' attention the following article from the Eugene Register-Guard of November 16, 1969, describing Lane Community College's combination of on-the-job training with classroom instruction for students interested in child care.

The program, administered by Mrs. Jill Halpern, not only demonstrates yet another community service which community colleges can perform, but also offers a sound answer to the question of

how to secure trained staff for day care centers.

The article follows:

**UP-TO-DATE DAY CARE CENTER AIDS LCC STUDENTS, CHILDREN**

(By Cynthia Anderson)

Finding adequate child care is a worry for any mother who works. Finding adequate child care at reasonable cost is an acute worry for low income or welfare mothers who want to take job training or employment.

President Nixon acknowledged this problem in August when he outlined his domestic program. Calling for a "major expansion of day-care centers," he asked Congress for massive federal funding for child care facilities to help women get off welfare and into training for jobs.

Suppose Congress actually appropriated funds for child care centers. Suppose a rash of new day care centers and after-school centers was set up as envisioned in Nixon's message.

Who would staff them?

A new program at Lane Community College is attempting to answer a part of that need. At the LCC Child Care Center, 13 students enrolled in a Child Care Services Program are receiving on-the-job training along with classroom instruction in preparation for careers in child care.

In addition to training students for the future, the center offers here and now service. Day care is provided at the center at low cost for children of students in LCC training programs. Many of the students are mothers on welfare enrolled in government programs of job training.

Coordinator of the Child Care Center is Jill Halpern who considers the center a partial fulfillment of a long-time personal dream.

Mrs. Halpern has championed nursery and pre-school programs since World War II when she worked in a residential nursery school for children evacuated from London. During her career she has worked with children in the slums of London, with deprived children in Australia and Canada.

"Research has shown that the pre-school years are all-important in the development of children," Mrs. Halpern said recently. If you care at all about what happens to little children, you will recognize the need for more day care centers, more good home care facilities for infants and more after-school programs for youth," Mrs. Halpern said.

"Look around and see how many mixed up young people we have. Something went wrong and who's to say where it all started? If we could only detect the trouble early . . ."

To provide the quality of child care Jill Halpern speaks about takes more than up-to-date physical plants, hot lunches and supplies for teaching and playing. It takes trained staff personnel, says Mrs. Emory Ellingson who is in charge of the trainees in LCC's Child Care Services program.

The program offers a one-year certificate in child care services after completion of 26 classroom hours and 15 hours a week working in the nursery school. A second year will be added to the program soon, according to Mrs. Ellingson. The two-year program will result in an associate degree. Credits from the program are also used for college transfer if students plan to work for bachelor's degrees, she said.

"At last we have recognized the fact that people need to be trained in child care," Mrs. Halpern said.

"There is government money available for child care facilities now, but under federal regulations, only facilities meeting high standards—in plant, materials and staff qualifications—can receive the funds.

"I am hoping these regulations will upgrade the quality of child care in the country."

**THE GYPSY MOTH**

**HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I recently had the pleasure of addressing a Washington meeting of the National Gypsy Moth Advisory Council which had met to discuss ways of curbing the widening threat of the Gypsy moth insect pest. In recognition of the fact that DDT and other persistent pesticides can no longer be used, the council called for a plan of action including the necessary research to provide a more reliable method of controlling the Gypsy moth. The Gypsy moth is an insect of foreign origin which presently inhabits the Northeastern United States, but is rapidly being transported to other parts of the country where it continues to defoliate hardwood and softwood forests. Since trees are such an important part of our environment, I invite this situation to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that my address before the council and the remarks of Mr. Donald Shepherd, U.S. Department of Agriculture Research Service, and Dr. R. K. Arnold, U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, be printed in the RECORD:

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

**GYPSY MOTH REPORT**

(Presented by the Honorable RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER)

It is gratifying to see a group of people representing so many varied interests come together today to start planning for a united effort to combat a most serious insect pest of our trees. Trees to some people mean forest land, to others they mean shade trees around their home, to still others they mean relief from the steel and concrete of the city or urban area, regardless, they are trees and we are so happy to have people representing anyone interested in trees at this meeting today.

In the Northeast we are all aware of the dense population area referred to as megalopolis. Some forty million people live in the coastal belt which extends from Boston to Washington, D.C.

Yet in spite of rapid urbanization, trees still cover nearly 50 percent of this highly inhabited region. Man is literally surrounded by trees—from a national standpoint, 120 million trees on our city streets and another 80 million trees in our city parks. A high percentage of these trees are susceptible to the voracious appetite of the Gypsy Moth.

It is difficult to put a monetary value on trees in our urban areas. For each man values these for what they provide him—beauty, tranquility, shade, and protection. However, experts estimate that 200 million city trees are worth more than 30 million dollars and this investment is increasing at the rate of 7.5 percent yearly.

In my own State of Pennsylvania there are more than 15 million acres of forest land—ten million of which are susceptible to attack of the Gypsy Moth. Prevention of spread of the moth serves as a protection for this vast forest resource as well as jobs for thousands of people employed in forest related industries. Forest products produced in Pennsylvania are valued at 1.8 billion dollars annually and the payroll of this industry amounts to 440 million dollars each year. As

the Gypsy Moth moves Southward and Westward from Pennsylvania, it will eventually eat its way through the hardwood forest areas of the Appalachians and into the Ozarks, an area which encompasses more than 100 million acres of timberland.

Now due to restrictions on pesticide use, the Gypsy Moth is really on the march. A great new research effort is needed. Cooperation between industry, state, and federal agencies will be of utmost importance if we are to move ahead with the kind of funds and the kind of research that is going to be needed to meet this problem immediately.

Many facts and figures have been presented regarding the destructiveness of this particular forest pest. Those who have not lived in the New England States, New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania should learn more about this problem. I am sure today information will be presented that will bring you up-to-date and will show you very graphically the problems facing you as this potential forest defoliator moves into your area.

We are concerned today in Pennsylvania with the effect of this defoliator on the tourist industry, on those people who normally would look forward to moving into an area for camping in our recreational parks, to those who want to go to our beautiful mountain resort hotels, who may shy away from these areas because of the problems connected with the Gypsy Moth as it defoliates the forest area. And, as a U.S. Senator, I am concerned about the rapid spread of the Gypsy Moth to the states that have never had this pest previously.

People who already own homes in forested areas are becoming increasingly aware of the problems associated with Gypsy Moth infestations both from an esthetic and a nuisance standpoint. The problems presently facing the people in the Northeastern states, particularly in southwestern New York, southern Connecticut, and northern New Jersey where defoliation is severe, will be OUR problems throughout much of Pennsylvania in the near future and will be inherited by our neighbors to the South and West in five to ten years. As a matter of fact only this past week, I was told Gypsy Moth egg masses were found on a house trailer in Virginia. Chemical sprays alone can no longer be depended upon to contain the pests. We need newer and more efficient tools to work with—newer approaches.

Again, I want to point out—we are here for one purpose—to meet the Gypsy Moth head-on, to develop and support a research and method development program that ultimately will enable us to cope with this insect pest. Meanwhile, I am sure you will want to carefully study every available control, old and new, to choose that combination that will best meet your objectives pending the outcome of further research.

Those of you who have been invited to serve on the Gypsy Moth Advisory Council have an important stake in the problem. The organizations which you represent no doubt are affected financially in one way or another. So I challenge you today to examine this problem objectively. Let's not be biased by individual prejudices of the past, but instead, let's get together on a sound research program that will provide the answers we need.

**CURRENT STATUS OF GYPSY MOTH SURVEY, REGULATORY, AND CONTROL PROGRAMS**

(By DONALD SHEPHERD)

To those of us in plant protection work, the gypsy moth represents many firsts. It was really one of the first major pest introductions into this country from foreign lands. The early control was the first organized effort to eradicate and later to confine an important pest, and it was the first plant pest to be the subject of a Federal domestic quarantine. The initiation of the cooperative

control program in 1906 was the first time that the Federal Government appropriated funds to cooperate with the States in a control program. The first case of pest control litigation to establish the right to conduct pest control work on private property involved the gypsy moth. "Private rights may be abridged by the exercise of police power and must give way to the public interest. Individuals must yield to the requirements of the public as a whole."

The early effort to deal with the moth problem in the Medford, Massachusetts, area where it was introduced was very successful and, at one time, it appeared that eradication was practically accomplished.

I suppose the early success of that effort was largely responsible for the control program's undoing. As so often happens after a successful effort, the interest waned, workers became complacent and, by early 1900, the gypsy moth was again off and running. It was found in many new locations.

It was because of that explosive spread that the Federal Government entered the program in 1906. That buildup and spread also largely responsible for the promulgation of the Federal Quarantine Act of 1912.

Until 1938, the gypsy moth was contained east of a line extending along Lake Champlain and the Hudson River from Canada to New York City by a containment program in a barrier zone along that line. It is thought that in that year, egg masses were carried on debris into New York by hurricane winds, and many new infestations appeared in the next few years. By 1950, buildup had reached epidemic proportions as far west as the eastern counties of New York State and spot infestations occurred in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

By 1953, nearly 1½ million acres were defoliated in the infested States. The infestation encompassed about 40 million acres at that time.

With the introduction of chlorinated hydrocarbon chemicals in the mid-1940's, it was thought that there was at last a panacea that would provide a simple method of containing this pest. DDT at the rate of 1 pound actual toxicant in 1 gallon of oil to the acre did accomplish eradication. It was the tests with this chemical in the early 1950's in Pennsylvania that gave encouragement to the proposal to eradicate the infestation once again at least back to the barrier zone along the New York-Connecticut line.

Eradication treatments were begun in 1956 on the outer periphery of the infestation in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. In a 2-year period, more than 4 million acres had been successfully treated. However, the program had to be discontinued in 1958 because of the opposition by conservation agencies and the problem, too, of DDT residues in milk in the New York milkshed. There had not been any serious effect on wildlife values.

So our rejoicing was short-lived. Since that time we have been fighting a losing battle in our effort to stem the spread of this important pest.

For years our scientists and our control and regulatory officials have worried about what would happen once the gypsy moth infestation became established in the mountains of Pennsylvania. We no longer have to wonder about that question. There is evidence now that the gypsy moth has found an ecological situation especially to its liking. Infestation was found for the first time this year in Delaware and Maryland, and there was new spread into Centre County, Pennsylvania. A single moth was trapped as far south as Free Union, Virginia, on the Skyline Drive. We can expect under our current technology that it will continue to spread each year further south in the Appalachian range. Infestation now occurs, too, in Canada in eight counties in the southern part

of the Quebec Province. The only bright spot is the continuing evidence that the infestation in Michigan has been eradicated.

Now, what are some of our problems: In this program we have depended upon sex attractant traps to detect gypsy moth infestation to determine distribution and to check on the efficacy of control operations. Sites where male moths are caught are subsequently scouted for egg masses during the fall and winter months to determine the extent and intensity of infestation. Nearly 50,000 of these traps are used annually.

Division personnel in recent years have gone to Spain and other foreign countries infested with gypsy moth to collect the natural female sex attractant material. In addition, female tips are collected in this country in order to replenish the depleted supply of lure. The foreign collecting is costly and there is no assurance of a continuing supply. Detection even with effective traps is extremely difficult in the rugged, mountainous territory. In fact, the first evidence of infestation in the rugged country could be an area of defoliation.

There are problems, too, with the regulatory program. Where heavy infestation occurs, gypsy moth egg clusters and/or pupae may be found on a variety of articles such as mobile homes, military shipping crates, cable reels, and scrap metal—to mention a few. These articles are certified for movement from regulated areas on the basis of non-exposure to infestation, negative inspection, chemical treatment, or processing that renders the end product pest free. Providing adequate safeguards to prevent artificial long distance spread has become increasingly difficult.

A relatively new and serious problem centers around the growing popularity of mobile homes and campers. In recent years, gypsy moth egg clusters and pupae have been found on mobile homes in States well outside the regulated area—some as far away as Texas and Minnesota. Prompt control measures had to be employed to prevent the establishment of infestation in those States. Currently all trailer parks in known infested areas are under close surveillance by Federal and State inspectors to guard against spread by this means. Ideally, all infested mobile home parks and campsites, including the environs, should be treated by helicopter following gypsy moth hatch. There, however, we are faced with restrictions on the use of pesticides, particularly when applied by aircraft.

Despite the growing problems confronting our regulatory operations, it is noteworthy that, outside of a few isolated instances, the quarantine measures appear to have been effective in retarding the spread of this insect by artificial means. In fact, this has been a success story for which regulatory officials can be proud. It has been here for 100 years and still occupies a relatively small part of the susceptible host forests.

I am certain that our speakers representing the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania will outline in detail the problems that we face in the control operations. With the loss of DDT in 1958, we recognized we were in for difficult times. The insecticide controversy, among other things, pointed to the need for intensive investigation of problems in the field and was a principal factor in the establishment of a Gypsy Moth Methods Improvement Laboratory on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, in 1961. This Plant Protection facility is filling a long-standing need for development ways of dealing with this important pest. Current activities at the laboratory are aimed at improving chemical and biological control techniques, survey procedures, and regulatory operations.

Special emphasis is placed on developing techniques for rearing various parasites of the gypsy moth. At the Hicksville, Long

Island, New York, laboratory this year, more than 10 million gypsy moth egg parasites were reared and subsequently released by State personnel in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. In addition, nearly 100,000 specimens of a larval parasite were turned over to the States for release. Mr. Phillips, supervisor of the work at Otis Air Force Base, will elaborate on activities of the laboratory this afternoon.

The history of this pest and the control and eradication efforts of the past 100 years are very interesting and, in fact, very intriguing. Much knowledge has been gained about the biology of the gypsy moth and its control. Even so, with all this background we find ourselves today without the necessary technology to deal with the problem at hand. We can continue to prevent the spread of this insect by artificial means through regulatory action, but we know that the present control measures are not adequate to cope with its continued spread by natural means. That is why we are here today—to dramatize, if you please, the seriousness of the current situation—to try to find some direction for dealing with this important pest in the future.

#### CURRENT STATUS OF GYPSY MOTH RESEARCH

(Presentation by R. K. Arnold at the National Gypsy Moth Advisory Council Meeting, Washington, D.C., November 13, 1969)

Since its introduction into the United States 100 years ago, the gypsy moth has intruded inexorably into the forest and urban environments of the Northeast. It has done so in spite of our best efforts to halt, suppress, and eliminate it. We have appeared to win the battle at times, but as Don Shepherd has shown, the gypsy moth is now well established in most of its present distributional range and is continuing to spread. This is an unusually well documented case history of man's attempt to protect an important segment of his environment and, in so doing, causing further disruption of the natural ecosystem. This is also an excellent example of the interrelationship acting on forests and urban areas as their environments interact.

Our efforts thus far have had one benefit—beyond the temporary successes in putting the insect down. We have learned the size, scope and complexity of countermeasures required to combat it effectively; and we have some of the tools needed to do the job. Both research and practical experience have led to the inescapable conclusion that an unilateral approach to gypsy moth control is doomed to failure. The insect's ability to disperse and establish itself on a large number of host tree species, its capability for rapid increase to outbreak numbers, and the diversity of its impacts on forest and urban uses and values, call for a comprehensive, flexible, ecologically sound approach. At the same time, we know that the insect is responsive to physical factors in the forest environment and is vulnerable to a wide spectrum of natural control agents—all of which may be manipulated to some degree—in addition to its susceptibility to chemical insecticides.

We have both the need and opportunity, therefore, for a broad program of integrated control to minimize the chances for spread and population buildup of the gypsy moth in new areas and to contain it at tolerable levels where it is established. Dr. Campbell this afternoon will outline a plan for the research needed to bring such a program to fruition. I will describe to you at this time—very briefly—where we now stand in our knowledge of this serious pest. No specific credits will be given—our knowledge today derives from the work of many individuals,

past and present, in the USDA, state agencies, universities, and other private organizations.

#### I. POPULATION DYNAMICS

Although it is an introduced species, the gypsy moth is now subject to quite a sequence of mortality-causing agents. Insect parasites, birds, and cold winter temperatures kill the eggs. Heavy rains may even cause further mortality.

When populations are sparse, dispersal losses of the small caterpillars and predation of the larger ones largely determine whether the insect remains endemic or its numbers increase. In dense populations—where the foregoing have failed to keep the gypsy moth in check—disease is the major mortality factor.

The aggregative behavior of the caterpillars is an important factor in the population dynamics of the insect. For example, those that aggregate on the tree during daylight hours survive in greater proportion than those that crawl to the ground for rest and shelter.

Genetic variation in disease susceptibility, dispersal behavior, and other characteristics are important in the population system of the gypsy moth.

This fundamental knowledge of the dynamics of gypsy moth populations—the effects of specific factors and their interplay in natural population—provides the ecological foundation for the integrated control program now conceived.

#### II. BIOTIC CONTROL

Approximately 50 different parasites and predators of the gypsy moth have been imported and released throughout the north-eastern states. Twelve of these have become established. In addition, a large number of parasites and predators native to the United States have found the gypsy moth a suitable host. There is some field evidence that certain parasitic wasps with a bent for stinging many hosts without necessarily laying eggs in them may vector the virus disease of the gypsy moth.

Microbial control has been attempted, with promising results. Commercial preparations of the bacterial insecticide, *Bacillus thuringiensis*, have been tested intensively in the laboratory and field, and studies are still in progress on this and other bacterial pathogens that may be useful for direct control. Small-scale field trials with the polyhedrosis virus have indicated that it can reduce gypsy moth numbers markedly, and it has the great advantage that it is carried over into subsequent generations. Work is underway to develop a means of maintaining living gypsy moth tissue to mass produce the virus. Research to date indicates that the virus is innocuous to other insects and higher organisms.

Because the gypsy moth female mates just once and does not fly, the sterile-male release technique is feasible—at least in spot infestations or, possibly, following chemical control operations where residual numbers are low.

A similar approach, suggested by early basic research on the genetics of the gypsy moth, would involve the use of males of certain Japanese strains. These Japanese males when mated with native "American" strain females produce offspring of which all females are sterile and one-half of the males carry the lethal factor. In this case, the genetic information is known, the Japanese stocks are available, but no actual field trials have been carried out as yet.

As many of you know, there has been some difficulty in isolating and identifying the pure sex attractant of the gypsy moth. This problem is near solution, I understand, and with the knowledge and technology to synthesize the active material, we will have yet another means of inducing the insect to destroy itself.

#### III. SITE MANIPULATION

Ecological studies of the gypsy moth have provided much information on the influence of certain site factors such as stand composition, host tree form and size, and microclimate on survival rates of the insect. At different times recommendations have been made regarding removal of preferred tree species and of old and injured trees with many bark flaps and branch stubs that provide favorable conditions for survival. There has not been sufficient testing to fully evaluate the effectiveness of this silvicultural approach.

#### IV. CHEMICAL CONTROL

Crossing of egg masses, application of lead arsenate dust by ground equipment to kill the caterpillars, aerial dusting, the advent of DDT in the 1940's, and its proven effectiveness, all added up to what appeared to be the solution to the problem—virtual elimination of the gypsy moth from the United States. This was not successful, and we are now well aware of the hazards of continued, extensive use of broad spectrum and/or persistent insecticides.

Intensive screening of candidate chemicals led to the selection of carbaryl, a carbamate, as the successor to DDT. The presently recommended dosage of 1/2 to 1 lb. actual toxicant per acre is considered relatively safe, but it is not as effective as DDT. More recently, another carbamate, Gardona, has been shown to be reasonably effective and safe to use. With the past and present involvement of the gypsy moth in the pesticide controversy, it seems clear that special emphasis must continue to be given to safety aspects in the testing and development of chemical insecticides for gypsy moth control.

Another approach with chemicals may be feasible. Host preferences of the gypsy moth are mediated by substances in the foliage that stimulate or inhibit feeding by the caterpillars. Researchers at the Forest Service's Hamden (Connecticut) Laboratory are attempting to isolate and identify these substances. If the repellent-deterrent constituents, or other chemicals with similar action, can be synthesized and produced inexpensively, they might be very practical and effective as protective sprays.

#### CONCLUSION

Let me sum up this sketchy outline of where we stand in research on the gypsy moth. The ecological and economic impacts of this pest on the environment of the Northeast, and the threat that it poses to the valuable forests and urban areas of the Midwest and South, justify strong action. A comprehensive, integrated program of surveillance and control is needed to cope with the diversity of ecological conditions involved and the multiple forest and urban values at stake.

There is a definite and proven threat to the quality of man's environment. Ultimate control will be possible only when man understands that environment, so that he can manipulate it in ways which make it uninhabitable for the gypsy moth.

#### WITHDRAWAL IMPOSSIBLE

**HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, from time to time it is well to remember that those who would bug out of Vietnam, leaving our allies to the mercies of a merciless enemy are a relatively new breed.

Even those they hold in reverent memory never went so far. Certainly Robert F. Kennedy was aware of the dangers of precipitate withdrawal.

The National Review of December 2 quotes from "To Seek a Newer World" by Robert F. Kennedy, published in 1968.

The quote is attached:

Withdrawal is now impossible. The overwhelming fact of American intervention has created its own reality. All the years of war have profoundly affected our friends and our adversaries alike, in ways we cannot measure and perhaps cannot know. Moreover, tens of thousands of individual Vietnamese have staked their lives and fortunes on our presence and protection: civil guards, teachers and doctors in the villages; mountain tribesmen in the high country; many who work for the present benefit of their people, who have not acceded to the Vietcong even though they may not support the Saigon government. Many have once already fled the dictatorship of the North. These people, their old ways and strengths submerged by the American presence, cannot suddenly be abandoned to the forcible conquest of a minority.—(To Seek A Newer World, Robert F. Kennedy, 1968; excerpt in 12/2 National Review.)

#### A LITTLE MORE ENCOURAGING

**HON. RICHARD BOLLING**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that there are days when each Member of Congress feels the weight of so many problems confronting this country that it seems there is "no light at the end of the tunnel." Reading the Wall Street Journal for December 4, 1969, I felt a little more encouraged because of bitter-sweet observations made by a newspaperman that were carried under the caption "Notables and Quotables." I would like to share these remarks with my colleagues. The article follows:

#### A LITTLE MORE ENCOURAGED

(By Joseph B. Cummings, Jr.)

Something remarkable has happened in the South in those fifteen years (1954-69). The American idea worked. Careful now, I did not say the racial problem was solved or that prejudice was banished. Problems of human society are not "solved"; they are whittled down to workable size. The founding fathers calculated quite explicitly on the flawed nature of man, and what we have seen in the South is an important example of how their plan works, how ingeniously the machinery can function to bring us a little closer to the ideal. It has been a long slow process over the years of America, but history has produced enough response for people to believe that it can work. And this is the magic ingredient: That enough people believe it can work. The Civil War was a great test; Teddy Roosevelt busting up the corrupting accumulation of power of big business was another. Legal recognition of the rights of labor unions in the '30's was another. None of these victories brought perfection. America is not Disneyland; it is a nation in the act of becoming, an Idea being tested. The silver thread must hold; continuity is a gift only time can give. Each crisis that ends with America coming closer to the Idea instead of further away adds strength to the Idea. The impatient radicals today do not believe in the long slow correcting process. They have a point: For this country

to have suffered the existence of slavery in the face of a declared belief that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. . . . It seems to them prima facie hypocrisy. But these zealots are steeped in the sweet Rousseauistic notion that human nature is not so imperfect and destruction of the clumsy machinery of Government that now exists would produce a twilight garden of gentle simplicity. They have not talked to the hunter or the Cadillac dealer. The destruction of the American Idea would mean the death of freedom with no guarantee that all the flaws would be made straight.

Because of what has happened in the South, I tend to be hopeful that this nation has the vitality to respond and strengthen the working system. Yet I must admit sometimes on the back roads in the land of despair I imagine how it might be to hear the chilling eternal swoosh, feel the cellar-cool breath of the closing of a great book.

"Oh well," God sighs, "it was just an idea."

#### THE VOICE OF AMERICA

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, I participated in a memorial service at Rosewood Memorial Gardens in Norfolk, Va. While I was there a survivor of the Pearl Harbor attack, Mr. Arthur Strickland, presented me with a poem which he wrote the day after the Pearl Harbor attack.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in submitting for publication in the RECORD Mr. Strickland's verse:

#### THE VOICE OF AMERICA

(By Arthur Lown Strickland, U.S.S. *Dobbin* (AD 3), December 8, 1941)

(Dedicated to the memory of my shipmates who died at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941)

Listen, oh sons of the tyrant's rule, to the voice of America;

To the voice of the poor;

To the voice of the rich;

From the man in the manse;

From the man in the ditch;

To its ever increasing victorious pitch,

As they rise up to meet the foe!

Listen, oh keepers of slav'ry's chains, to the sound of the marching feet;

As they tramp from the farm;

As they tramp from the town;

To the free navy blue,

And the brave khaki brown

Who are fighting defending our liberty's crown

As it rests on the land and sea!

Listen, destroyers of liberty, to your answer from men born free;

As it rings from the East;

As it rings from the West;

As it rings from the hills

Where the heroes do rest;

As it rings from a mother with grief in her breast

For a Pearl Harbor navy boy!

Listen disciples of war and hate, to the guns of America;

As they roar on the sea;

As they roar on the land;

As they roar on the wings

Of a raiding air band;

As they roar from Bermuda to Philippine strand

Where the ramparts of freedom stand!

Listen, betrayers of honored trust, to the voice from the silent graves;

From the lips of the roll

Of the missing and dead

As they pass on the flag

For whose cause they have bled

To the hands that have lived through the bombs bursting red

At the Pearl Harbor battle line!

Listen, oh fiends of a strife torn world, to a voice from our ages past;

From the Lexington green;

From the great Alamo;

From wherever the roots

Of our liberty grow,

And again we shall answer the challenging foe

At the place where they choose to strike!

Listen, oh foes of the God we love, to the prayers of the trusting ones;

As they call upon Him

To be Leader of all;

Of those who will live;

Of those who will fall;

Of the men who have heeded the challenging call

Of the Saviour of all mankind!

Listen, you lovers of brutal greed, to the sound of a day to come;

To the beat of the drum;

To the bugle's blare;

To the victory cheers

As they trill through the air;

To the sound of the breeze in the banner still there;

The American flag we love!

#### COURAGEOUS ACTION OF GARY E. O'NEAL HELPS WOMAN ESCAPE

### HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, recently an incident was brought to my attention by the editor of the Orlando Sentinel, which I would like to relate to my colleagues. I am sure most of us have read news media accounts of citizens standing by and doing nothing while major crimes were being committed in their presence. On November 26 an Orlando high school senior, Gary Eugene O'Neal, was driving along a main street when he observed a group of eight teenagers pelting a car with bricks and concrete. It happens that the car, which was at a four-way stop sign, contained a woman and her two young children. This young man immediately stopped his car and raced to a nearby telephone booth to call police. Then the gang of youths turned on him and began stoning the booth. As Gary left the booth to run back to his car, the youths hit him in the face from close range with bricks and pieces of concrete. Gary was released from the hospital last Friday after he underwent plastic surgery the day of the incident, his birthday, and spent Thanksgiving there recovering from severe face and head cuts.

To date six boys, ranging in age from 14 to 17, have been arrested in the incident and charged with either aggravated assault or destruction of property.

The courageous action of this young man allowed the woman and her children to escape uninjured to a nearby service station, where she in turn called police.

This should be an inspiration to all of us.

#### OKLAHOMA PRODUCES TOP MEN— CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT IS ALSO PROUD OF HIS FELLOW OKLAHOMANS

### HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine has been kind enough to send to me a clipping from the Baltimore News-American. It appeared in the issue of December 3, 1969. It is entitled "Oklahoma Produces Top Men." At this time I offer the entire article for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the News American, Dec. 3, 1969]

OKLAHOMA PRODUCES TOP MEN

(By John F. Steadman)

Not wanting to plagiarize but willing to paraphrase Will Rogers, the greatest humorist of our time, let it be said:

"We never met a man from Oklahoma we didn't like."

Our respect for Oklahoma goes back to our infamous days as a minor league baseball player. The first roommate we had was Lloyd Randall, who was so kind he wouldn't kill a mosquito. He'd ask him to leave.

Then over the years, we had the chance to know such other Oklahoma natives as Billy Vessels, Jim Owens, and Buck McPhail, Lloyd and Paul Waner, the only brother act in Baseball's Hall of Fame; Jerry Adair, Harry Brecheen, Eddie Fisher, Wayne Chambers and other Oklahomans too numerous to mention.

But one significant fact has always made itself prevalent. Oklahoma turns out a special breed of man. Honest, forthright, decent.

They have all the good qualities; none of the bad. We once met a Oklahoma citizen we thought we didn't like but it turned out he was originally from Texas, which kept the record clean, and preserved the contention that Oklahoma consistently produces high class individuals.

We never felt where you happened to be from in any way influenced the kind of man you might be. Geography, it would seem, couldn't be credited or blamed, with producing a winning or losing type of personality.

All we can say about Oklahoma is that it's the best. It is indigenous to good people.

We have tried to probe into the history of Oklahoma to see if there is any connection with its historical birth and the sterling citizens it turns out.

It's interesting to know that the name Oklahoma is derived from a Choctaw Indian phrase meaning "red people." Oklahoma gained statehood on Nov. 16, 1907, which means it is still a young whipper-snapper in the family.

The state bird in Oklahoma is a scissor-tailed flycatcher. How do we know that? You have to be an expert on Oklahoma or be able to read Collier's Encyclopedia, Volume 18, page 100.

We once paid a visit to the Will Rogers Memorial in Claremore, Okla., and while hitch-hiking back to Tulsa had a bad experience.

Still, we had a chance to see a lifelike statue of Rogers and to press a button that, through the magic of recordings, allowed one to hear highlights of his speeches and entertaining dissertations.

It was one of the most memorable days of our life to be able to visit the area where

Will was born. And certainly one of the most tragic moments we experienced was that day in 1935 when word came over the wire from Point Barrow, Alaska that Rogers had been killed in an air crash with Wiley Post.

Just because Will Rogers was a great American doesn't give Oklahoma a corner on producing unforgettable men. But certainly Rogers stands tall in any Hall of Fame you want to collect.

Most Oklahomans we have met are solid and sound. They don't make it a habit of telling lies or stealing another man's horse.

We once asked our friends Vessels and Adair why it was Oklahoma had such reputable and revered individuals. "I never did think much about it," said Adair.

"You got me," answered Vessels. "We just do the best we can with what we have."

Obviously, the most admirable quality to be found in a man from Oklahoma is that he's a nonbraggard. And when you are good you don't need to tell the rest of the world—just like we're doing for Oklahoma right now.

Being called an "Okle" once had a connotation that wasn't exactly a compliment. But to us it was always symbolic of the strong and the hard-working who were only trying to make an honest living off the land, regardless of their lot in life.

The spirit of Oklahoma has been put in verse and song. The musical works as the "Oklahoma Hills" and "The Rose of Pawnee" will forever remain classics.

We just happen to believe Oklahoma is one of the best places in the world. It we couldn't be in merry old Maryland we'd sure be there, way out on the range riding a pinto pony and enjoying life under the Oklahoma heavens.

P.S.—HE LOVED OUR COUNTRY,  
DO YOU?

**HON. DURWARD G. HALL**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is the month of December, a time when the thoughts of many traditionally turn to the celebration of the birth of the "Prince of Peace."

It continues to be a paradox that during this time, in many parts of the world, there is no peace.

While America's young men continue to die in the rice paddies and jungles of Vietnam, other Americans march in support of those they oppose. Many of those who march in protest are naive and well meaning, while others know exactly what they are doing; giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

As a reply to those who openly support the aggressive and terrorist attacks of the Communists from the North, I offer a letter from a Neosho, Mo., family. A family whose son, Terry, gave his life for the cause of freedom and self-determination.

The letter follows:

Instead of writing to my son tonight, in Vietnam, I find I'm trying to express myself in hopes this may be a bit of help for someone else who may one day be in the same situation. Just 11 days ago, three soldiers came to our home to deliver a message we didn't want to hear.

Our son, Terry, had paid the supreme sacrifice, the necessary telegrams received, the return of the soldiers (bless them, what a thankless job they have). The many friends, without them this would be unbearable. Finally the word of our son's body arriving.

Our first impulses were bitter, very, very bitter, then came a letter from him writing three days before he died. This letter, put our thinking back into proper focus. In part it said—

"Dad, I believe you understand by your letters, but if the people, including my generation, would just unite for a couple of months, this war would be over and I and all could come home, but guess that's asking too much—"Charlie knows he's beaten here but his people in the United States will win it for him. Dad if it's right, let's win it, if it's not let's get out of our mess honorably. Sorry to get off on all this, but we just got first briefing, why we are here."

I had to put out the good old American Flag again. If it was good enough for him to die for, it surely was good enough for me to live for. Not condoning every policy, but we are there let's get all our Terry's home in an honorable fashion and not by protesting.

As Terry's parents, we want to express our appreciation to the city and to our many friends for all the kindness and sympathy shown to us. Words are not adequate for this expression.

P.S.—He loved our Country, do You?  
HARLEY ZUMALT AND FAMILY,  
421 E. McKinney St., Neosho, Mo.

TRIBUTE TO CIVIL DEFENSE VOL-  
UNTEERS LONG OVERDUE

**HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the great privilege of addressing a convention of the Indiana Civil Defense Directors Association, Inc., in Indianapolis. It was brought to my attention that these volunteers are seldom if ever given nationwide recognition for their long hours of service to their community and to their Nation.

In my small way, I would like to do my part to correct this injustice today. The civil defense volunteers—in Indiana and elsewhere—are, I believe, great preservers of peace. By their vigilance and preparedness to minimize the damage that would be wrought by nuclear war, they have perhaps staved off the threat of such a holocaust.

Operating on limited funds, giving of their leisure time, serving selflessly in so many ways, often risking their own safety in their peacetime services at the scenes of fires, explosions, and other disasters, the men and women of Civil Defense deserve our undying gratitude.

I ask at this time to insert into the RECORD the names of 12 of these great Americans who were given special recognition at yesterday's meeting. They received "Thank You Plaques" for 10 or more years' service as county civil defense directors. These men are:

Loring Russell Stott of Johnson County, who has served as civil defense director for 18 years and who was in 1951 a cwinner with the late Robert Wolf of the Freedoms Foundation Gold Award;

Andrew K. Houk of Boone County, past secretary of the Indiana Civil Defense Association;

Marshall I. Sipe of Delaware County, past president of the Indiana Civil Defense Association;

Charles J. Walker of Miami County, present president of the Indiana Civil Defense Association;

Paul D. Smith of Wayne County, past president of the Indiana Civil Defense Association;

Samuel Hughes of Hancock County;  
Crayton Holderead of Marshall County;

Richard H. Giannini of Vanderburgh County;

Roscoe Eller of Jasper County;  
Richard R. Gregory of Crawford County;

D. O. Dulin of Montgomery County; and

William H. Grossman of Ripley County.

TELEVISION'S OPPORTUNITY

**HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the continuing controversy on the media, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following two articles from the Christian Science Monitor.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 22, 1969]

AGNEW ON TARGET

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—If we didn't have a Spiro Agnew at large today, sure as anything we would want to invent one.

At times he may hurl his arrows at the wrong targets and overweight them with heavy adjectives, but we wouldn't want to see him muzzled. There is only one man in the United States who could muzzle him and he has no intention of doing so.

DEBATE ON FAIRNESS

It isn't debate which divides the nation. It is one-sided debate which divides the nation. Too many people too often remain silent and thus leave most of the headlines to the protesters.

Now, the Vice-President is at it again and he has started a debate on the fairness—or lack of fairness—of network television news and commentary which will be with us for some time. That's healthy.

As one who thought that the "effete snobs" speech was not well-conceived or well-timed, this time on this issue I am almost entirely on Agnew's side.

The Vice-President is simply saying, more bluntly and more baldly than others have been disposed to say it, that the big-audience evening TV news shows reveal considerable bias and unfairness—sometimes deliberate as at the Chicago convention, sometimes accidental, often with a raised eyebrow or a lowered voice.

It's true and it seems to me all to the good to have Mr. Agnew speak out in a way which further alerts listeners to this fact and causes them to indicate their dissatisfaction to the networks.

VALID CRITICISMS

Thousands of listeners did exactly that in the wake of the Agnew speech, and while that kind of stimulated write-in and phone-in is not a balanced cross-section of listeners, it is a kind of spontaneous "Nielsen rating" of the news shows which the networks will not lightly ignore.

I was eager to see what the network executives would say to rebut the Agnew criticisms. But there was no rebuttal. They devoted themselves almost wholly to knock-

ing down mythical strawmen by firming replying to statements he didn't make. To me at least this was confession that Agnew's criticisms were essentially valid and that rebuttal wasn't possible.

The network presidents argued that government censorship would be bad. It would. Agnew never proposed censorship. He simply urged listeners to be alert to news and commentary bias and to let the stations know how they felt.

There is also the empty contention that Agnew said there was a network "conspiracy" to shape the news. He never said there was any conspiracy. He simply said that the power to shape the news which has a nearly captive audience of some 40,000,000 viewers nightly is in the control of so small a group of producers and editors and commentators as to constitute a near-monopoly and that their performance should be subject to public scrutiny and public criticism.

This is exactly what Freedom House, a national organization, where liberals and conservatives unite to strengthen the cause of a free society at home and abroad, is preparing to undertake. It is preparing to create an institute which will provide a continuing appraisal of how well TV and the press perform so that the media, free of government censorship, will still be subject to responsive criticism—and responsive.

#### GOOD ALERTER

There is one important, balancing point which the Vice-President neglected to make in his speech. Perhaps he did not want to blunt the force of his argument. Anyway, it is encouraging to realize that the American people are not easily pushed around by high-powered, mass-audience commentators. Bias in the news is always dangerous and pernicious, but the barrage of one-sided analysis of Nixon's Vietnam peace-plan speech was followed by a Gallup Poll which showed 77 percent of the people backing the President and another poll reporting 79 percent support.

This is no justification of prejudice and one-sidedness in TV news and commentary which, cumulatively, could shape opinion in its own image.

It won't, if listeners remain alert. Agnew is a good alerter.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,  
Nov. 26, 1969]

#### TELEVISION'S OPPORTUNITY

The television networks should hardly have been surprised at Vice-President Agnew's criticism of their news coverage and commentary. Almost the same thing happened in Britain when Prime Minister Wilson and Labour ministers thought, rightly or wrongly, that television was zeroing in pretty sharply against them and their policies. A couple of protesting "shots across the bow" were fired by Labour spokesmen. Britain's two networks survived the assault, even though the country has no press freedom guarantee imbedded in a written constitution.

Mr. Agnew was opening up discussion aimed at evaluating a number of media practices.

For instance, is it a good idea, immediately after the nation's president—be he Kennedy, Johnson or Nixon—has finished speaking, for television commentators to give their instant, briefed-down versions of what the president said? How has anyone a chance to make up his mind? Wouldn't it be better—say, a half hour later—to assemble a panel (as the British do and American networks occasionally do) to discuss the presidential speech pro and con, with all viewpoints represented? To have only Averell Harriman commenting following Mr. Nixon's Vietnam speech, as did one network, isn't enough, for Mr. Harriman has been steadily critical of the President's policy.

Another question is whether a small group of network newsmen and analysts do not, almost unconsciously, influence America's millions to their outlook and viewpoint. And indeed whether the liberal-establishment Eastern press in the United States does not, by the strength of its coverage and the far-reaching writ of its editorializing, exert more of an influence than is realized.

Perhaps David Broder, writing from Cambridge, put his finger on an essential problem when he said: "No journalistic medium has yet made an effective effort to exploit the rich variety of regional viewpoints and voices to help its readers or viewers to examine the conventional wisdom of their own area." The TV commentators live and work around New York and Washington. The New York Times' Tom Wicker is from the South, but when he says the American protest movement "may or may not be a majority" he is not paying much attention to the polls, which show protesters to be a minority.

The press, the networks, should pay more attention to what solid citizens are thinking elsewhere, should seek the reasons why these outlanders, far from the East Coast, may be wrong or right. A little travel into Texas, Oklahoma, California would reveal opinions very different from those held in New York City.

Another question, raised often, is whether television coverage is not sometimes stacked in favor of unrest and protest. Not only the Chicago convention scenes but the TV panels and debates. Television has wrought splendidly in uncovering hunger in America, in pointing up civil-rights abuses. But on a number of panels, including those featured by educational television, the spokesmen for disorder seem to carry the day.

There is probably virtue in allowing speakers on Boston's black program "Say Brother" to denounce, unchallenged, the United States as imperialist. That is giving black activists their say. But there is less justification for giving some of modern society's wild men the TV publicity they crave.

We can't expect the networks to be the moral influence that the Royal Family is asked to be in Britain. But one can expect all of the news media to heed the various warnings about American polarization issued lately: polarization of the intellectual East against the Midwest, South, and West; polarization along generation lines, the bright collegians against their elders.

The networks, the news media, wield enormous influence. Through presenting all sides of a case, through letting everyone be heard, through indicating ways to agreement, through seeking out spokesmen for constructive solutions as well as for smash-the-Establishment, the news media can do much to heal and save the nation.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES B. DEANE

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues from North Carolina and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of the late Honorable Charles Bennett Deane of Rockingham, N.C., who passed away recently.

Charles Deane and I were "classmates" in the 80th Congress—we came to Congress together and served together for

many years. He was an able, talented legislator—modest and unassuming. He was a man of high principles, a Christian gentleman, who served as president of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina for 2 terms, a high honor and tribute.

Charles Deane, through his selfless, devoted service to his district, State, and Nation, added stature to the Congress. He will be greatly missed and I want to take this means of extending and expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Deane and other members of the family.

#### BILL TO PROHIBIT PUBLIC OFFICIALS FROM OPERATING DUAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

#### HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, enclosed is a bill which I plan to introduce soon and in order that those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have an opportunity to see it, I include it in the Extensions of Remarks:

H.R. —

A bill to prohibit public officials from operating dual school systems, and from requiring racial balance in school systems, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Freedom From Force Act."

#### TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1. The right of elementary and secondary education students to attend their neighborhood schools shall not be abridged by any person or authority based upon the race, creed or color of the student.

SEC. 2. Each local "unitary school system" shall have the right to determine their own attendance zones without interference from Federal authority as long as they are reasonably drawn so as to serve the needs of the community and no effort is made by drawing such attendance zones to force a student to attend a particular school because of his race, creed or color.

SEC. 3. Each local "unitary school system" shall have the right to determine the placement of any new school or school facility without interference from Federal authority so long as the new school or facility is placed so as to reasonably serve the needs of the community and no effort is made through its placement to discriminate against any student or group of students based upon race, creed or color.

#### TITLE II—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 1. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "unitary school system" whenever applied to any school system receiving public support means a school system wherein all schools comprising the system function as a part of an overall single administrative unit and in which there is no force or discrimination present, based upon race, creed or color, in establishing the makeup of the student body, faculty or in the allocation of funds, books and facilities to the respective schools.

(2) The term "dual school system" whenever applied to any school system receiving public support means any school system other than a unitary school system (as defined in subsection (1) of this section).

The term "pairing" whenever applied to any school or school system receiving public support means any act required by any governmental authority or person or board acting pursuant to such authority to cause the merger of schools or the alteration of the grade structure for the purpose of altering the race or ethnic make-up of the student body.

#### TITLE III—ILLEGAL ACTS

SEC. 1. (a) The operation of a dual school system shall be illegal.

(b) The pairing of schools shall be illegal.

(c) The closing of any school for the purpose of forcing any student into a different school so as to alter the racial or ethnic make-up of the student body shall be illegal.

(d) Forcing a child to leave his neighborhood school to attend another more distant because of his race, creed or color shall be illegal.

#### TITLE IV—PENALTIES

SEC. 1. Any person who violates Section 1 of Title III of this Act shall be subject to be imprisoned for not more than one year, or fined not more than \$1,000, or both.

#### VOCAL VEEP

### HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago Vice President AGNEW stunned the television network moguls by questioning their news coverage.

AGNEW hit the nail so square on the head that the leftist-liberals did everything but jump out of their New York ivory towers.

Every pollster in the country, except the leftwing Lou Harris poll which was given lucrative Government contracts in the last administration, attest to the overwhelming support for AGNEW throughout the United States.

To the utter dismay of the networks, AGNEW does not have anybody in his corner except the American people who have waited years for someone with his courage, intelligence, and integrity to pull the chain on the leftist propaganda efforts of the networks.

The Indianapolis Star describes the character-assassination attempts on AGNEW now underway by the networks, and why, for the sake of America, the smear efforts must fail.

The editorial follows:

#### VOCAL VEEP

Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew said in Harrisburg, Pa., Oct. 30, "A little over a week ago, I took a rather unusual step for a Vice-President—I said something."

What's more, he has gone on saying something. In Des Moines, Ia., Nov. 13, he took on the networks. And on Nov. 20 at Montgomery, Ala., he jostled the press—or some of it.

And by and large the public loved it.

Of course, Mr. Agnew has built-in pizzazz. He's a first-generation American and a self-made man. That's why regular folk relate to him like a topside dogwatch to hot buttered rum. And that's why he can ditch political doubletalk and say what the "silent majority" has been longing to hear.

How is it then that his remarks have attracted censure that reverberates from a great height and seems accompanied by a steely glance down a very long nose?

For instance, Dr. Frank Stanton, president

of Columbia Broadcasting System, commented: "Apparently the Vice-President is embarked upon a campaign . . . to intimidate the news media into reporting only what he wants to hear."

Leonard H. Goldenson, president, American Broadcasting Company, said: "Again I leave it to the public to determine whether the Vice-President's renewed attack . . . is an attempt to intimidate and discredit not only television news reporting but other major news media. Personally, I believe it is."

A resolution passed Nov. 21 by the National Small Business Association, with 35,000 members in all 50 states, may indicate that the public inclines more to the Vice-President than to Mr. Goldenson. The resolution states that "members of the executive committee . . . meeting in special session Friday, Nov. 21, 1969, commend the Honorable Spiro T. Agnew, Vice-President of the United States, for his efforts to secure more truthful, complete and responsible reporting by the nation's news media."

Mail to The Star on the subject has been running at least eight for Mr. Agnew's stand to one against.

The opposite side wrap their words in odd-shaped packages. They avoid the issue. Instead, swathed in injured innocence—the customary attitude of one caught with his fingers in the cookie jar—they leave a chimera hanging in the air, the dark hint that high office is being used to threaten censorship.

On this score Mr. Agnew said: "I am opposed to censorship of television or the press in any form. I don't care whether censorship is imposed by government or whether it results from management in the choice of presentation of the news by a little fraternity having similar social and political views, I am against censorship in all forms."

As a matter of fact, what has the Vice-President been talking about that's caused all the fuss?

"I am not asking immunity from criticism. That is the lot of the man in politics . . . But my political and journalistic adversaries seem to be asking . . . that I circumscribe my rhetorical freedom while they place no restriction on theirs.

"Just as a politician's words . . . are dutifully recorded by the press and television to be thrown up to him at the appropriate time, so their words should likewise be recorded and likewise recalled . . . And when their criticism becomes excessive or unjust, we shall invite them down from their ivory towers to enjoy the rough and tumble of public debate."

In a nutshell, fair play. That's what Mr. Agnew has been talking about, that boots grown accustomed to stomping should themselves expect to get mashed now and again.

A reasonable enough position, right? Wrong? Wrong to the "liberal" fraternity, that is. A fair exchange is the last thing a "liberal" wants. He doesn't debate. His tactic is to plug one line until people believe it. But there must be no other side.

The United States is one of the last countries where people are still individuals with enough sense of justice to buck the march of "liberalism." All the same, under the New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier and Great Society, the business of brainwashing Americans has prospered beyond belief. That is why a man, able to speak for the fair-minded, down-to-earth majority against the debilitating dogma that has plagued them too long, is a major threat to the "liberal" fraternity.

Such a man is Vice-President Agnew. And that is why "liberals" will not debate him, but only terminate him by character assassination if they can.

If they cannot, it is just possible a new era may be on the way when the American people can hope to see their affairs run with sanity and a degree of consideration for the industrious majority who make everything possible.

#### THE AMERICAN WAY

### HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all the talk we are hearing now concerning the alleged massacre of South Vietnamese civilians by American troops is, of course, disturbing to the American people.

But I do feel it is important that we examine this talk and put it in its proper perspective rather than be carried away by emotion. The talk and accusation may well be valid but if not, it does an injustice to the accused as well as unjustly points the finger of guilt at the majority of those who are members of the armed services and at our country's military policy.

No decent human being would approve or condone the wanton killing of innocent civilians as a necessary act in any war.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the November 28 edition of the Fort Lauderdale News. I feel that this editorial is truly an excellent analysis of this unfortunate matter and an honest analysis as to how we can now deal with it.

I agree with the statements made in the editorial that the alleged massacre could very well have occurred but as it suggests, I am sure that this incident is an isolated one and certainly it does not now represent, nor has it ever in the past, the policy of our Nation or its leaders—it just is not the American way.

It is for these reasons that we must not allow ourselves or anyone else to put such a barbarian stigma on our American fighting men. To do so is completely erroneous and unfair.

I am glad to commend the following editorial to my colleagues:

FEW VICIOUS G.I.'S MUST NOT SMEAR VAST NUMBERS WHO SERVE HONORABLY

(By Jack W. Gore)

With public interest and demands for a thorough investigation of the alleged massacre of South Vietnamese civilians by U.S. troops continuing to mount, it would be well today for all Americans to keep a proper perspective about this incident.

As we pointed out in this space last Tuesday, this affair, if it did happen in the manner in which various eyewitnesses have reported it happened, cannot be justified under any provocations.

It was a ghastly affair completely untypical of the normal reaction of U.S. troops under battlefield conditions, and it adds up to something which cannot go uninvestigated or without those involved being brought before a proper tribunal to answer for their deeds.

At the same time, however, it should be kept in mind that this was but an isolated incident in a pretty bloody and horrible war and which reportedly involved only a very small number of U.S. combat troops attached to one particular unit.

With all this publicity this incident is receiving, both in this country and abroad, it is easy enough to lose sight of the fact that for every GI who participated in this affair, there are thousands who are still in Vietnam or who have served there in the past, who have conducted themselves in an impeccable

manner despite the strains of combat and who have gone far out of their way to win the friendship of the people of this war-torn land.

We, for instance, have read innumerable stories of GI's spending almost all of their off-duty time working in orphanages and writing letters back home asking their friends to send some items of food, clothing and toys to be distributed among these orphans.

Other GI's have risked their own lives going to the rescue of wounded civilians or helping them get out of a war zone.

These incidents, however, seldom rate the news space that is devoted to the other side of the coin, and thus they become easy to forget in the justifiable furor created over the alleged slaughter of 100 or more unarmed civilians.

It must also be kept in mind the alleged atrocity, indefensible as it might be, can't hold a candle to the terror campaign waged by the enemy in Vietnam in which thousands of innocent civilian noncombatants have been cruelly slaughtered.

Just the other day, for instance, there was a report which indicated that over 2,500 innocent civilians had been murdered by enemy troops in the town of Hue during the TET offensive, yet many of the newspapers in this country which devoted a large amount of space to the alleged U.S. atrocity, hardly mentioned this report.

This is what we mean by maintaining a proper perspective over this incident. We don't doubt that it happened nor that its disclosure came as a shock to most Americans. But the entire Defense Department and the hundreds of thousands of members of our armed forces who are a part of it can't fairly be blamed for the misdeeds of a very few, any more than a whole community can be blamed if a single one of its citizens runs amok and kills a bunch of innocent people.

There's also this point to remember. Any time a large number of men are taken from their civilian pursuits and trained to be professional killers, there are going to be some who aren't going to be particularly selective about who they kill. Nor is it easy to predict how any certain individual will react to a long exposure to a kill or be killed environment.

Men who have been through combat can better understand how this alleged atrocity could have happened than those who have never been subjected to such an ordeal. Not many combat veterans will condone the wilful slaughter of women and children even in a war zone and under battle conditions, yet they can understand how such incidents can occur, and particularly if ordered by higher authority.

In the days ahead there is little question but that this incident is going to be given a great deal of public exposure. That is perhaps as it should be, but in passing judgment on this regrettable affair it should be kept in mind that it was an isolated incident; it does not reflect the overall attitude of our combat forces in Vietnam, and it involved just a few of the million or more American fighting men who have served or who are still in Vietnam.

The many shouldn't be judged by the actions of the few, but unfortunately this could happen if this incident isn't viewed in its true perspective.

#### NUCLEAR POWER ON THE MOON

### HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of how magnificently the

Apollo 12 flight progressed once the astronauts overcame the initial problems at liftoff. As in so many activities in this Nation's space program, another first was achieved on this mission—the generation of electricity by nuclear means on the moon.

The Apollo Lunar Surface Experiment Package—ALSEP—is powered by a nuclear generator which uses the heat of decay of plutonium-238. The heat is applied to one side of a series of thermoelectric devices and they in turn create electricity directly. This nuclear generator, which has no moving parts, is called the SNAP-27. I would like to point out that the SNAP-27 generator will still be functioning when the experiments it is now powering have ceased operating.

The SNAP-27 is the power source for a passive seismic experiment, a lunar surface magnetometer, a solar wind spectrometer, and a suprathermal ion detector, as well as the central station and transmitter which sends the data back to earth.

I would like to recall other successes with space nuclear power sources, namely, the SNAP-19 which is providing most of the power for the Nimbus satellite, our most sophisticated weather satellite, and the grapefruit-sized SNAP-3 navigational satellite which was launched in 1961 and is still operating. It, in fact, is our oldest operating satellite.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection, I would like to insert in the RECORD the characteristics of the SNAP-27 and a description of the experiments it is powering on the moon.

The item follows:

#### SNAP-27 GENERATOR

SNAP-27 consists of a generator and fuel capsule with total weight of 40 pounds.

#### FUEL CAPSULE

Weight: 14.8 pounds.

Size: 16.48 inches long, 2.51 inches in diameter.

Operating temperature: 1300 degrees Fahrenheit.

Thermal power: 1480 watts.

Nuclear material: Plutonium-238.

#### GENERATOR

Housing: Beryllium structure including fins.

Size: 18.23 inches high, 15.67 inches in diameter across the fins.

Weight: 25.2 pounds.

Power output: 56.2 watts three years after assembly.

Voltage: 16 plus or minus 0.2 volts.

Thermoelectric Material: Lead Telluride.

Powered Devices of the Apollo Lunar Surface Experiment:

Central data collection station and moon-earth transmitter-receiver.

The four scientific experiments are:

1. *Passive seismic experiment.*—This is intended to gain information in lunar physical properties. It will determine the frequency of moon quakes and measure approximate azimuth and distance to seismic epicenters. The location and frequency of meteorite impacts on the moon can also be observed.

2. *Lunar surface magnetometer.*—This will indicate the deep permeability and conductance of the moon and whether it has a ferrous core. It will yield information about the interaction of solar wind with the moon and since the conductivity of rock is a strong function of temperature, inferences may be drawn as to the deep subsurface temperature of the moon.

3. *Solar wind spectrometer.*—Provides information as to how solar wind(s) react with the lunar surface as to close-in shock fronts and directional changes. This will provide information on the confinement of plasmas in the laboratory, electrical conducting of the moon, the moon's availability to retain an atmosphere and the effects on the lunar surface of charged particle bombardment.

4. *Suprathermal ion detector with cold cathode ion gauge.*—This experiment measures characteristics of positive ions at the lunar surface. Its purpose is to gain information about the lunar atmosphere as well as the low energy portion of the solar wind(s). The effect of electric fields near the lunar surface can also be observed.

The cold cathode ion gauge will indicate the density of the lunar atmosphere and detect any variation of particle density associated with the lunar phase or solar activity.

#### MANY PARENTS OBJECT TO DEMONSTRATORS USING THEIR SONS' NAMES

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Vietnam moratorium, many parents of servicemen killed in Vietnam were deeply disturbed by the use of their sons' names by the demonstrators. This father speaks poignantly for many families who have given a son or husband for their country and I would like to share his strong feelings with my House colleagues. The letter follows:

[From the Las Vegas Review Journal, Oct. 16, 1969]

#### "WHEN THEY READ THE NAME OF MY SON"

When the peace demonstrators read my son's name, let them know how he felt about the Vietnam war, and how the parents who shaped him feel about it.

It is we, the parents, who said goodbye to him when he went away to fight—not the peace agitators.

It is we, the parents, who wrote long, anxious letters to him during his three months of almost continuous combat—not the agitators.

It is the ones who saw his body returned in a flag-draped coffin who first should be heard—not the protesters.

These transparent propagandists were not there to see my son buried, nor do they accompany me on my trips to lay flowers on his grave.

My son was killed while fighting for his country.

America cannot be permitted to perpetually persuade its citizens to instill in their sons a sense of patriotism, loyalty and a determination to defend the oppressed, and then after the sons have died, suddenly change her mind and yield to those who killed them.

Most of the peace demonstrations and name-reading ceremonies across this nation are an obvious propaganda device designed to influence the President of the United States into surrendering South Viet Nam to an enemy which admittedly and openly seeks to conquer it by any and all means.

When they read my son's name to advocate peace at any price—the price being defeat—let them remember that he whose name they read did not surrender.

When these pretentious mourners read my son's name, let them realize that their grief would be better served if applied to the Viet Cong whose flag they wave even as they burn the one which graced my son's casket. Let

them apply their bogus sorrow to those aggressors felled by my son as he won his posthumous Silver Star for heroism in ground combat.

And when they read the name of my son, let them know that he advocated an increase in the bombing of the ammunition depots in North Viet Nam—not a cessation so that his enemy would receive unlimited war supplies with which to kill him.

When they read the name of Gregory Malcolm Thompson, let them realize that they are proving before the world the truth of the oft-repeated Communist claim that many Americans have become soft, decadent and yielding to any determined force which opposes them.

And when these weak, gullible ones read his name in their avowed pursuit of peace, let them remember that a peace purchased at the price of surrender is but a brief Munich-type peace lasting only until the aggressor's appetite demands more victims.

Finally, when these hypocrites read the list of the dead who defended South Viet Nam, let them know that they have reached the ultimate low in the world-record of human infamy, in that they willfully and cunningly utter a dead man's name to achieve the defeat of the cause for which he died.

MALCOLM THOMPSON.

#### EDITORIALS SUPPORT PRESIDENT ON GERM WARFARE DECISION

### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to renounce the use of "germ" warfare has won broad acclaim.

From every part of our land I have received editorials supporting the President's action.

These editorials have come from papers that otherwise might be described in some cases as "hawk" and in others as "dove."

They come from the East, South, North, and West.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a sampling of these editorials for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times Dispatch, Nov. 27, 1969]

#### DEMILITARIZING GERMS

Some of the world's great powers possess a terrifying arsenal of biological weapons capable of killing or crippling vast populations, and the horrendous possibility of germ warfare has hovered over mankind for years.

Available for use are biological agents capable of causing such deadly diseases as plague, anthrax, tularemia, botulism, Rocky Mountain spotted fever and encephalitis. In a single pass over New York City, one fighter plane could drop enough anthrax bacteria to wipe out half the city's people. Cities the size of Richmond could be rendered lifeless with no trouble at all.

Now the shadow seems to be lifting, thanks to PRESIDENT NIXON'S renunciation, on this country's behalf, of the use of bacteriological weapons under any circumstances. This unilateral decision, coupled with Mr. NIXON'S pledge that the United States would never be the first to use chemical warfare weapons, should rid all but the most cynical of the notion that the United States is an imperialistic nation. The President's action indicates the defensive nature of this country's military posture.

Some might attempt to disparage Mr. Nixon's act by insisting that the biological weapons he has renounced were impractical anyway, that he really hasn't forsworn the use of a single weapon of value. It is true that any country that resorted to biological warfare would run a grave risk of unleashing deadly germs upon its own people or upon friendly countries. But a country convinced of the military necessity of using biological weapons might not allow such a chilling possibility to stop it. Mr. NIXON'S decision could persuade other nations to forgo the development of a cache of bacteriological weapons, and this, of course, would reduce the chances of germ warfare.

Other critics are upset by Mr. NIXON'S failure to include tear gas and defoliants, now being used in the war in Vietnam, on the list of chemicals this country does not intend to use first. In other words, they want the United States to stop using tear gas and herbicides altogether, now.

A ban on such chemicals may ultimately prove to be desirable, but the President was right not to abandon them precipitately. Of course they are damaging and reprehensible. All weapons of war are. But tear gas is not deadly, and the controlled use of defoliants doesn't have to pose a major threat to human life.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Nov. 27, 1969]

#### PRESIDENT NIXON TAKES SANE STEP

President Nixon has moved to put sanity back into United States policy on chemical and biological warfare (CBW).

For years now, CBW developments have gone their own mindless way. Neither the public in general nor its most responsible leaders have realized what was afoot in this field.

There is evidence, for example, that President Nixon himself didn't know about stockpiles of nerve gas on Okinawa during his first months in office. As Rep. Richard D. McCarthy writes in his new book, "The Ultimate Folly", the majority of congressmen knew little about the CBW program even though they appropriated money for its operations.

One of the few informed CBW supporters in the House was a congressman who also happened to be a major general in the Army's chemical reserve and the representative of a district which was home to a major Air Force CBW laboratory.

But thanks to the Okinawa disclosures and, more important, the accidental gassing of 6,400 sheep near Dugway, Utah, Rep. McCarthy and a great many others recognized what was happening in both the chemical and biological fields. What they saw wasn't pretty.

The United States was not only stockpiling weapons that most of the rest of the civilized nations of the world had agreed not to use under the Geneva agreement of 1925. There were pressures in the Pentagon for exotic new developments such as a synthetic germ that would create epidemics for which there was no medical defense.

In a dangerous world, this country must often take defensive moves it would rather forego. But it is not in our defensive interests to play the role of the brilliant scientist who creates a CBW monster that can easily get out of control.

As President Nixon said, CBW weapons are too unpredictable and uncontrollable to be made "options" in any nation's arsenal. It is time this country concentrated on ridding the world of their grotesque threat rather than on carrying it to a more hideous perfection.

The President has proposed the basic steps for a sane policy: Ratification of the 1925 Geneva agreement with a tough amendment to ban weapons unknown in 1925; destruc-

tion of our biological weapons; and concentration on genuine defense measures against biological weapons through research outside the Defense Department.

These steps can take our CBW program out of the dark corners of the Pentagon where it has flourished so dangerously. And with our own policy in order, we can join a worldwide effort for genuine CBW defense by seeking the mutual elimination of all CBW weapons stockpiles.

[From the Oregonian, Nov. 26, 1969]

#### GOOD, BOLD EXAMPLE

President Richard M. Nixon's statement on gas and germ warfare is a major initiative toward elimination of world-devastating warfare.

The President not only asked U.S. ratification of a 1925 Geneva protocol prohibiting use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, he proposed that America join Great Britain in seeking a reaffirmation of that principle in a newly drafted convention. And of even greater immediate significance he:

Flatly renounced any further U.S. research in bacteriological weapons;

Said America would not employ such germ warfare even if an enemy were to do so;

Ordered a study leading to the destruction of all existing U.S. stockpiles of bacteriological weapons;

Promised that future bacteriological research would deal only with countermeasures against germ weapons used by others, with the research administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare rather than the Defense Department;

And reaffirmed America's long-standing commitment against first use of lethal chemical, as distinguished from germ, weapons, and extended the commitment to incapacitating chemicals.

America should long since have ratified the 1925 Geneva protocol, which was an outgrowth of the use of gases in World War I. The belated action, coupled with the other unilateral intentions listed by the President, should encourage wide adherence to the convention updating the 1925 pact. These actions set a bold and admirable example for others who possess or aspire to gas and germ offensive weapons.

The U.S. risk is in the possibility of surprise attack by an enemy with such weapons. The safeguards emphasized by the President are an alert U.S. intelligence with respect to such foreign research and the perfection of counter measures. The risk, so limited, is well worth the prospect of eliminating a kind of warfare that not only threatens the very existence of man on earth but also who a brutalizing influence on those who have the power to wage it.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Nov. 27, 1969]

#### AN END TO CBW HORRORS

For more than a decade, the United States has secretly been preparing for chemical and germ warfare—a potential killer which some scientists say makes The Bomb look like a toy.

The amounts spent and details of the grisly chemical and biological weapons (CBW) have for the most part been concealed. The horrors that have been developed began to be known with the accidental killing of sheep in Utah last March; with the discovery that nerve gas was stored on Okinawa; and the disclosure of the army's plans to dump obsolete stocks of chemical agents in the ocean.

This year it was learned that about \$2.5 billion has been spent by the United States for CBW work since 1960 with little debate in Congress and with most congressmen not being aware of what was being done.

Public revulsion to silent killers evoked from the Pentagon the response that CBW was a deplorable weapon but we must have

the capability to use it so other nations will be deterred from doing so.

Now, after an intensive review, President Nixon has taken another stand, one which shows a far better understanding of the frightful hazards of CBW.

"Mankind already carries in its hands too many of the seeds of destruction," Mr. Nixon said. "Biological weapons have massive unpredictable and potentially uncontrollable consequences. They may produce global epidemics and impair the health of future generations."

The President has ordered a halt to the creation and stockpiling of more odorless, tasteless, kill-in-seconds materials. In addition, the gruesome stockpilers are to be destroyed.

Instead of becoming a CBW power to deter other nations, the United States will find ways of countering any germ warfare attack. The President wisely decided on the shift in research and placed the responsibility in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, rather than the Defense Department.

In addition, the President extended U.S. policy to foreclose the first use in a war of chemicals that incapacitate. A policy against the first use of lethal chemicals in a war was adopted by the United States decades ago.

The presidential announcement was well-timed. It came on the same day the Russians pushed for consideration in the United Nations of a draft treaty banning chemical and biological weapons.

Also, redirecting the research on CBW towards a more humane approach took place when Americans were reeling from disclosures about the massacre at Pinkville. Mr. Nixon's action on CBW will not affect the lesion on our national honor caused by the slaughter of women and children at Pinkville. But it does show that this nation still has a basic abhorrence for the horror that man can create and perpetrate.

[From the Chicago Today, Nov. 17, 1969]

#### ENDING THE GERM-WAR RACE

Good News about armament stockpiles is rare, and we're grateful to President Nixon for providing a double helping of it. The President announced Tuesday that the United States is renouncing the use of bacteriological weapons under any circumstances—even in an attack by an enemy using them—and will destroy its stocks of germ-war components as quickly as the job can be done in safety. [The defense department says it hopes that will be "well within a year."]

Nixon also formally renounced the first use by this country of deadly or incapacitating chemical weapons, and called on Congress to ratify the 1925 Geneva convention banning them.

All this is an immensely hopeful change—a decisive step away from the nightmare of gas and germ warfare, after many years of determinedly pushing toward it. Moreover, the new policy shows a basic shift in the thinking that has governed military decisions for decades: The compulsion to pile up more and deadlier weapons because, if we don't, the other side may be able to annihilate us more times than we can annihilate them.

That fear-thinking has led to a self-accelerating race that, sooner or later, could only make the nightmares a reality.

There is no other way to stop this spiral than to stop it; to declare that, since it takes two to make a race, this particular race is over as of now. Taking the first step required some courage, as does every first step, and we're glad Mr. Nixon has it.

Nixon exempted from the self-imposed ban on chemical weapons such riot-control agents as tear gas and its modifications. That left room for further discussion, and the Communists promptly moved into it. Shortly after he spoke, the Soviet Union and seven other communist nations submitted a resolution before the United Nations asking for a com-

plete ban on chemical and biological weapons, presumably including these.

If that means the thrust has been reversed, and that east and west now will start trying to outdo each other in denouncing gas-germ weapons instead of stockpiling them, it's the best news in that sector yet.

[From the Nashville Banner, Nov. 26, 1969]  
NIXON SPELLS IT OUT—ON BIOLOGICAL WARFARE, THUMBS DOWN

"Germ Warfare," and biological methods, have been so repugnant to conscience that civilized people—by common consent—have refrained from their use, though other weaponry has developed in volume and destructive power.

The United States has meticulously shunned bacteriological use—confining research in that field to preparedness for purely defensive purposes. The fact is underscored, and policy as the national guideline emphatically spelled out, in President Nixon's statement on the subject yesterday. He has moved also to correct a 44-year oversight, by proposing Senate ratification of the 1925 Geneva treaty prohibiting first use in war of "asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and bacteriological methods of warfare."

This nation has abided by that rule, though not a signatory to it. The record in that particular speaks for itself.

The United States' activities in that field will be restricted, by this order, to maintaining a defensive research program. That does not alter the policy, it simply defines and formalizes it. In the area of international affairs, it also substantiates further this nation's commitment to leadership for world security and peace.

In addition to renouncing "first use" of lethal chemicals, President Nixon extended the American position forbidding first use of incapacitating chemicals. Again, as he stipulated, any research or resources in these will be for defensive purposes only—and reserved strictly for possible retaliation.

The policy is clear and valid, as was the one on which the ABM decision was based—recognized for what it is, a national defense mechanism.

Mr. Nixon has made his case. It will be understood in the chancelleries abroad. It should be understood, even by chronic policy-needlers, at home.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle,  
Nov. 26, 1969]

#### CB ABOLITION A MORAL VICTORY

(By Royce Brier)

In 216 B.C. Hannibal with 40,000 men routed a Roman army of 86,000 at Cannes, one of the most extraordinary pitched battles of all time. The story is he slaughtered 60,000 survivors, but it's a Roman story, not his.

Anyway, ancient battles and sieges were often total. Today we have nuclear weapons, but we're scared to use them. They are being hoarded for survival conflict, but experts concede that in nuclear warfare victory is impossible in any rational sense.

The technology which begot nuclear energy had spinoffs devising other forms of warfare, possibly as total as nuclear. Indeed, it started a little earlier when the Germans used poison gas in World War I, with only local success.

Notwithstanding, the military outfits of the several great powers created sections to devise and experiment with non-detonation war, chemical and bacterial, called CB in the trade. Since World War II the CB activity has been intense on a small scale, and millions have been dumped into it by the United States, and probably by the Soviet Union.

The method was to assemble specially trained brigadiers and colonels with technical and scientific aides who teamed with private industries to produce the junk.

They were put in fenced compounds, and it was so secret the personnel couldn't tell wives what the duties were. Testing grounds were set up in isolated areas, one in Utah. If anything went awry, the administrators were required to lie about it by their superiors, disclaiming that their work had anything to do with a given mishap.

Manpower and money were wasted, because the weapons they fashioned were potentially unusable on both moral and practical grounds.

So it was a child's game, designed chiefly to snuff out civilians. President Nixon in a highly commendable move has now renounced it.

He said he is unilaterally ordering the destruction of bacteriological and offensive chemical stocks. The only exceptions are tear gas and other riot-control agents, and some chemicals used against plant life. Only defensive production and testing will remain. Apparently the manpower will be diverted to other military duties.

The gases, including nerve gas, are subject to the caprice of air movement in close combat, and even in remote bombing are unreliable. Very few Americans wish to behold the inhabitants of even an enemy city reduce to quivering and dying paralytics. Spreading germs, cholera for instance, is even more repugnant, and there is no guarantee an epidemic could be confined to enemy territory. Defensive medical science is not that exact.

There will be wails the Nixon decision undermines national security. Nonsense. In a survival war we have nuclear weapons. Genocide by detonation is bad enough, without casting about for bizarre ways to accomplish it.

Renunciation of CB warfare can't have anything but a salutary world effect. It may be a turning back from the extermination of mankind the doomsday folk postulate as the end of the technological road we pursue on all fronts today.

[From the Seattle Post, Nov. 28, 1969]

#### GERM WARFARE

President Nixon's decision to renounce the use of lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons and to destroy existing stockpiles of even more dreadful bacteriological weapons is a welcome initiative for Americans and all mankind.

Soviet negotiators at the strategic arms limitation talks in Helsinki can hardly interpret the President's action as anything but a sincere move toward sanity in the ever escalating world arms race.

Even though the United States has never formally ratified the 1925 Geneva Treaty prohibiting first use in war of "asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and bacteriological uses of warfare," we have always adhered to the principles of the pact.

The President's message now makes feasible an explicit U.S. commitment toward limiting the possibilities of chemical and biological warfare through action in the Senate.

It is an entirely sensible move on our part. A defensive research program in "germ warfare" is an adequate deterrent to guarantee safety from potential aggressors.

[From the Denver Post, Nov. 26, 1969]

#### WISE DECISION ON GERM WEAPONS

President Nixon has acted wisely and humanely in pledging that the United States will never engage in germ warfare and in renouncing the use of chemical warfare weapons for all but defensive purposes.

The fear of bacteriological warfare has

been with the world for many years. The President's decision, announced Tuesday, to destroy all existing U.S. stockpiles of bacteriological weapons should alleviate much of this fear. But similar statements from leaders of the Soviet Union and other major powers are needed to set the world at ease on this matter.

We wish that President Nixon had also been able to announce plans for destruction of chemical warfare weapons—most notably of such lethal gas supplies as those stored at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver. In our view, these chemical weapons represent as great a threat to the people of the United States as they do to any possible enemy.

The President certainly could strengthen his hand at the SALT talks in Helsinki if he also proposed to phase out the supplies of lethal gas.

The subject of germ and chemical warfare is not likely to be raised at the Helsinki talks, which are concentrating on nuclear disarmament. But the ongoing general disarmament conference in Geneva would be appropriate for such a discussion.

In the meantime, we hope that Congress promptly heeds the President's request for ratification of a 1925 Geneva protocol prohibiting the first use of "asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare."

Such action, coupled with U.S. backing for a British draft treaty on the banning of biological weapons, would definitely enhance the cause of worldwide disarmament.

[From the Seattle Post, Nov. 26, 1969]

**BOTH NIXON AND U.S. MAY GAIN FROM BAN ON GERM WEAPONS**  
(By Robert M. Smith)

WASHINGTON.—By the time President Nixon made his speech yesterday on chemical-biological warfare, there was nearly unanimous agreement among the top members of his administration on the decision he announced.

This was because Nixon gave up a few untested weapons in the American arsenal to gain possible real advantages of security for the nation and prestige for himself.

Informed sources here say Nixon's decision on chemical-biological weapons was both shrewd and quick. They are asking people to look at what the President really gave up, and they suggest that he will now take other important steps, though probably with less splash.

What the President gave up, they say, was—

The first use of incapacitating chemicals. The U.S. has only one "incap" chemical—a gas called BZ. BZ enters the body through the lungs and interferes with the normal mental and physical processes. But BZ, the Pentagon has admitted, is terribly expensive (\$20 a pound, and it takes thousands of pounds to knock out, say, a battalion), and its effects vary; while it makes some people passive, it may send others berserk. In addition, it can—in certain cases—kill its victims.

The use of germs to incapacitate and kill in war. It has been American policy that biological agents would be used to "retaliate in kind" against an enemy who used them on American forces or population.

However, experts in chemical-biological warfare (CBW) point out that there were several problems that would probably have prevented the U.S. from ever using germs as weapons, even in retaliation.

In the first place, the germs and toxins (the dead but poisonous products of bacteria) stockpiled in refrigerated igloos at Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas have never been tested; it is not clear what effect they would have on enemy forces or population.

Secondly, there is a central problem of

"retaliation in kind": identifying the attacker. How could the U.S. tell whether it was, say, Peking or the Soviet Union that had spread a particular disease?

Thirdly—and this is probably the most common argument of those opposed to the stockpiles at Pine Bluff—how could the U.S. distribute germs against an enemy so that it could be sure that the germs stayed in hostile territory. How, they ask, could the diseases be kept from spreading into neutral or friendly territories or even from triggering a world-wide "pandemic" that would boomerang on the U.S.?

In light of all these uncertainties, the experts say—and Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird apparently agreed—both the incapacitating agent BZ and the arsenal of germs have very dubious strategic value. And it is only these weapons that Nixon foreswore the use of yesterday.

On the other hand, the gains to the nation and to Nixon personally appear substantial, according to informed sources.

First—and perhaps most importantly—biological and chemical agents neither cost as much nor require the technical ability of nuclear weapons to produce. By maintaining a stock of biologicals and refusing to sign the Geneva protocol banning the use of gas and germs, the U.S. may have been engendering interest in CBW weapons on the part of small, poorer countries keen to create their own arsenals.

In addition, the U.S. has been criticized at the Geneva Disarmament Conference and at the United Nations for refusing to take a strong stand on CBW. This week, the Political Committee of the United Nations is scheduled to discuss CBW.

At the same time, domestic pressure on the administration has been mounting. Some of it has come from the academic community, some from a public troubled by accidents involving gas, and some from the Congress.

The American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Salk Institute sponsored a conference on CBW. In July in Boston; Rep. Max McCarthy, a New York Democrat and outspoken critic of CBW policy, has a new book, "The Ultimate Folly" which comes out today, and a House subcommittee is in the midst of hearings on CBW.

The administration made clear that it did not regard tear gas as banned by the protocol, pointing out that Australia—which is also fighting in Vietnam—shares that view.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Nov. 26, 1969]

**NIXON'S CBW WEAPONS BAN STEP TOWARD PEACE, SAFETY**

Criticism of the American military establishment's continuing emphasis on the weapons of chemical and biological warfare (CBW) was mounting in Congress and in scientific circles when Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird answered it rather roughly last July.

In a statement which seemed to reflect official policy, Laird said that the best way to ensure that the United States is not attacked with chemical or biological weapons is for it to maintain its own weapons as a deterrent. The U.S. he said, would never be the first to resort to CBW, but it would continue research and production of gas and germ weapons.

If that was official policy then, it is no longer.

President Nixon yesterday announced changes in this country's CBW program which should satisfy all reasonable critics.

With respect to chemical warfare, the U.S.—

"Reaffirms its oft-repeated renunciation of the first use of lethal chemical weapons" and—"Extends this renunciation to the first use of incapacitating chemicals."

Accompanying this pledge was an announcement by the President that he will

ask the Senate to ratify the 1925 Geneva Protocol which prohibits the first use in war of "asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and bacteriological methods of warfare."

With respect to biological weapons, Mr. Nixon said:

"Biological weapons have massive, unpredictable and potentially uncontrollable consequences. They produce global epidemics and impair the health of future generations. I have therefore decided that—

"The U.S. shall renounce the use of lethal biological agents and weapons, and all other methods of biological warfare.

"The U.S. will confine its biological research to defensive measures such as immunization and safety measures.

"The Department of Defense has been asked to make recommendations as to the disposal of existing stocks of bacteriological weapons."

Beyond this, the President said the U.S. "associates itself" with a British proposal to ban not only the use of bacteriological weapons—already covered by the Geneva Protocol of 1925—but also their development and production.

The new policy announced by Mr. Nixon is praiseworthy as "an initiative toward peace." It also may be valuable as a means of protecting the United States against accidents which could be devastating.

CBW weapons are, in fact, worse than useless. Rep. Charles A. Mosher (R-Oberlin) and three other Republican Congressmen recently made this point in a 37-page report.

"Our study clearly shows," said Mosher, "that CBW (chemical and biological weapons) do not contribute in any meaningful or effective way to our national defense; in fact, our possession of these volatile weapons may severely restrict our ability to negotiate significant arms limitations on conventional and nuclear weapons systems.

"The fact is that chemical and biological weapons are even more dangerous to those who have them than to any potential enemy," Mosher continued. "There is simply no reliable, foolproof way to produce, transport and store them safely."

As for ratification of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) predicted that this could be accomplished before the end of the year, despite a crowded Senate schedule.

"I see no reason why there should be any controversy," he said. "It's 44 years overdue."

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Nov. 26, 1969]

**A CRUCIAL "INITIATIVE TOWARD PEACE"**

Only last June the White House announced a detailed review of chemical and biological warfare, including the U.S. position on arms control and the question of ratifying the 1925 Geneva protocol renouncing the use of such weaponry.

Now, in what he properly calls an "initiative toward peace," President Nixon has put the U.S. on record with an explicit and emphatic policy position that not only reaffirms renunciation of the first use of lethal chemical weapons, but goes beyond that to spell the end to production and stockpiling of biological agents of destruction.

As an appropriate punctuation to this contribution to an "atmosphere of peace," moreover, Mr. Nixon will seek a belated Senate confirmation of the Geneva Protocol.

What must be even more gratifying to Rep. Richard D. McCarthy of Buffalo, as one of the first and most articulate critics in alerting the nation to the perils of disease-spreading weapons, is the President's decision to outlaw lethal germ agents even for deterrent and retaliatory purposes.

Mr. Nixon firmly supports the basic and unanswerable argument for a total, unequivocal ban—that biological weapons inherently have "massive, unpredictable and uncon-

trollable consequences" that could "produce global epidemics and impair the health of future generations."

In ordering the destruction of present stockpiles, the President has gone far beyond, if indeed he has not actually overruled, what has been generally understood Defense Department doctrine that the U.S. must maintain such weapons for their "defensive and retaliatory capability." The effect of this now is to align the U.S. closely with the British proposal at the 18-month disarmament conference for a convention that would strengthen the 1925 Geneva Protocol by prohibiting the production and possession of biological agents for hostile purposes.

In the area of gas warfare, the President goes far enough for now, we think, in renouncing first use of lethal and incapacitating gas while making an exception of tear gas. Here we suspect Rep. McCarthy is barking up the wrong tree in trying to get even tear-gas added to the banned list.

The President has done a good day's work for peace. It affirms the determination of this country to do its part in easing the universal sense of horror generated by disease-spreading weapons which rival in risk to humanity the thermonuclear weapons whose control is the subject of current U.S.-Soviet talks in Helsinki.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Nov. 27, 1969]

#### STEP TO PEACE

President Nixon's renunciation of any use of biological weapons and first use of lethal chemical weapons is a laudable step that advances the cause of world peace.

The Senate should follow through with prompt ratification of a Geneva protocol prohibiting first use of these weapons. This action is 44 years overdue; the protocol was achieved in 1925 but the United States and Japan remain the only major nations that have not ratified it.

The next advance should be an international agreement prohibiting any use or stockpiling of these terrible weapons. Disarmament negotiators are now working toward that end. Their task is a difficult one, but Mr. Nixon's action should make international agreement easier to achieve.

[From the Baltimore News American, Nov. 27, 1969]

#### GERM WARFARE

President Nixon's decision to renounce the use of lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons and to destroy existing stockpiles of even more dreadful bacteriological weapons is a welcome initiative for Americans and all mankind.

Soviet negotiators at the strategic arms limitation talks in Helsinki can hardly interpret the President's action as anything but a sincere move toward sanity in the ever escalating world arms race.

Even though the United States has never formally ratified the 1925 Geneva treaty prohibiting first use in war of "asphyxiating poisonous or other gases and bacteriological uses of warfare," we have always adhered to the principles of the pact.

The President's message now makes feasible an explicit U.S. commitment toward limiting the possibilities of chemical and biological warfare through action in the Senate.

It is an entirely sensible move on our part. A defensive research program in "germ warfare" is an adequate deterrent to guarantee safety from potential aggressors.

As the President declared: "Mankind already carries in its own hands too many of the seeds of its own destruction. By the examples we set we hope to contribute to an atmosphere of peace and understanding between nations and among men."

HUGH DOWNEY

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a magnificent private effort has been underway for some time in Ethiopia that deserves the commendation of all of us. I refer to the efforts of Hugh F. Downey, a young man from Kansas City, Mo., who has organized a program of community action in rural Ethiopia. I have known this young man just as I have known his father, Hugh B. Downey, himself a responsible and conscientious community leader, for many years. I admire them both and I can understand by knowing the father why the son is the diligent, capable, and talented person he is. Last Thursday, national recognition came to the younger Hugh in the form of the Lane Bryant Volunteer Award. The program brochure carries a citation supporting Mr. Downey's achievement. It follows:

HUGH DOWNEY—CO-WINNER, \$5,000  
INTERNATIONAL AWARD

In a remote province of Ethiopia 3,500 feet about sea level, a 28-year old native of Kansas City, Missouri labors in the hot, arid terrain. He is working to help people who are fighting not only the natural enemies of poverty and disease, but the human hostilities that exist in the unsettled areas as well.

Hugh Downey came to Ethiopia as an enlisted man in the United States Army. A chance meeting with a priest introduced the young soldier to the poverty of the remote villages. From that moment he was committed to teach the villagers how to help themselves in every way possible.

After Mr. Downey's discharge from the Army in 1965, he only returned home long enough to marry his childhood sweetheart and to seek support from among his friends and family for the people of Ethiopia. Then the Downeys returned and, despite tremendous obstacles, have recorded an impressive list of achievements.

Through their efforts, 10 schools, currently educating 1,000 pupils, have been built, equipped and staffed. Ten brick making machines, imported from the United States, have been loaned to villages to transform grass hut structures into sturdy, clean homes. One village has a church, council hall and many residences and, as a reward for its progress, has been presented with a gasoline powered generator for electricity. An orphanage of five buildings, designed free of charge by an American architectural firm, houses 100 orphans. A school connected with the orphanage is open to an additional 100 day students from poor families in the area. Its scholastic standing is recognized as among the best. A public library of over 5,000 volumes was established in Keren. It was so popular that the municipality has taken over its operation.

The Downey's personally combated two serious malaria epidemics, obtaining quantities of medicines, organizing and supervising a distribution system. They have organized and taken part in medical safaris, carrying aid into remote areas never before having the benefit of modern medicine. They continually minister to the sick and afflicted in a large area surrounding the town of Keren. Presently, they are building a 75-bed hospital in Keren, a modern structure de-

signed by an American architectural firm. Joining with the officials of Keren, the Downeys have helped establish an obstetrical clinic which is nearly ready for use.

With all this incredible activity, the Downeys have also managed to maintain a home, providing room, board and tuition for secondary school students who otherwise would be unable to continue their education. They have financed young native businessmen in establishing trades for which they are suited. In addition, Mr. Downey has conducted small, but successful agricultural experiments.

These accomplishments have taken their toll. Mrs. Downey lost her first baby in Keren and was once wounded in the leg by a stray rifle shot. Happily, the Downeys welcomed the birth of their son, Hugh Michael, on March 3, 1969.

Mr. Downey has been commended by His Imperial Majesty Emperor Haile Selassie. H. H. Ras Asserate Kasza, Governor General of Eritrea, stated that even more important than Mr. Downey's physical accomplishments, is his moral force. Governor Kasza pointed out that he is a man of peace and of much creative ability, compassion and intelligence. Hugh Downey conveys to the people the need for commitment to self-government, the need for hard work in a spirit of sacrifice and growth. He actively trains Ethiopian citizens to take over the various projects he initiates, and inspires others to start similar projects on their own.

Praise for Hugh Downey does not come from high places alone. A river near Keren has been renamed . . . The River Hugh.

#### PARITY FIGURES FOR NOVEMBER 1969

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, as is my custom since I have been in Congress, I am today inserting the latest parity figures for November 1969.

The parity figure has gone up from 72 percent in January 1969, to 76 percent in November 1969. This is a step in the right direction. I sincerely hope that Congress will do all it can at the Federal level to keep moving toward the goal of 100-percent parity.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby insert the November 1969, parity figures with January and October figures to show comparison:

PARITY, NOVEMBER 1969

[Percent]

Commodity	January	October	November
Wheat.....	47	46	46
Corn.....	65	65	62
Cotton.....	41	45	44
Milk.....	83	81	82
Butterfat.....	74	75	75
Wool.....	44	42	41
Barley.....	65	61	62
Flax.....	67	62	61
Oats.....	69	60	61
Sorghum.....	64	68	69
Soybeans.....	70	61	63
Beef.....	74	81	79
Hogs.....	74	95	96
Lamb.....	85	90	89
Chicken.....	67	66	64
Turkeys.....	65	69	72
Eggs.....	83	75	89
Average	72	74	76

STOCKTON-BASED FOUNDATION  
REDUCES MEDICAID COSTS

**HON. JOHN J. McFALL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article concerning the unusual and fine work being done by California's San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care in providing excellent patient care and at the same time saving money on Medicaid.

Possible application of the system established by the foundation to other areas of the State and Nation now is under study at Sacramento, Washington, and Baltimore.

In view of the necessity to broaden the availability of good medical care, the results of the foundation's pioneering work are of particular interest.

The foundation was established in 1954 by the San Joaquin County Medical Society in attempting to accept the challenges of the future by instituting bold new programs. These programs have come into being as a result of thorough analysis of the public needs and desires and reflect the social changes of our times. The purposes of the foundation are to encourage adequate comprehensive prepaid medical care programs for the entire population of the four counties in California it serves, to study ways and means of bringing the highest quality of medical care to all segments of the population regardless of their ability to pay, and to accept the responsibility for professional discipline so important in medical care programs and to medical discipline.

Nearly one-half of the population of San Joaquin, Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties now is covered under the Foundation for Medical Care-sponsored programs.

One of the earlier and most successful of these programs involves a contract between the foundation and the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union-Pacific Maritime Association Welfare Fund to provide medical and surgical care to the longshoremen of the Stockton area. It began 14 years ago as a 1-year program and is still in effect, providing comprehensive services to between 600 and 700 longshoremen, ships' clerks, and walking bosses.

Other coverage to large groups has been arranged through contracts with private organizations and public bodies.

The foundation has initiated an experimental program for agricultural workers. The program allows for care in a physician's office in the patient's resident area as well as care through fixed and mobile clinics. The program, now in its third year, has been funded through three separate grants. These grants were from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Migrant Health Section of the U.S. Public Health Service and from the California State Department of Public Health. One of the basic purposes is to determine the cost of medical care of migrant workers in order that Congress may have factual information upon

which to base decisions on possible national programs of this nature.

The medical society through the foundation continues to look for ways by which quality of medical care programs can be improved and quality medical care made more accessible to the poor.

The story of the successful achievement by the foundation is presented in good detail by the article entitled "Stockton Cuts Medicaid Costs," written by Harry Nelson of the Los Angeles Times and appearing in the October 12 issue of the Washington Post.

I am very proud that one of the most progressive medical societies in the country is in my congressional district and commend to the attention of Members of the House the Washington Post article which follows:

STOCKTON CUTS MEDICAID COSTS

(By Harry Nelson)

STOCKTON, Calif.—Physicians here are doing what nobody else apparently has been able to do: Saving money on Medicaid.

While the Medicaid program (called Medical in California) is under increasing fire almost everywhere because of spiraling costs and questionable quality, 330 Stockton physicians are providing high quality treatment without using up their allotted funds.

They expect to return \$220,000 to the state of California out of \$5 million they will handle this year.

The program's success here has attracted observers from Medicaid and Medicare headquarters in Washington and Baltimore and from state medical societies where the medical care program for the poor is in trouble.

HOW IS IT DONE?

Everyone wants to know how it is done in Stockton.

The answer lies in the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care, an organization of 330 physicians in private practice, which runs the program here.

Much of the foundation's success is attributed to a peer review system under which the doctors carefully examine each other's claims. Certain other plans use peer review also, but the thing that makes the San Joaquin plan more effective, according to its supporters, is its "personal" touch.

All 330 physicians in the program are familiar with one another's practice and type of patients. Consequently, each doctor thinks twice before submitting a claim which might be questioned.

This does not mean that nobody ever submits a questionable claim. About 10 per cent of all claims go to the medical review committee. About half of these are handled by letters which ask the doctor for information which will either justify the claim, or if it is not justifiable, let him know for future reference that the review committee is doing its job. About 1 per cent of the doctors are asked to come into the claims office for a personal talk.

Doctors who are familiar with the program say that its chief controls are the informal, friendly, man-to-man confrontations between doctors who are doing things right and those who show signs of abusing the program.

Dr. Donald C. Harrington, who started the foundation, believes the savings in money is not its most important feature. He is more interested in the quality of medicine provided and he is convinced the plan builds quality.

Eighteen months ago the foundation signed a contract with the state to do a pilot study involving about 33,000 Medicaid beneficiaries living in the four-county area the foundation serves.

It agreed to give all the medical services needed by the beneficiaries for one year in

return for a fixed amount of money that the state pays the foundation each month.

RETURNED AFTER YEAR

This produces a monthly amount of money out of which all physicians' services are paid. If the need outstrips the money available, the doctors must work for nothing. If there is an excess, the amount is carried over to the next month.

If there is an excess at the end of the year, it is returned to the state.

The prospect of achieving savings on a program which last year cost \$3.5 billion nationally—and some say will be costing \$12 billion to \$16 billion within five years—is what keeps the government and organized medicine representatives streaming into Stockton for a closer look.

Dr. Harrington says the potential savings for other communities is even greater than it has been for the area served by the foundation.

He believes that transplanting the foundation's program across the country would result in a saving of approximately 12.5 per cent of Medicaid's cost.

Backers of the San Joaquin plan believe that its personal touch, with doctors reviewing other doctors' claims, is far more effective than a program conducted under mandates from Sacramento or Washington.

It not only achieves its purpose, they say, but keeps doctors in the Medicaid program, rather than quitting in a huff because of resentment over interference in the private practice of medicine.

KNOXVILLE SOLDIER KILLED IN  
VIETNAM

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fighting men, Sp4c. James F. Polusney, of Knoxville, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Specialist Fourth Class Polusney for his heroic actions, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

KNOXVILLE SOLDIER KILLED IN VIETNAM

A Knoxville medic who left for the Army two days before he was to receive his college diploma from Duquesne University was killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Dept. announced.

Sp4c. James F. Polusney, 25, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry F. Polusney of 236 McKinley St., was killed Monday while on patrol northwest of Saigon with an element of the 1st Air Cavalry Division.

Specialist Fourth Class Polusney finished his degree work at Duquesne in January, 1968, and was a management trainee for Sears, Roebuck and Co. before he was drafted into the Army.

He left for training on May 28, 1968, two days before his graduation ceremonies.

He was assigned to Vietnam in May.

Mrs. Polusney said her son "never complained about the war" but felt sorry "for the little children that had to be involved."

"I'm only glad he never had to kill anyone," she said.

She also said her son was engaged to marry Susan Dieckman of Mt. Oliver.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a brother, Eugene.

## SOME FACTS RELEVANT TO MYLAI

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the Congress are alarmed over the outcome of the Mylai incident and it is hoped that all of the salient facts will be made known, as well as the imponderables, before final judgment is rendered upon the principal figures. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this short article written in a way easily understandable to all, by retired Gen. Ira C. Eaker.

## SOME FACTS RELEVANT TO MYLAI

(By Ira C. Eaker)

Before anyone joins the left wing and pacifist press in condemning without a trial the U.S. Army operation at Mylai as a massacre, there are certain relevant facts which should be considered.

There is little question that more civilian non-combatants, proportionately, have been killed in Vietnam than in World War II. There are several reasons for this which should be understood and remembered in any judgment of U.S. atrocity charges.

The initial efforts in the Vietnam War was made by the Vietcong, local Communist forces in South Vietnam, always supplied by Russia, China and North Vietnam. It was only when this effort was not succeeding that North Vietnamese regular divisions came down from the North.

A prime Vietcong strategy is to gain control over a village or an area through terror, murdering local leaders, police, and teachers and abducting sons and daughters for military service or labor. It is also standard Vietcong practice to use South Vietnamese women and children as hostages against attack or reprisal.

Vietcong guerrillas seldom wear military uniforms. Those who plant mines and booby traps and conduct terror raids against South Vietnamese villages by night often become simple, peasant rice farmers, innocently tilling their paddies at sunrise.

Adding to the problem of discriminating between friend and foe in Vietnam is the difficulty in identifying men and women a few hundred yards distant. Both sexes wear the same conical straw hats and trousers.

The Vietcong, in a deliberate effort to turn the people against the Americans, often come into a village by night and at daylight open fire upon U.S. reconnaissance planes or helicopters. Before the bombers arrive, the Vietcong return to their forest hide-outs leaving the village inhabitants at the mercy of the retaliatory attacks the guerrillas have assured.

It was because of the difficulty of identifying friend and foe that the U.S. Command has made such extraordinary efforts to prevent attacks on friendly villages. Before any attack can be made on any locality, even after our planes and forces have been fired upon, the local South Vietnamese civilian government head as well as the local South Vietnamese military commander must approve. That policy was followed prior to the attack on Mylai.

Any charge or inference that U.S. forces are guilty of frequent atrocities is completely disproven by Chu Hoi figures and facts. This is the program which urges, by leaflets and loudspeakers, that Red forces defect to U.S. or allied South Vietnamese troops. During the past four years nearly two hundred thousand Reds have crossed over. More than 70% of these have surrendered to U.S. forces rather than to South Vietnamese troops. The rate of defection is higher now than at any

earlier time, despite Mylai, and whenever there is the opportunity for preference, the defecting Reds always surrender to U.S. troops.

In any assessment of U.S. troops conduct in Vietnam it should also be remembered that more than half the draftees sent to Vietnam were minors. So long as our government persists in sending its adolescents to do its fighting, it can scarcely expect that they will always use mature judgment especially under the stress of battlefield conditions, with wounded and dying buddies in view.

When a reporter in Vietnam is asked why he reports any evidence of U.S. cruelty, while neglecting to file stories on Vietcong atrocities, he promptly points out that it is news when Americans commit atrocities since they so seldom do, while it is not news when the Reds commit such inhumane acts because that is their standard practice. He may also add candidly that U.S. atrocity stories are solicited by his paper since this supports its demand for immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces.

This judgment is confirmed by the fact that the anti-war press has devoted more than ten times the space to the 300 killed at Mylai than the 3,000 civilians butchered by the Reds in Hue.

## MODESTO RESERVISTS HELP THE NAVAL DISTRICT WIN AWARD

**HON. JOHN J. McFALL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the 12th Naval District recently received the E. V. Richards Memorial Trophy for having the most outstanding Naval Reserve program in the Nation. It was the first time the district had been so honored since the competition began in 1960.

Rear Adm. L. B. McCuddin, commandant of the 12th Naval District, was justifiably proud of the accomplishment during the fiscal year of 1969 which was announced October 23. He sent a message of congratulations and appreciation to "all hands" in his district encompassing central and northern California, Nevada and Utah, complimenting each unit for its part in bringing the award to the 12th. In all, there are 12 Naval Districts competing for the trophy sponsored by the Navy League of the United States.

Two Naval Reserve units in my congressional district, in Modesto, Calif., are doing their part to keep the trophy in the 12th during the current fiscal year. In this respect, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to place in the RECORD an article from the October 31 issue of the Modesto Bee, noting the city's two Naval Reserve units were rated excellent by a visiting inspection team.

The article follows:

## MODESTO NAVY RESERVISTS EARN "EXCELLENT" RATING

Ratings of "excellent" were given to the Modesto Naval Reserve training facility and its two units in a three-day inspection conducted by Naval officers here this week.

Conducted by Cmdr. Richard E. Butcher, Naval Reserve program officer, and Lt. Cmdr. John Gainey, Naval Reserve surface program officer, the inspection was to determine the

proficiency of the facilities and units in the areas of personnel, administration and training.

"It's been a long time building these units," a sailor attached to the facility said. "But now we're really going places." Ratings were high in all of the inspection phases, he said.

The Modesto-based units, Surface Division 12-16 and 12-17, have a total of 80 enlisted men and 10 officers. Division 12-16 is commanded by Lt. Cmdr. John Rasmussen of Turlock and Division 12-17 is commanded by Lt. Cmdr. Stephen Henry of Fresno. The units train newly enlisted reserve personnel for one year prior to the reservists' two years of active duty.

## HOW ABOUT SIBERIA?

**HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following lead editorial from the December 8, 1969, Indianapolis Star gives that newspaper's opinion on a current and controversial issue:

## HOW ABOUT SIBERIA?

Congressional doves and parading peaceniks think it is all right to openly attack the United States effort to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam.

But to them it is unthinkable that an American soldier who escaped after five years in a Viet Cong prison camp should be so brash as to tell the American people how Hanoi turns dove-peacenik dissent into propaganda to help break the spirit of U.S. prisoners of war and boost the morale of the Viet Cong.

This is not the logic of Moscow, Peking and Hanoi. It is the argument of Senator Stephen Young (D-O.) and Representative William F. Ryan (D-N.Y.), who were enjoying the privileges, pleasures, comforts, security and ample pay of American lawmakers while Maj. James Rowe of the Green Berets was sweating it out in captivity in a Red base camp in a Mekong Delta jungle.

If anyone should know about what it is like to be a POW in Red hands, Maj. Rowe should. He said American POWs took little notice to Hanoi's propaganda until 1967 when it began spouting news reports of stateside anti-war demonstrations and quoting the dove words of U.S. senators including J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), George S. McGovern (D-S.D.) and Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.). That got through to the POWs, knowing that Americans safe at home, including senators and congressmen, were cutting the ground from beneath them and saying their pain and sacrifices were in vain, for an unworthy cause. Why shouldn't it?

Maj. Rowe has a double reason to hold the peaceniks in low esteem. During years of interrogation his captors, intent on squeezing information out of him that would fit into their intelligence picture, starved, abused and tormented him. But Rowe, day after day, refused to give more than his name, rank and serial number. At length, a U.S. peacenik group supplied the Viet Cong with Rowe's military background information.

Soon afterward, Maj. Rowe escaped.

In November he told the House Armed Services Committee: "The peace demonstrators and the disheartening words of these (dove) senators made our life (as POWs) most difficult. It helped to break the spirit of Americans and boost the moral of the Viet Cong."

He has been telling his story to other Americans as well. Because of this, said the Honorable Senator Young:

"Maj. Rowe should be silenced or assigned to some other post of duty outside Washington. A tour in the Aleutian Islands or some post in remote Turkey might cause his mouthings to be silenced."

How about Siberia? The Communists no doubt would like to have him silenced too. Perhaps, as a courtesy to their peacenik *poputchiki*—their fellow travelers—they could arrange it.

Or maybe the peaceniks who ratted on him could have him shipped back to that Red prison camp in the Mekong Delta.

## BAN LETHAL CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL AGENTS AND NUCLEAR WARFARE

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 2546, the military procurement authorization bill, contains among other things an explanation of the bill relating to chemical and biological warfare.

I was pleased with the extensive consideration given this important subject in this bill because many people have been greatly concerned by incidents relating to lethal substances getting out of control, endangering people and in at least one case destroying animal life in large numbers.

The problems in this area were ably discussed and publicized by our able, distinguished friend and esteemed colleague, the able gentleman from New York, Congressman RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, who gave a great deal of time, energy, and ability to presenting the case for adequate safeguards with reference to these very dangerous, harmful chemical and biological agents, so hideous and horrible in their effects in the event they should be carelessly handled in any respect, much less used in military operations.

I want to commend my friend, Congressman MCCARTHY, for his persistent efforts in alerting the country to the threats and dangers to life and property that are presented by these terrible agents of destruction.

In a recent article in the *Manchester Guardian*, it was stated that the Secretary of Defense is reported to have endorsed a secret memorandum stopping production of all germ warfare weapons, and I take it by that is meant also the terrible agents associated with them.

It is anticipated that the National Security Council will review this matter in the near future pursuant to an interdepartmental report considered recently by senior officials at the Pentagon, State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

It is not clear whether the Secretary of Defense will gain the support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who in the past have taken a position that production of biological agents was necessary to deter any such biological attacks by the enemy.

It is anticipated that the arguments now adopted by the Pentagon that the

dangers inherent in the offensive use of germ weapons, and the lesser risks involved in stockpiling, are expected to move toward total ban on germ warfare as one of the first proposals to be submitted by the United States at the long delayed arms limitation talks.

It would be a great benefit and relief to all humanity if some enforceable agreement could be reached banning the use, and regulating the testing, possession, and deployment of these dreaded weapons and agents.

In the conference on the military procurement bill, conferees agreed to uniform use of the term "any lethal chemical or any biological agent," without barring such materials as may be harmless to man, or used for public health disease control, or for medical research, development, test, evaluation, or diagnosis.

The conferees were clear on setting forth the procedure, specifying that the Secretary of Defense must determine that the proposed transportation, or open air testing is necessary to national security, and he must notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the proposed action.

The latter may then direct the Surgeon General and other qualified persons to review the proposed action and to recommend what precautionary measures are necessary to protect public health and safety. The Secretary of Defense is required to implement any precautionary measures recommended, and must notify the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House 10 days prior to any transportation and 30 days prior to any open-air testing.

In addition, the Secretary must notify the Governor of any State through which such agents will be transported appropriately in advance of such transportation.

It is not proposed to vest the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with any powers to make national security decisions or impede testing. If these measures prove so burdensome as to prevent proposed action, or should the President determine it is necessary to national security, there is nothing in the bill that would affect the authority of the Department of Transportation with respect to the shipment of hazardous materials, as established by 18 U.S.C. 831-835 and 46 U.S.C. 170. The protections afforded by subsection (b) are intended to supplement these provisions.

In the event of future overseas deployment, or storage of agents and delivery systems, the conferees agreed that prior notice must be given to the host country. Where the deployment or storage will be on territory or under the jurisdiction of the United States, prior notice must be given to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

With regard to future overseas handling of agents the Secretary of State determines if international law will be violated. He must report these determinations to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House, as well as to appropriate international organizations in the event such report is required

by treaty or other international agreement.

I am of the opinion that the conferees' language should go a long way, not only in maintaining effective protection at home with respect to lethal chemical and biological agents, but may well point the way to action by our Government to spark international action barring these agents in the arms limitation meetings.

The world has long been hung up on the refusal of the Soviet Union to agree to international control of nuclear substances and weapons based on inspection by a duly constituted, impartial, international body. Presumably, the Soviet has some good reasons of its own for taking this position, which for many years now has militated against effective control of the production, military utilization, and weaponry relating to nuclear substances, weapon delivery systems, so this may be the hour for us to strike once again for effective control in this field, and in the field of lethal, chemical, and biological agents, in another most urgent effort to bring sanity into our international programs to protect the human race and its world civilization from widespread mass murder and perhaps utter destruction.

In pursuing these problems and questions which are of great moment, I believe that we have taken another most important step forward, looking toward peace and the elimination of barbaric weapons and lethal agents, even as we take action to make sure that the Nation is prepared adequately to meet any and all contingencies that may be directed against us, designed to bring about our destruction and conquest.

The bill was constructive in many other ways which are dealt with in the conference report of the committee and the debate. I was particularly happy that the House agreed concerning section 402 of our own bill striking language that might well have put colleges or universities engaged in Government research in the unenviable position of having to report upon their cooperation on military matters for which these institutions might not be entirely responsible, and might be construed as accusatory, by implication, of officials having no connection with instances of lack of cooperation complained of.

I think that the conferees came to a very good decision regarding the handling of this section by stressing the fact that the American people should be fully informed as to the manner in which defense dollars are being spent on research and development contracts in various universities and institutions of higher learning, and the identification of personnel entrusted with vital, classified, security information. I think that this Government has the right to expect that all persons engaged in these important functions and responsibilities of such great magnitude and value to the defense of this country shall give every assurance that this vital work will be done satisfactorily under classified conditions where necessary, and that arrangements are made to insure that no persons who are poor security risks should be permitted to participate in this work, or be

in a position to acquire and distribute classified information.

If we can ban chemical and biological agents and agree upon international control of nuclear weapons and substances under an impartial international tribunal such as I have worked for since 1947 in the House, we shall have taken a giant stride forward toward the elimination of horror and fear among the peoples of the world and the prospects for the establishment of universal peace would be greatly enhanced.

The article previously referred to follows:

[From the Manchester, England, Guardian, Nov. 25, 1969]

U.S. GERM BAN NEAR  
(By Adam Raphael)

Mr. Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense, is reported to have endorsed a secret memorandum recommending that the United States should stop production of all germ warfare weapons.

This shift by the Pentagon, which as up till now insisted on the maintenance of an offensive germ warfare capability, is expected to swing the balance against biological weapons at a National Security Council review next month. An inter-departmental report which has been considered this week by senior officials from the Pentagon, State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is also said to have reached similar conclusions.

It is not yet known whether Mr. Laird will be able to gain the support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who in the very recent past have taken the position that production of biological agents such as anthrax, the plague, and tularemia was necessary to deter any such biological attacks by the enemy.

The arguments now adopted by the Pentagon of the dangers inherent in the offensive use of germ-weapons and the lesser risks involved in stock-piling are expected, however, by informed observers to carry the day. A total ban on germ warfare could in fact be one of the first proposals submitted by the United States when the long delayed arms limitation talks get underway.

The Administration has already moved to cut back sharply on military spending over the next five years. Two brief National Security policy statements distributed to key Government departments last week are believed to have projected a less ambitious global strategy. In particular the doctrine that has underlain defense planning for a decade that American forces must be prepared to fight two major and one minor wars concurrently has now been modified to a commitment of one major and one minor brush fire action.

#### THE UGLY AMERICANS?

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH  
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, an interesting question is raised by the Indianapolis, Ind., Star concerning the events at Songmy in South Vietnam.

Every Member of Congress should read this challenging editorial.

The editorial follows:

#### THE UGLY AMERICANS?

The massacre of Vietnamese civilians at Song My proves that war is hell, human nature is capable of evil as well as good and that most Americans have an incomparably

greater sense of honor, justice and honesty than their adversaries in the Vietnam war.

But one thing it does not prove, and that is the charge being made by the Vietnamese Communists and their sympathizers and supporters that "the ugly Americans" have a monopoly of wickedness and that the Song My killing is further proof that the United States should leave all Vietnam to the kindly Reds, as Senator J. William Fulbright says it is.

The Red international apparatus has gone into action around the world, seizing upon Song My as an atrocity comparable to the Nazi annihilation of 6 million "enemies of the state" and evidence of the "Fascist nature" of Americans.

But it was Americans who brought the slayings to light. It is Americans who are investigating them. It is the United States Army that is seeking out those responsible and taking legal action against them. And it is certain that before all is said and done, the American people and the world will have a thorough, true account of what happened at Songmy, including how it happened and why and the motives of the men involved.

However, there is no Senator Fulbright in North Vietnam to point a finger of guilt at the systematic Communist slaughterers of thousands of South Vietnamese civilians at Hue, or the Red killers of 50,000 North Vietnamese civilians after the Red takeover, or the Viet Cong butchery of 35,000 civilians in the South during the conflict.

Again the world observes in the failure of Red sympathizers even to acknowledge these inhumane mass murders, let alone to denounce them, the strange double standard by which these always-vocal moralizers judge Americans and judge Communists fighting for world domination and breaking every moral law ever known to the human race to do it.

The question is why?

#### THE MESSAGE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the lessons of history are ones from which we all could learn. Although technology has advanced life for us to a point far beyond the dreams of persons generations ago, we still face problems which are heavily embroiled with the thread of the past.

The younger generation, focal point of so much consternation and too often the target of bitter criticism, has heeded the lessons of history more often than we have. They have looked to the past, to the words and promises that have been made throughout history, and they have seen little consistency between promises and action.

History, it is important to note, has also chronicled a spirit which, in today's light, has caused much of its brilliance to be misinterpreted and feared.

Mr. Speaker, the editor and publisher of the Locust Valley Leader, Mrs. Edith Wyckoff, a very close friend of mine for a number of years, is one of the few persons I have known who has looked to and learned from the lessons of history. Recently, Mrs. Wyckoff offered her readers a most sensitive and lucid discussion of this matter. Since it offers all of us a message, I include her editorial in the RECORD:

#### THE MESSAGE

In these days of turmoil which many fear, resent and misunderstand, it is well to relax, sit back and try without rancor to discover what really is happening and why. There is more good than bad in it but you have to listen carefully to get the message of the dissenter. Of course it is impatient. Talk has led to nothing but more talk and when that happens unwanted action is certain to follow. And no amount of censorship or retaliatory action will still the voice that pleads a cause it believes in.

Look at the burning issue—Viet Nam. 15 years of intervention in a civil war in a country no one heard of, 300,000 U.S. casualties and the list growing every day until soon, in destruction of young life and limb, it will be rivaled only by World War II. The majority of these boys were not killed or wounded after the cry began to end the war. It has been a slow, relentless erosion that many properly resent because no one yet has given a convincing reason for it. When a man is asked to lay his life on the line he should be given a good reason or be excused if he does not choose to die for a cause he does not believe in or understand. To do otherwise is insane.

No one needs to be reminded that we live in history's most affluent era when more people have more of everything. Our children, pampered, spoiled and indulged, have been robbed of their responsibilities because we give them everything and ask nothing of them. This is not their fault but ours. Nevertheless, they are people—our own creations—and in time they will grow older and take from us the torch of leadership, something many of them already are doing. Freed from the need to scratch to survive, they have looked around thoughtfully and seen much that does not measure up to what they have been taught. They are saying you teach us one thing and do another. Your institutions are riddled and rotten with the hypocrisy of a double standard. You tell us to be honest but you are not honest and you rarely demand that those who lead you be honest. You claim the war you have asked us to fight is a crusade to make a better life for a people who live on the other side of the world and yet the truth is that the war is a scandal that no one has yet clearly understood. You opt for the rights of others, make the laws and then say let's wait before we enforce them. And while you are waiting you expect the laws to be forgotten. It was this kind of thing that made the moderate George Washington in July, 1774 say, "Shall we, after this, whine and cry for relief, when we have already tried in vain?" And so when the talking failed the young found another way to get things done—now. They had to do it because it was the only way to make people listen. And it is because of their sometimes shocking dissent that much has been accomplished during the decade just ending.

If you think today's dissenters are a noisy, callous bunch you might do well to dip into the pages of history, look at the old pictures and old stories that tell what happened in the late 1700s when a young nation was suffering pangs of birth that would pull it forever from the mother country. It is an exciting, sometimes horrifying, lusty and brilliant story. The basis for understanding much that is happening today can be found in the story of the years before the American Revolution, one of history's few true revolutions.

Today our young are shoving us toward the bright world envisioned by the founders of this nation where all men can live in peace with "liberty and justice for all". But the dream, simple as it sounds, is too complex and too potent for most of us to accept or understand. It is a hard row to hoe for it demands the absolute best in all of us and sometimes that is more than most of us know how to give. But give it we must if we are to fulfill the dreams of our founders. To do less will move us to the place of an also-ran nation that, unable to live up to its own

noble aspirations, must slide back to second best which asks little of its citizens and as a consequence gets nothing.

#### THE DEVIANT UNIVERSITY

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the autumn issue of the University Bookman which is edited by Russell Kirk, the respected educator and author of long standing, carries an extremely interesting commentary on the present state of the university which is worthy of consideration. Written by Dr. Donald Marquand Dozer, professor of history at the University of California at Santa Barbara, the views of Dr. Dozer place in proper perspective the influencing of education by the state:

The university has already sacrificed its status as a bastion of true liberalism by "cozying up" to the state. In exchange for government monies it has accepted the concept of captive scholarship, has allowed the fine art of teaching to be either neglected or prostituted to noneducational ends, and has converted the social sciences, in some cases the physical sciences, and even religion into handmaidens of the state. It has abdicated its independence and true "academic freedom" in exchange for support by government agencies, while insisting that the academic freedom to be protected must be only the freedom to conform within a narrow academic and official ambit.

Dr. Dozer emphasizes the utter necessity of reestablishing the true idea of the university and setting forth on this monumental task:

The university must be made again a place where old truths, glimpsed for the first time by young people, may be seen in a new light and may be grasped as tools for successful living. It must recover its mission of articulating the unity and singleness of purpose of all learning and must exert itself to fulfill once more its role as a spiritual force and as least a partial revealer of the vision infinite.

The effect of Federal control of education has had its subtle and debilitating effort on many of our institutions of learning. Dr. Dozer's analysis of the situation in the area of higher education merits consideration and for this reason I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

#### THE DEVIANT UNIVERSITY

(By Donald Marquand Dozer)

The university today is being subjected to the brutal searchlight of inquiry and criticism. Ironically, at a time when education has acquired a new mystique and is the method offered for curing most of the ills of society, this mystique is not associated with institutions that should embody it. The lauding of education as the best means of promoting progress is accompanied by a denigration of the academic. In some quarters the university, indeed the very idea of a university, is considered to have lost its *raison d'être*. The attack upon the university cannot be airily dismissed as springing simply from know-nothingism or anti-intellectualism. It has deeper causes.

A generation ago, public reproaches of university life were directed against its narcissism. In college and university communities the principal aim that was sought was

the life of the mind, unsullied by contact with the market place. Members of those communities made their living, it seemed, only by taking in each other's intellectual washing. Now, however, public criticism is pointed not at the indifference but at the activism of the university, at the brash attempts by professors and students alike to use the university to destroy "middle-class morality" and to control and revolutionize society. In their efforts to do so, a minority of student leaders boast that they will destroy the university as an institution, "not pull it apart brick by brick, but bring it to a complete stall." In their hands the torch, traditional symbol of education lighting the way of the future, has become a firebrand. So serious have these gestures become that the public is no longer able to dismiss them as mere harmless acts of exhibitionism.

The traditional preoccupation of universities with reasoned solutions of society's problems has given them and their leaders within the past generation admittance to the seats of power in a political system that sought to identify itself with science, objectivity, and intelligence. Is it possible that those who are now trying to wrest control of the university away from its lawful authorities recognize it as an essential element in a national political system and are ambitious to take advantage of its privileged status to elevate themselves into positions of power? In other words, as universities have become engrossed in the political game they have become pawns in a power struggle. Some of the protesters, particularly those who are ensconced in positions of leadership, appear to believe that they can retain leadership positions or gain higher ones in a new socialist society. While striking out existing agencies of power, for example the selective-service system, the police, and educational administrators, they aspire to gain absolute control over them for their own use.

Such self-seeking revolutionaries, constituting a small minority, can and must be dealt with forcibly by agencies of social control. They must be disabused of their predilection to seek changes in education through methods of violence. When they equate progress with incendiarism and confuse dynamism with dynamite, they must be restrained. Somewhere a line must be drawn in these matters.

On the other hand, it is precisely because the university has so long and so effectively played the political game that some of the rebellion against it now takes the form of an emotional indictment of the university as an arm of the state. For at least a generation colleges and universities have been teaching that our only salvation lies in governmental centralization and bureaucratic controls. It is against this so-called "liberal" ideology that many of our modern campus nonconformists are now protesting. When they see that those dogmas result in war and regimentation which adversely affect them, they resist. Many of the protesters simply desire to return to a more libertarian type of society. They feel an outraged sense of having been conned. They have been tricked and short-changed by the university. They are crying out against the identification of the university with public authority, against higher education as a nationalized industry, against Big Brother in Washington and the Holding Company, the universities. The world they have inherited is not the world they desire. The "thing" that each one of them wishes to do is not the "thing" that others in society wish them to do. They are convinced that they are opening the way for a dynamic revival of the American dream by opposing the policies and practices of government. Their protests, though seemingly devoid of any objective except rebellion for its own sake, nevertheless, insofar as

they have rebellion itself as an objective, represent a rejection of the system with which the university is identified. This is their method of announcing that they are not "with it," that they have unplugged themselves from it. Why?

For many years the university has been alienating itself from the kind of world that these young rebels intuitively aspire to see and live in. They want a better system than the system to which the university has been gradually accommodating itself. The university against which they are protesting is not the university of the open mind. It has disappeared and no longer exists. "The president of Columbia," chanted the students in New York in their demonstrations in May 1968, "is the president of the United States," naming him. "What I mean by revolution," declared the president of the student body of Washington University in the three-day conference at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in August 1967, "is overthrowing the American government and American imperialism and installing some sort of decentralized power in this country." At the later convention of "hippies" in Philadelphia, some of the conferees declared it to be their objective to restore to this nation the kind of free society that existed at the time the Constitution was adopted in the 1780s.

The university has already sacrificed its status as a bastion of true liberalism by "cozying up" to the state. In exchange for government monies it has accepted the concept of captive scholarship, has allowed the fine art of teaching to be either neglected or prostituted to noneducational ends, and has converted the social sciences, in some cases the physical sciences, and even religion into handmaidens of the state. It has abdicated its independence and true "academic freedom" in exchange for support by government agencies, while insisting that the academic freedom to be protected must be only the freedom to conform within a narrow academic and official ambit. If the university is indeed committed to academic freedom and is fulfilling its historic functions as an open forum of ideas, how does it happen that the academic community presents a nearly monolithic front on all major social, economic, and political questions, and that front remarkably coincides with the collective "liberal" syndrome, which is and has been for a generation the dominant ideology in our society?

The university has failed to fulfill the requirements of academic freedom because it has too strongly and too uncompromisingly identified itself with a single all-encompassing ideology, the dogmas of statism camouflaged as modern liberalism. It has become, in this sense, a doctrinaire institution, committed to the principle of the closed mind. "Today," Professor Isaiah Berlin wrote in 1950 in words as true now as then, "the tendency to circumscribe and confine and limit to determine the range of what may be asked and what may not, of what may be believed and what may not, is no longer a distinguishing mark of the 'reactionaries.' On the contrary, it comes as powerfully from the heirs of the radicals, the rationalist, the 'progressives' of the nineteenth century as from the descendants of their enemies." ("Political Ideas in the Twentieth Century," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 28, p. 382.)

In the area of the so-called social sciences, for example, the university has deplorably narrowed its conception of its mission. It has largely accepted the postulates of a modern ideology—that man is motivated entirely by his economic interests; that economic factors are decisive in society and in history; that the proletarian class, defined in economic terms, is involved in a necessary struggle with the bourgeois, also defined in economic terms, for control of society and for its share of the economic benefits of the in-

dustrial revolution; that capitalism as a system is inseparable from exploitation and is responsible for international wars; that government must dedicate itself to social justice and can achieve it by mechanistic and legal methods; and that socialism (that is, centralized authority) will inevitably triumph over capitalism as a form of social organization. And these ideas are held and propagated with passionate conviction, for one of the many paradoxical aspects of modern university life is the emotionalism of the "intellectuals." For the troubles of our time the teachings of the self-styled intellectuals, not the upthrusts of the ignorant, are responsible.

A man is free to the extent that he knows intellectually what he is dealing with. But he remains still in fetters if he only emotionally feels what he professes to know and reacts with passion to pressures for change. When men such as this, lacking the essential attribute of freedom, come to dominate university life they subtract from the contributions which the university can make to a free society. The university should be a place of both informed and disciplined thinking, and among its members logic must prevail. "Logic," wrote Professor Alfred North Whitehead, "is the olive branch from the old to the young." (*The Aims of Education*, p. 122.) If it does not prevail in an educational institution, then that institution is intellectually bankrupt, however involved it may be in society and its problems. Under these circumstances the defense of academic freedom and of the university as a free market place for ideas is disingenuous and irrelevant.

The rightful role of the university in freely exploring all facets of knowledge is not under attack. For young people, who aspire by nature to undertake difficult tasks, to cultivate their creative impulses, and to make the world a better place in which to live, the ideologue-dominated university presents no opportunity and no challenge. The university, like the state that is controlled by these dogmas, is therefore exclusively preoccupied with the conditions of living, not its values or ends. College and university leaders have failed abjectly in making a case for educational values; they are wandering farther and farther from this, their primary mission, in their preoccupation with finance and budgets. They have allowed their institutions to sink into a morass of educational inadequacy and even to contribute to the destruction of society rather than to its enlightenment and vision. The university has rejected Matthew Arnold's sage advice to educators, "Teach a whole." It has become instead a place of half-truths masquerading as the whole truth, unresponsive therefore, to all phases of society's complex needs. It has forfeited its commitment to the rational examination and the never-ending reconsideration of all principles.

Because universities have attached themselves too firmly to the state, they have, despite their fine protestations to the contrary, become politicized, and they have consequently succumbed to a debilitating servitude to the present. As a result, the notion has become widespread that it is scientifically and intellectually immoral to accept anything from the past as valid. Truth and reality can be found only in the present and in the future. This view is imposed even upon higher education by its own administrators. "Education," decrees the president of one of the New York State University colleges, "should be geared primarily to the future with the only reference being made to historical events as a means of enlightening the students' understanding of current events and the production of future social problems." Guidelines such as this have rendered the university an officialized fatuity. Pressures for compliance with such guidelines, usually unexpressed but tacitly sensed,

are not long in rigidifying an academic system.

It is always difficult to explain why Renaissance man was both a humanist and a classicist. How could Erasmus, for example, find in the authors of antiquity a justification for his concern with modern man? The answer, of course, lies in this—that permanent truths are as valid today as yesterday; or that, differently expressed, history is the very essential structure of humanity.

But modern humanitarianism ignores the relevancy of yesterday's truth to today's problems and is substantially committed to a creed of ahistoricism. Under this creed it attempts to construct intellectually a detailed "modern" system and to absolutize it, making man and society static and stifling all possibility of progress.

Whenever truth is embodied in a neat package of clichés fobbed off as intellectualism, the validity of all rational processes and of the ideas emanating from them begins to be called in question. This condition, climaxing a generation-long process of abdication of responsibilities in education, accounts for the degradation of university life around which so much controversy today swirls. The university has allowed itself to become preoccupied with means, not ends; with the materials but not the substance of education; with political compliance rather than the task of animating youthful vision. As a consequence it is failing to carry out its civilizing function and has become fair game for immature absolutists who cling with intolerant passion to their false "certainties." But behind these juvenile "certainties" lurks the conviction, often unrecognized even by those who trumpet them on college campuses, that the university has been perverted from its true purpose. If the values of education cannot or are not demonstrated, then obviously the institutions which are expected to exemplify those values will not receive and do not deserve support.

Much of the unrest of students is really attributable to their need for finding alternatives to the statist trap in which they are caught. Their world was fashioned by their statist-minded elders, and in rejecting it they also reject them, causing the present acrimonious generation conflict. Some of them simply dismiss the present society out of hand without bothering to analyze it or to label it anything except unredeemably bad. Despite the fuzziness of their resentment, many of the student activists see the status quo against which they rebel as a totalitarian creation. Although they sense it only vaguely as such, their feeling of frustration is basically directed against a collectivist mode of life which was considered desirable by the older generation and which has now been fixed upon them. It is the older generation now which is committed to authoritarianism, centralism, and socialism. From this system the young rebels, the exponents of individual enterprise, and all those who are young in heart and spirit today find it necessary to dissent.

What these protesters desire is complete disengagement from a system that is manifestly failing. They are seeking the true freedom which has traditionally been associated with university life but which the modern university denies them. Some of them unfortunately fly off into an eccentric libertarianism, even into bacchanalian libertinism. They have succumbed to the blandishments of the apostles of decline and have accepted the solution of utter negativism and surrender. These are, in the language of students in Latin American universities where the same phenomenon is occurring, the *nadaistas* or exponents of nothingness. They are the pitiable casualties of a deviant educational system, a system that has done little to further the quest of the human spirit for progress toward something higher and better than itself, toward the "divinity that shapes our ends."

The university has abetted its own absorption into the state. For obvious reasons, the public university could not resist this process, but while accepting it academic leaders have failed to educate the public to the uses of a university broadly and traditionally conceived. With less justification, the private university also has connived at its own subordination to the state and consequent distortion of purpose. The university, like the individual in modern society, is suffering from an identity-crisis; it has melted into its environmental background to become an undifferentiated thing. In April 1968, the Association of American Universities, composed of both public and private universities, voted to depart from its time-honored policy of eschewing open political activity and to launch a frankly politically motivated campaign to obtain a larger chunk of government monies from Washington, representing their cause as almost a life-or-death matter for higher education in the United States.

The current protest against higher education may be viewed as a wholesome upthrust by the victims of ideology against the ultimate logic of that creed. Their discontent, if properly channeled, may succeed in thwarting the death-wish of modern liberalism for our society. Though it is devoid of explicit philosophical pretensions, it may result in a redemption of faith and of values. They may be yearning for a refurbishing of old absolutes to serve their modern needs. In their strange and often incoherent argot they are complaining of the general misplacement of value priorities in our society and of the failure of our educational institutions to restore them. Every university, whether public or private, is a public instrumentality. It must serve public ends. But in order to fulfill its best public purpose it must remain a place of free inquiry unidentified with the political climate of the moment. A university as a many-faceted social entity will necessarily reflect certain aspects of society, but if it would fulfill its fundamental purpose it must seek to ennoble all of them. In doing so it will be criticized for thinking, for helping, for acting in unorthodox ways, but only by doing so can it properly perform its mission.

The purpose of a university, simply stated, is to educate and enlighten. It must not, as Jacques Barzun warned us, confuse its role with that of the Red Cross. It is a place for searching out the truth and leading others to see that truth. It is a place for growing in wisdom. Its objective should be to strive to understand the whole of life and to foster the proven best. It invites each new generation to acquire as individuals the best possible understanding of that which is good and valid in the past and at the same time to acquire the desire to go forward to better things. It must show the past as present and bring the distant near. Upon the university has been placed by society an obligation to show a worthwhile way of life and to uphold the ideals of civilized man. It can and should respond to the demands of students for relevancy in their university experience, not by discouraging them from playing a part in the "happenings" of their time but rather by encouraging them to play an intelligent part in these "happenings."

Within the walls of the university both tradition and change should be encouraged. "It is a place," wrote John Henry Newman, "where inquiry is pushed forward, and discoveries verified by the collision of mind with mind, and knowledge with knowledge." The university is the temple of the open mind. It must always be free to develop new ideas and to counter them with better ideas. Without such true liberalism, education and the society which it must serve closes its doors to new prospects. At the same time the university must impose cautionary restraints upon experimentation because it teaches the

importance of reckoning with the consequences. These restraints follow logically from the experience of other persons, some long since dead. The university must encourage each new generation to look steadfastly at the vision which it sees and to fulfill that vision, controlled and guided by an understanding of both the accomplishments and non-accomplishments of past generations. It must supply the material for critical judgment and perception of ultimates which the fulfillment of every vision demands.

The element of the word university that needs to be stressed is the first syllable *uni*, implying unity, integrity, harmony. But now this traditional concept has been abandoned in favor of the multiversity, the implication being that it cannot be unified around anything, either nuclear research or medicine or philosophy or even "the thought divine." Whereas the ideal of integration, of a common ethos, is being stressed in many areas of modern life, the university has moved in the opposite direction and is consequently falling apart. Even the possibility of restoring integrity to the university is denied by educational leaders. It is "not the job of a university in its institutional capacity," a university president has declared, "to have any rigid total system of 'morality' except to teach that a fact is better than a rumor, [and] logic better than confusion." Such a pinched conception of a university denies that there is any single ultimate value or set of values, any goal or goals toward which all men strive, any aspiration for intrinsic personal fulfillment, any need for an individual to feel that he is worthwhile to himself and to others. The university viewed in this light is a positively destructive and fragmenting force in society. It is antagonistic to a genuine humanism.

The deliberate rejection by university leaders of the need to supply the unity without which the university remains only another computer in a computerized society explains the disillusionment of students, overwhelmed and intimidated by the mechanistic and materialistic logic of higher education and by its scatterbrained diversity. This situation has resulted in large part from the aforesaid politicization of universities both public and private, that is to say, from their total involvement in government, their utter commitment to a mechanistic liberalism, and their resulting inability to serve society in ways in which universities have traditionally performed their centuries-old function.

In tribute to the British universities, the late poet laureate of England, John Masefield, wrote:

"There are few earthly things more beautiful than a University. It is a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see; where seekers and learners alike, banded together in the search for knowledge, will honor thought in all its finer ways, will welcome thinkers in distress or in exile, will uphold ever the dignity of thought and learning and will exact standards in these things."

To what modern university can such a lyric description now be applied?

The university must be made again a place where old truths, glimpsed for the first time by young people, may be seen in a new light and may be grasped as tools for successful living. It must recover its mission of articulating the unity and singleness of purpose of all learning and must exert itself to fulfill once more its role as a spiritual force and as at least a partial revealer of the vision infinite. It must reclaim its traditional role as a sublimating influence in society, upholding ideals of the true, the noble, and the beautiful. It should begin again to vindicate the ideals of education, which, as it happens, are also the ideals of youth.

## VOCATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CLUBS OF AMERICA

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, recently two young representatives of the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America—VICA—Ron Pearson and Ed Benavidez, dropped by my office to acquaint me with the plans and activities of their organization. They were accompanied by Mr. Jim Allison who is the supervisor of the California Association of Vocational Industrial Clubs of America. Mr. Allison comes by this position as a result of his being with the bureau of industrial education of the State department of education which sponsors the California division of VICA.

Ron, Ed, and Jim, as well as other members and supporters of the organization contend that America can make a sound investment in its future by investing now in the development of the young men and women who will be tomorrow's craftsmen and technicians. These youths need opportunity—to acquire marketable skills and to develop to their fullest potential as citizens and individuals. The key to a sound investment in their future—and ours—is the combined support of business, industry, and organized labor for programs that encourage youth to achieve.

VICA offers concrete programs that develop and encourage youth in their critical growth as workers and citizens. On April 21, 1967, the Youth Development Foundation was established by VICA to seek the "key," the support of business, industry, and labor for activities that directly benefit the trade, technical, industrial, and health occupations student—activities such as leadership development conferences, national competitive activities, leadership awards, an individual achievement program, and the publication of leadership development materials.

While industry cries for skilled manpower, hundreds of thousands of our youth hopelessly seek employment. An obvious solution to this problem is training. For many years, education, business, and labor have engaged in various types of skill training—apprenticeship, on-the-job, up-grading and in-service—but the problem still exists: Industry needs personnel, and youth cannot find jobs. Where is the gap? The problem is that many young people who will not be entering academic and professional fields are leaving the public educational system without preparation for a vocation. Often, they are taught to look down upon industrial-technical opportunities. What is the answer? The answer is one of communications, emphasis, and status. Youth must be made aware of the opportunities in industry, that there is dignity in work, and that a substantial income can be earned by the use of one's hands as well as with one's mind. VICA, Mr. Speaker, is attempting to meet this challenge and it deserves our support and recognition. The purposes of the or-

ganization are to advance the educational development of students enrolled in trade, industrial and technical education in the United States, its territories and possessions, to assist in the creation and development in the youth of America of interest in the pursuit of trade, industrial, and technical occupations and to promote and stimulate interest in trade, industrial, and technical education on the part of the general public. VICA's programs are an outgrowth of its goals. Central to all of these programs is the concept of the total development of the individual. Judging from the caliber of the fine young men who visited my office, the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America is meeting its purposes and performing a most worthwhile service to America. Let us hope that they keep up the good work.

## NEW CHEERS FOR OLD NOTRE DAME

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as disruptive and harmful demonstrations on college campuses continue, few institutions of higher education have coped with them. An excellent approach to the situation has been taken by Notre Dame University.

WBBM-TV, channel 2, Chicago, carried a proper editorial on Friday, November 21, on the Notre Dame policy of handling student anarchism:

### NEW CHEERS FOR OLD NOTRE DAME

There are cheers for Notre Dame these days. Many of these cheers are for the University decision to accept a football bowl bid. But there was another action for which Notre Dame should receive cheers.

The University carried out the dictum of its President, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, that students engaged in disruptive demonstrations should be given 15 minutes of meditation to cease and desist. There was a demonstration over first a CIA recruiter, and then a Dow Chemical Co. recruiter. The Dean of Students, acting on terms of Father Hesburgh's statement ruled . . . those refusing to stop demonstrating should be suspended after 15 minutes, and expelled if they demonstrated at the end of another 5 minutes. Five students were ordered expelled, five suspended. They have until next Tuesday to decide if they want to appeal, and if they do, they will go before a student-faculty-administration board.

The University has obtained an injunction against interference with recruiting of any kind. The CIA recruiter left the first day, the Dow Chemical recruiter left the next day.

The University's position is that it should be voluntary whether or not a student wants to talk to a recruiter. But there should be no interference with the student's rights.

The University permits dissent. It acts only against *disruption*. We must stress again that Father Hesburgh in enunciating his rule said also there are legitimate reasons for protesting, but this must be done with rationality and civility, not force and violence.

We believe it is important that the rules of a University are made known to a student on entrance and throughout his career there.

We believe there is no place in a University for disruption or interference with the rights of other students, or the operation of the University. We believe it particularly important when such a rule as that laid down by Father Hesburgh is enunciated, it be enforced without any equivocation. We believe it will result in a healthier more productive University . . . and suggest other universities follow this method of handling disruptions.

#### BONABOND HELPS EX-ADDICTS AND EX-CONVICTS

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday evening, I was afforded the unique opportunity of speaking to what may be the least known, most unusual, and most effective social action agency in the District of Columbia.

The name of this group is Bonabond. Its purpose is to rehabilitate drug addicts. The staff, organized 3 years ago by Mr. Petey Green, is composed entirely of ex-addicts, most of whom are also ex-convicts. The group was originally conceived to provide fiduciary bonds for ex-convicts seeking employment. However, with the assistance of a small grant from HEW, the scope of the project was expanded to include the rehabilitation and placement of addicts.

Since that time, Bonabond's success has been extraordinary. Under the excellent directorship of Mr. Hiawatha Burris, the group has compiled a record for outstripping those made by larger, better-financed agencies. For example, of the more than 250 persons who have been released by the courts to Bonabond during the past year, only five skipped bail. Eighty percent were placed into jobs. Mr. Burris attributes this success to staff understanding of the addict's problems.

The Washington Evening Star Sunday supplement of November 30, 1969, printed an excellent article on Bonabond, by Mr. Mike McManus. Since the article does such a fine job of relating the accomplishments of the agency with society's supposed incorrigibles, I insert the full text in the RECORD for the benefit of any of my colleagues who might have missed it:

**KICKING THE HEROIN HABIT—BONABOND, A BONDING AGENCY RUN BY MEN WHO HAVE BEEN THROUGH THE DRUG SCENE, IS PROVIDING EX-CON ADDICTS A CHANCE TO END THE PHYSICAL CRAVING FOR DRUGS AND TO GET A DECENT JOB**

(By Mike McManus)

Steve Matthews didn't look like one of the city's most successful dope peddlers when he appeared on television recently. Clean-cut and solidly built, the 24-year-old spoke precisely, his face animated by the glint of intelligence about the eyes. It was easier to imagine in that face his bright beginning as a high school graduate and son of hard-working middle class parents.

But shortly after he was graduated from high school in 1963, someone gave Steve a shot of heroin. "It was a feeling I couldn't forget," he says.

First, he shot only once a week, then two

or three times a week, always thinking he could stop when he wanted to. Instead of going to college to become a doctor or lawyer, as he had dreamed, Steven began shoplifting and picking pockets to pay for his growing habit.

"I didn't have the stomach for robbery, so I turned to peddling drugs," Steve comments matter-of-factly, in a soft voice. "It was challenging. I always had to use my mind to know how to get people to buy my product. I had to learn how to spend less and make more by cutting the white powder with weakened solutions of lye or formaldehyde. In the beginning, I would not sell to young boys and girls, but after the money got good, it didn't bother me at all. I started earning \$200 a week.

"After two years, I became a transporter, going up to New York docks to buy from longshoremen. I'd spend \$1,000 to \$1,500 to buy drugs which sold at street prices of \$3,000 to \$5,000. My habit grew bigger—\$80 to \$90 a day at street prices. Of course, I cut my drugs off the top, and soon I was earning \$350 a week on top of that. I'd see my father coming home at the end of the week, tired and barely making ends meet on a job that didn't have any enticement for me.

"It seemed there was nothing I couldn't do. But I was putting something over on myself. True, people using drugs were my slaves. But somebody bigger than me made me his slave. I was using something in my arm. Though I wasn't a field hand, I was a houseboy, the head slave. If my drugs were cut off, I'd be like the lowliest addict in the street, sick and crying. My marriage broke up because my wife didn't want my three boys brought up around drugs. Many times I wanted to kick the habit, but couldn't."

Things changed for Steve last summer. He's had no drugs since August. Levitt & Sons, the construction firm in Bowie, Md., now pay him \$125 a week as a carpenter's assistant. He is dating Thelma Williams, a girl who never used drugs, so he thinks he won't be tempted to associate with friends "strung out" on heroin. Now his dream is to marry Thelma, and buy one of the Levitt houses.

"I'm breathing easier," he says.

He's also using his knowledge of drugs to help others. Steve advises Levitt on which ex-addict job applicants have kicked the habit, and which are hopeless. He's spoken to high school students, a Kiwanis Club, the Bowie narcotics squad and appeared on television—telling his personal story without pulling punches.

"I feel it's my obligation to help a lot of people who wouldn't have turned to drugs if it hadn't been for me," he says. "I want to pay society back for the people I addicted."

Steve Matthews is one of the few addicts who has managed to break the dreary cycle of dope, crime, arrest, prison, dope, crime. It is a very difficult thing to do, to kick the heroin habit. Matthews did not do it alone. He was helped significantly by an organization named Bonabond.

Bonabond has no official status. It receives none of the District's \$650 million budget, nor any support from the United Givers Fund. Though it works with about 100 addicts at any time, Bonabond has no treatment facilities, nor any "professionals" on its seven-man staff.

Every Bonabond worker is an ex-convict.

Unlike many professionals in the crime prevention business—policemen, probation officers, psychologists—Bonabond staffers don't look down on the criminal. And offenders look upon them as symbols of hope, not reminders of failure. Bonabond's expertise is unique. "No one can understand the problem better than us; because for years, we were the problem," says its executive director, Hiawatha Burris.

Bonabond was created three years ago, the brainchild of Petey Green, an ex-addict, ex-

wino and ex-con who worked as a job coach for the District's anti-poverty organization and who already had formed a voluntary group of ex-offenders to help find work for men coming out of prison. This group, Efforts From Ex-Convicts, kept running into employers who refused to hire persons with criminal records on grounds that bonds would be necessary to protect employers from possible losses from thefts. No ex-con is able to get a fiduciary bond on his own. This meant that only the dirtiest, most menial, and lowest paying jobs were open to the men trying to go straight.

Green's solution was to create a small agency which would investigate the backgrounds of ex-convicts, and put its name behind those if found trustworthy. Aetna Insurance agreed to provide a bonding service, if a staff were hired to do the research.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, appropriated a modest \$63,000 for the experiment. Under the initial supervision of a lawyer, a group of EFEC members, including Burris, were hired to do the legwork. The attorney wanted to call the program Trustworthy, but as first board chairman, Petey opposed it.

"We didn't want that, cause they never thought we was trustworthy before!" he complained. Eventually, they settled on Bonabond (or, "good bond").

The program was so successful that the agency almost put itself out of business. None of the 60 former prisoners backed by Bonabond caused the agency to forfeit bond money. More important, employers stopped using the bonding issue as an excuse not to hire ex-offenders, opening up hundreds of jobs.

When Burris became executive director, he turned the group's focus toward ball bonding—taking responsibility for people arrested for crimes pending their trials. At any given time, Bonabond has 100-125 people under supervision (without charge) as "third party custodian." This responsibility led to the creation of a drug program for addicts trying to kick the habit, a job placement operation, probation supervision, and a social club for ex-offenders.

The importance of Bonabond's work was made crystal clear last spring when Maryland Sen. Joseph Tydings' District Committee conducted a remarkable set of hearings on crime in Washington. During these hearings, Dr. Murray Grant, then the director of the District Department of Health, told the committee that half of the men and three-quarters of the women in D.C. prisons are drug addicts.

Most were not imprisoned for narcotics offenses, but for crimes they committed in order to pay for drugs—offenses ranging from shoplifting and prostitution to armed robberies which led to dozens of killings. In other words, more than half of the District's crime was related to the use of drugs.

This was not always the case. Kenneth Hardy, director of the Department of Corrections, told the committee that the number of known addicts arrested this year would be double that of 1968, and seven times as many as in 1965. Clearly, there has been a flood of drugs into the city in recent years. And since an average addict requires \$200 to \$300 a week in cash just to pay for drugs, he either has to sell drugs to feed his habit, or steal. And he can't simply steal three \$100 suits to pay for a week's supply of heroin, for "fences" rarely pay more than 25 percent of an article's value on the black market.

A man with a \$50-a-day habit has to steal \$200 in goods every day of the year. Or he turns to armed robbery to get hard cash.

The result was predictable: between 1966 and 1969 the number of armed robberies shot up five-fold. In the early sixties, the city had no more than 1,000 robberies a year. But there were 1,049 robberies for the single month of July, 1969, and 1,226 for August. A

spokesman for the Board of Trade told Sen. Tydings' committee that most of the \$80 to \$150 million worth of goods stolen from area stores are believed to have been pilfered by addicts.

It is facts like these that make the following recitation of the policies and attitudes of official District government agencies more than a little hard to understand:

Between 1952 and the summer of 1969, the District police department participated in the breakup of only one major drug trafficking ring (in 1964). Yet, when President Nixon ordered a coordinated attack to be launched this year, it took only a few months to indict 41 of the city's biggest traffickers.

The department's tiny (21-man) narcotics squad apparently was more interested in stopping the sale of marijuana than of heroin. At the request of the Senate District Committee, the squad's record for the last three months of 1968 was surveyed, and it was learned that only 15 cases were prosecuted for the sale of heroin, while 23 marijuana cases were prosecuted. Furthermore, the heroin cases prosecuted were for "street sales"—sales typically made by addicts to support their habit—not for wholesalers like Steve Matthews.

The Department of Corrections ran no programs in its prisons to rehabilitate drug addicts, though some 1,000 of those imprisoned each month are addicts.

Up until the Senate hearings, Health Department Director Grant did not even ask the District government for funds to treat addicts. Asked why, Dr. Grant said funds were "not needed" because D.C. General Hospital had a 35-bed ward for addicts. Yet this facility has been both underused and ineffective. Between 1964 and 1967 it lacked even the minimal facilities necessary to check a patient's urine for the presence of heroin, and the ward was open to anyone, making it child's play for a pusher to sell dope to patients.

And, it is by reason of facts like the above that few knowledgeable people were surprised last March when General Sessions Judge Alfred Burka told the Senate District Committee:

"The only, single, effective method existing at the moment to break the cycle of addiction, crime, imprisonment, release and crime again is an organization known as Bonabond."

Such words of praise for a little-known agency were a distinct embarrassment to the heads of three government programs set up to process and rehabilitate the 12,000 drug users arrested each year: The D.C. Bail Agency, Probation Department, and the Drug Addiction and Treatment Center. Bonabond competed with each of these agencies and demonstrably outperformed them.

The Bail Agency was established to administer the Bail Reform Act of 1966. The Act was passed to allow people arrested to return to everyday life before their cases came up in court, if they could prove deep enough community roots: family, job, home. Young law students employed by the Bail Agency interview the "lockups." The agency is more careful about whom it releases than is generally realized. Only 10,500 out of 22,000 prisoners were set free in the agency's first two years.

The problem is, criminals soon learned they could give the young, white students phony names, addresses and phone numbers. The overworked Bail Agency staff may not have time to check the facts. Or they may end up calling an addict friend of the arrested person, who says, "Oh yeah, he works here." When those released fail to show in court for trial, police must rearrest them. Many can't be found. By last summer, 1,000 lockups had vanished from the view of the law. And, of course, these persons were free to commit more crimes.

Compare that record with Bonabond's per-

formance. Its staffers also go to the cell block of the Court of General Sessions to interview "lockups" about getting released pending trial. Bonabond doesn't bother with those approved by the Bail Agency or by professional bondsmen. It works with what's left—the dregs of the dregs of society, two-thirds of whom are addicts. Only a few will be picked each day, those the staff feels are trustworthy.

In three years, Bonabond became the "third party custodian" for 380 criminals. Only four of the 380 failed to show up in court at their appointed time; and Bonabond found all of them, and turned them in. Furthermore, not one person in Bonabond's supervision has been rearrested for a felony (though 10 percent have been picked up for misdemeanors).

How does Bonabond perform so impressively?

Begin with the fact that Bonabond's ex-con staff members speak the same language as those arrested. They know many of the lockups personally, and are more likely to spot phonies than college-educated professionals.

And Bonabond has a program geared to help the offender help himself.

As soon as an addict is released from jail, Bonabond sends him to the city's only narcotic detoxification facility with proven effectiveness, a 20-bed ward in St. Elizabeths Hospital. (As noted, D.C. General has a 35-bed ward used by some addicts, but most of the patients are alcoholics; and, as noted, pushers easily gain access to the ward to make sales to patients). There is virtually no hope for killing a drug habit until the physical craving is eliminated—a task which can be accomplished in two weeks under medical supervision with little pain.

More than 90 percent of the referrals to St. E's come from Bonabond—which means that a host of other agencies in town are making few referrals. Bonabond developed this program with St. E's, and has sent 305 people to the hospital over the past year. Most of the referrals were of people who simply were seeking Bonabond's help, not those released from jail.

Once an addict is "clean," Bonabond will find him a steady job or job training. With economic security, an ex-offender is obviously less likely to return to crime. So Bonabond has made employment referral a major activity, helping about 300 find full-time jobs with pay averaging \$100 a week.

By contrast, the Drug Addiction and Treatment Center (DATRC), operating on a \$600,000 yearly budget had referred only 100 out of 876 addicts to jobs in its first year. DATRC also failed to refer its patients to a hospital for "drying out," except in rare cases. Result: 90 percent of the addicts referred to DATRC by parole officers were rearrested within six months.

Once a person is working, Bonabond becomes for him the strictest probation or parole office in the city. Everyone is required to call the agency once a day, every day. Box scores are kept with a red pencil on a big chart on the wall. Each of the 100 people in Bonabond's custody at a given time must attend a Wednesday night Bonabond meeting. In addition, addicts are asked to attend group therapy sessions on Tuesday nights. The atmosphere of the meetings is much like that of Alcoholics Anonymous. People going straight stand beside those in trouble and recite this pledge at the opening and close of the meeting: As a member of Bonabond.

I want the opportunity to prove my faith in myself;

I want to earn the respect of others;

I want to help my fellow man;

I want my future to be a good example of the meaning and purpose of human life;

With God's help, I accept this challenge.

Some slippage is permitted with Bonabond's regulations. A typical weekly meeting will have only 20-30 people present. And if a person arrives "high" from a heroin fix, no one would think of throwing him out. But a person out on bail must be demonstrating a genuine effort to help himself. If he continues to be "strung out" on drugs, is absent from work, or fails to call in regularly and attend meetings—Bonabond washes its hands of the case, turning him back to the courts to be thrown back in prison. The threat of reincarceration probably does more than anything else to induce those in its custody to toe the line. It is no mere threat. Some 62 of the 380 placed in Bonabond's custody were voluntarily surrendered.

That's a far tougher approach than is practiced by the Probation Department of the Court of General Sessions. It terminates only five percent of its cases, compared to Bonabond's 14 percent. Why is Probation less strict? Its director, John Bindl, told this reporter: "The majority of our time is spent in writing reports for the court. No one really supervises. The case loads are too big." Each probation officer has 115 cases, despite a growth in numbers of officers from nine to 29 in the last two years.

But the issue goes deeper. Not one of Probation's staff members is an ex-offender. None would dare walk along 7th or 14th Streets NW late at night to make contact with individuals on their case lists. This is where the addicts hang out, and this is where Bonabond staffers operate. Thus the "professionals" are less likely to know who among their cases is using drugs. Further, many become numb after a while, and cease to care. They develop an attitude which can be tersely paraphrased: "He can't make it," they say to themselves. It becomes a self-fulfilling attitude. The bureaucrat's success, after all, is not measured by the number of offenders motivated to go straight, but by fidelity to proscribed procedures in processing criminals.

By contrast, the Bonabond staff member's only security lies in measurable performance with the hardest of the hard core recidivists. Oddly, perhaps, he is naturally a more stern disciplinarian than his middle class counterpart. The reformed ex-con has fallen just as far as his clientele into crime, but managed to pull himself out of the cycle into a legitimate job. So his attitude is: "If I made it, you can too."

"We will knock ourselves out for a guy trying to get himself together, but won't waste time with someone jiving about his interest in making it," says Nightlife Young, Bonabond's deputy director.

The ex-offender's signal advantage is his ability to understand and communicate in a way no middle class person can. One need only sit in the Bonabond office and listen. Early one morning recently, Young was talking with a man he'd known for 20 years who was then on probation. Their friendship began when both were addicts. For two years, Fred (as I'll call him) managed to kick the habit, inspiring Nightlife to get clean. Nightlife recalls: "I saw him dressed, and clean—looking good, with money in his pocket." Now the tables were reversed:

"It look to me like you ain't even trying," Nightlife said to the shabbily dressed man. "I seen you up on 14th Street last night. You don't never need to go there."

"I can't get no job. No one let me be an ex-addict," said Fred, his head nodding from the effects of a recent fix.

"You can't get no job 'cause you ain't clean. I coulda had you a job," Nightlife said in a calm voice. Pipe smoke swirled above his head.

"You gotta give me a chance."

"You haven't give yourself no chance! Man, this is the fourth time I've given you a chance. I had to threaten you. I don't dig this. If I keep letting you get away with this, I'll

be out on the street. I been sticking my neck out—putting the whole organization on the line . . . Me and you walked together, shot dope together. I ain't stupid. You can't function."

"I tried to make those meeting, but . . ."  
 "I don't want to ——. You mean you couldn't put in an hour of time? We got you out on probation, and you ain't even trying to get yourself together. Now, I want you to go to the hospital on Monday. If you don't go down there, we'll surrender you. This is your last pass to success."

Fred gratefully looked at Nightlife: "Bonabond is the only organization which has ever did anything for me. The only reason I didn't progress was because it was my fault. When you see me next, I'm going to be fit. I'm going to the hospital with good intentions."

The good intentions of an addict are notoriously unreliable. Though Fred did show up at St. Elizabeths, on the tenth day of his stay he was caught offering a patient a fix. It had been mailed to him. Thrown out of the hospital, Fred returned to Nightlife the next day. He was shrewdly dressed in his best clothes and a \$50 pair of shoes. And he had a good excuse: "All my life I've had so many things going against me."

This time, it didn't wash. Within a week Bonabond staffer Ike Mallard, a man who had forged several hundred-thousand dollars worth of checks in his time, took Fred back to Judge Charles Halleck and said: "He's not showing enough initiative in himself. That's the biggest problem." A few days later, Fred was back in prison.

In this case, Bonabond failed. Or, rather, Fred failed. He was offered all the understanding and compassion which could reasonably be expected. But once he refused to help himself, Bonabond had the guts to turn him in. It's hard to imagine a better rehabilitative approach, or a staff more qualified by experience to know how to practice it. Bonabond offers the ex-con more concern, greater firmness, more services, and demands more of staff and those it helps than any and all of the traditional agencies.

Judge Halleck put it best: "Bonabond is performing a function which ought to be performed by the court system itself. The court (and its attendant agencies) has abdicated its duties and responsibilities. We are fortunate that the void has been filled by organizations like Bonabond. It ought to be five times bigger than it is."

But Bonabond has come perilously close to floundering. Practically its only source of support is the \$63,000 grant from HEW, channeled through UPO. The District government has refused to support Bonabond. And getting the grant renewed each year is a harrowing experience. In 1967, funds ran out. Every staff member continued to work for weeks without a payroll, or even a promise that the agency would survive. According to Merrill Collett, a white businessman on Bonabond's board of directors, "UPO had doubts about giving a grant to Bonabond because of its lack of a professional staff."

Fortunately, this attitude seems to be changing. The traditional system seems to be learning from Bonabond and from other operations staffed by ex-addicts, such as Col. Hassan Jeru-Ahmed's Blackmen's Development Centers. For the first time in its history, the Department of Corrections has put ex-offenders on its staff—20 of them.

"We are following in Bonabond's footsteps," says Dr. Robert Dupont, an engaging, 32-year-old psychiatrist who is associate director of corrections.

"Bonabond pointed the way to us for the effective use of ex-offenders in correctional programs," he says. "The ex-offender is dedicated in a way professionals are not. They will work harder—longer hours and weekends—because they have something to prove to themselves and the world. I won't let my work intrude in my private life as they will. But then, I don't have to. I have security."

Furthermore, the ex-con will work at half the salary of a college-educated professional. Corrections is paying \$5,500 to \$6,200, which means Corrections can have twice as many counselors.

They'll be working in a new form of correctional facility, an operation halfway between the total isolation of prison and the loose control of parole. By mid-December, about 100 convicts will be serving part of their sentences in five Community Correctional Centers, houses scattered in the inner city. "Inmates" will live in the centers at night, but hold down regular jobs during the day. While living in the centers, offenders will earn their own upkeep, pay taxes and live in a therapeutic community with other ex-cons who've shaken lives of crime. A pilot experiment with this creative rehabilitation approach has been extraordinarily successful.

Dr. Dupont also plans to try a unique experiment with Bonabond itself. At present, Corrections gets only \$1.10 a day to supervise a man or woman on parole. In order to find if Bonabond can do a better job at parole supervision, Corrections has plans to contract with Bonabond for the same figure to see how well it does with 50 parolees. If Bonabond outperforms middle class parole officers, its role will grow, Dupont says.

When asked last summer if his Probation Department planned any such experiments, Probation Director John Bindl responded: "Our first need is to hire professionals to handle case loads adequately." He was afraid that if an ex-con was hired, he might slip back into crime—a valid fear. Today, however, probation officers are talking with Bonabond about recommending ex-offenders who might work as probation aides.

Equally important, there is a growing interest in helping Bonabond expand. The Meyer Foundation has given the ex-convicts \$10,000. The Calvary Baptist Church, which has been sponsoring a "prayer luncheon" on Tuesdays for people working on the drug problem, may sell Bonabond a house at low cost for conversion into an informal "half-way" house for addicts. And Bonabond even has a possibility of getting National Institute of Mental Health funds to operate a 100-bed half-way house in a converted motel. Hiawatha Burris, the former confidence man who now heads Bonabond, has gained the confidence of District judges to such an extent he now lunches with them weekly.

Recently Burris received a "degree" for his achievement from Gov. Raymond Shafer of Pennsylvania, full of phrases as "know ye" and "by the authority vested in me." Like any other professional's degree, it hangs from the wall of his office. But this is no M.D. or Ph. D. It is a legal pardon wiping clean his record of five indictments for "burglary, fornication, operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of liquor, larceny, receiving stolen goods, conspiracy, and receiving stolen goods in 1951, 1952, and 1953."

It is a degree in crime and in self-rehabilitation—eminent credentials for helping other ex-cons catapult out of the desperate dope-crime syndrome. Three years ago, it was literally illegal for him to meet with the felons on his staff: people convicted for such crimes as armed robbery, prostitution, check forgery, and dope peddling.

Today, these ex-offenders are setting a new standard of "professionalism" in the crime prevention business: performance.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the November 24, 1969 issue of "Memo from

Cope," the publication of the Committee on Political Education, AFL-CIO, carried an article on the situation with regard to medical care in the United States. In the article it is noted that AFL-CIO President George Meany has stated that national health insurance "is the only system that will provide truly adequate health care to all Americans."

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

#### IT'S TIME FOR NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN

Sixty billion dollars a year for medical care is a good chunk of money. That's what was spent in fiscal year 1969 in the U.S. It's seven percent of our gross national product, a larger percentage of GNP than any nation spends. It almost approaches our defense budget.

Yet concern over the quality as well as the cost of medical care in the United States is mounting. In 1950, the nation was sixth in the world in infant mortality. Now it is 18th. We have dropped in recent years from 13th to 22nd in life expectancy at birth for males, from seventh to 10th for females. Death rate of middle-aged males is higher here than in any Western European country.

With this, doctor's fees soar. Hospital fees go out of sight. In a short time, it will cost an average \$100 a day to put up in a hospital, according to the American Hospital Association. Medical costs have been going up faster than any other item on the Consumer Price Index.

Medicare and Medicaid, so bright in promise at their inception, have been tarnished by the incredible leap in health costs that reduces the protection these programs should provide.

Meanwhile, there are not enough doctors. Medical schools graduate only 7,400 physicians a year and some medical schools are closing shop, making the squeeze even tighter.

These are just some statistics that add up to a crisis in health care in the United States, one which President Nixon described this way last summer: ". . . unless action is taken both administratively and legislatively . . . we will have a breakdown in our medical care system affecting millions. I don't think I am overstating the case."

What to do?

AFL-CIO President George Meany posed the key question before an Industrial Union Department conference on health care: "Can we get good medical care for all Americans at a reasonable cost?"

The answer, he said, is national health insurance, "a program that would provide comprehensive health care for every American . . . that would include every kind of treatment that is necessary to maintain or restore good health . . . preventive services, all types of physicians' services, hospital and nursing home care, home health services, rehabilitation."

Meany said such a system would be financed like social security but with a government contribution. While "doctors would continue to practice medicine without any interference, we would expect the national health insurance system to encourage the highest quality of medical care, improvements in the efficiency of its delivery and effective controls on its cost."

Development of pre-paid group practice plans would be integral, Meany stressed, pointing out such plans provide good health care "at lower costs than the usual fee-for-service arrangement of doctors in solo practice."

Meany said proper health care has three fundamental objectives:

To prevent unnecessary illness.

To have the best possible treatment for all persons when they are sick so they will recover quickly and completely.

To keep medical cost at a reasonable level so that people are not denied needed care simply because they can't afford it.

He concluded national health insurance "is the only system that will provide truly adequate health care to all Americans."

#### WORLD FEDERALIST YOUTH PETITION

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the World Federalist Youth, U.S.A., the student division of World Federalist U.S.A., of which former Senator Joseph S. Clark is president, has submitted a most commendable petition to Secretary General U Thant. The petition calls for every nation of the world to use 1970—the 25th anniversary of the United Nations—"to examine its own national priorities and military policy as well as its relationship to the United Nations in its role as a builder of peace." It also calls for "establishment of a permanent U.N. peacekeeping force with the power and authority to accomplish its duties" in the hope that such a force might eventually render national conscription armies unnecessary.

I want to extend my congratulations and applause to the authors and signators of this petition, and to the high principles it sets forth. I commend it to my colleagues in the House and other readers of the RECORD.

The World Federalist Youth petition and a letter to its U.N. representative, Mr. Donald F. Keys, from Secretary General Thant, expressing his similar feelings, follow:

TO THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

As concerned youth of this nation and citizens of the world, we petition you to present our views to the General Assembly of the United Nations for consideration and implementation. We stand together in our affirmation that man is at all times more sacred than property and we condemn both the use of warfare and the use of violence as a means of settling disputes.

We wish to see each nation use the year 1970—the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations—to establish a commission to examine its own national priorities and military policies as well as its relationship to the United Nations in its role as a builder of peace. Concurrently, we desire immediate establishment of a permanent U.N. Peacekeeping Force with the power and the authority to accomplish its duties. Such a force will eliminate the need for conscriptive armies in all nations. This, we believe would be a most positive step in our efforts to free mankind.

OCTOBER 24, 1969.

Mr. DONALD F. KEYS,  
United Nations Representative, World Association of World Federalists, United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KEYS: Thank you for your kind letter of 21 October. I would be grateful indeed if you could transmit to the leaders of your youth organization my deep appreciation for the world-wide appeal they are launching in support of the United Nations.

While it would not be proper for me, at a time when the General Assembly is engaged in the consideration of the report of the Preparatory Committee for the twenty-fifth Anniversary, to endorse each individual proposal contained in the petition, I applaud without hesitation the fine spirit which has moved these young leaders to undertake this great effort on behalf of world peace and progress through the United Nations.

With kind regards,  
Yours sincerely,

MAUNG THANT.

#### YOUTH BECOMES PREY TO DRUGS

**HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, the evidence of an appalling crisis among our youth increases day by day. I refer to the large and growing use of drugs by a large and growing section of young men and women. This is a phenomenon of tragic impact, especially when one notes that our youth have been the most favored in history and yet they have become somehow prey to one of civilization's most fateful habits—the use of drugs. There was published in the Times Herald Record of December 1, in Middletown, N.Y., a lively newspaper in my district, an editorial which included a letter from Dean Ward of Amherst College. It is a letter of lamentation, but it is also a plea for all of us to take immediate steps of prevention of narcotics use among our youth. I bring this editorial to your attention and to the attention of all the Members of this House for their education and action:

#### A "MEANINGLESS DEATH" ON CAMPUS

On Oct. 11, a 19-year-old Harvard sophomore visiting at Amherst College took LSD, jumped 70 feet from the top of a four-story dormitory, and died.

The case, containing a parallel with that of Art Linkletter's daughter in California, is notable for several reasons, not the least of which is the following letter, written by Robert A. Ward, dean of students at Amherst, and sent to all undergraduates, alumni, and others.

Composed during the week after the first Vietnam Moratorium, the letter represents an articulate, compassionate plea to young people on the subject of drug use.

Dean Ward, 35, and himself an Amherst graduate, addressed the letter to undergraduates. But the statement is gaining wide notice across the country. Here is his letter:

"He was not an Amherst man; he was a visitor. But his death occurred in our community and we shared in the loss. We were shocked by the tragedy and stunned by the senselessness of it. He was young and bright—too bright to surrender his life in the foolish madness blighting a generation. In a week in which we paused to reflect on the waste of life half a world away, it may have been a strange irony that we were starkly faced with meaningless death on our campus.

"But that week is nearly gone—one memory fades.

"I will not rehearse the statements made in the past about drugs. Many of us for some time have been apprehensive that a tragedy would come—and last Saturday night it did. Repeated warnings had gone unheeded; it couldn't happen here.

"I only wish those who ignored those warnings could have spent part of that horrible night waiting in Cooley Dickenson Hospital while the student's life ebbed or part of Sunday afternoon in my office while his parents struggled to comprehend the reality of that day.

"I did not become a dean to watch a generation of students pollute their sanity or distort their lives, and I confess to a numbing and depressing sense of helplessness. Words are inadequate and deeds seem fruitless. More than ever students have taken on themselves the individual responsibility which shapes their lives in all areas. It should be so, but the judicious exercise of such responsibility demands wisdom.

"I see no wisdom at all in the growing and indiscriminate use of drugs. I also see a danger that one major tragedy may obscure other tragedies, smaller perhaps but no less frightening.

"On a beautiful Saturday afternoon which was in itself a natural stimulant, why the need for some artificial or uncertain drug? And where were we all on that night or on any night and when will we awake to the need to replace a disinterested privatism with a sustained concern for troubled people in our community? And why do we tolerate in our midst the profiteers of poison?? And by what moral right do we pass into the hands of others substances which can threaten their well-being and even their lives??

"What in God's name is happening to us? "Last Sunday in a scriptural lesson the timeless chastisement of Thomas was repeated: 'Because you did not see, you would not believe.' Last Sunday we did see. Now I plead as never before—please believe."

#### FLOOD-STRICKEN TUNISIA FACES A 5-YEAR RECOVERY TASK

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the catastrophic floods being experienced by Tunisia are a tremendous setback to that progressive North African nation. A few years ago I visited that fiercely independent country and was impressed by the progress being made without resort to a dictatorial regime of the left or the right.

I am dismayed to learn of Tunisia's current plight. The rains have been unbelievable, and a recent New York Times article indicates that the recovery period will be at least 5 years. U.S. relief has been provided. Some of it is described in the Times story which follows. The U.S. citizens assisting in the emergency are to be commended. But, clearly, we must be prepared to continue to assist the recovery of this admirable people.

#### FLOOD-STRICKEN TUNISIA FACES A 5-YEAR RECOVERY TASK

TUNIS, December 4.—After weeks of nearly constant rain and floods, Tunisia is facing a recovery task that is expected to take at least five years and cost more than \$40 million.

In some places the rainfall, between Sept. 24 and the end of November, totaled more than eight and a half inches a day. It left behind new lakes, and cut new rivers through the central regions of the country. Olive trees, one of Tunisia's sparse natural resources and the livelihood of many of her people, were uprooted and carried away.

But despite the picture of desolation and disaster left by the retreating waters, Tunisia has not been plunged into chaos. Her immediate appeal for help met with a prompt response from her North African neighbors, most European countries and the United States, which carried the biggest burden of aid beyond the \$40-million the Tunisians expect to pay.

#### RIVER BECOMES A TORRENT

French, Moroccan, West German and United States helicopters have been flying relief supplies and anti-typhoid vaccine to disaster areas. Teams of engineers from Belgium, France, Spain and West Germany began the task of re-establishing communications; repairs to 125 miles of highways and 60 miles of railroad track are under way.

The Zeroud River, which even in winter is little more than a modest stream in central Tunisia, became a torrent, more than a half mile wide and 40 feet deep. Experts estimated that it had a bigger instantaneous flow than the Rhine in France and Switzerland after the melting of the winter snows. Near the Islamic city of Kairouan, the river left its shallow bed, normally a few hundred yards wide, and became a 10-mile-wide expanse of raging floodwater that swept away all before it.

In the Plain of Kairouan, two other streams, the Merguelli and the Nebhana, were transformed beyond recognition with the same disastrous effects. Concrete blocks weighing about 100 tons each were torn out of wrecked bridges and hurled 50 to 100 yards downstream.

#### BRIDGES WASHED AWAY

Nearly 30 rail and road bridges were washed away. In the worst-hit area of Sousse, artesian wells and water-supply pipes are in urgent need of repair. Muddy rivers invaded villages and towns in the south, engulfing livestock. Dwellings crumbled, leaving 542 dead and some 300,000 people without shelter. Most Tunisian industries have been at a standstill since the beginning of the floods. The export of phosphates, Tunisia's chief earner of currency, was interrupted because of damaged railway track.

The railroad which carries phosphates from the mines of the Gafs a region to the port of Sfax, is being repaired by French engineers of phosphate exports. The repairs seem to be proceeding in record time, as the officials of the southern region are to announce shortly the completion of the task.

In the Sousse region, Spanish teams are building a bridge across the Zeroud at Sidi Bou Ali, a small town that suffered more than any other area. The Dutch are undertaking the rehabilitation of mud-filled artesian wells and the Sousse water supply.

The people of Kairouan and adjoining villages, which had been cut off from the rest of the country at the onset of the floods, have been kept alive by the uninterrupted flow of supplies and vaccine by United States Navy and Army helicopters. Their crews told of the human suffering they witnessed on the hazardous missions.

#### WOMEN IN DESPAIR

A member of one Navy helicopter crew said: "Down below a handful of people were gesticulating to attract our attention. We lowered the craft; we could clearly see women tearing their clothes and scratching their faces in despair. We dropped our supplies. People scrambled and fought for food like a pack of hungry wolves."

Another crew was forced to land on a railroad track, slightly denting the rear of the helicopter, to unload food supplies to about 20 Tunisian peasants who had taken refuge from the muddy river on the track and had been without food for four days.

Members of the United States Embassy staff in Tunis worked around the clock on the relief program. Supplies of blankets, food and vaccine were flown to Tunisia immedi-

ately. One million dollars was donated for the construction of emergency bridges in the north.

Medical teams from the hospital ship Hope, anchored in the Tunis harbor, went to the Sousse and Sfax areas to vaccinate the population. So far no cases of typhoid have been reported.

The World Food Program, an organization affiliated with the United Nations, has undertaken to feed 100,000 refugees for the next six months. Food, blankets and donations in money continue to arrive from many countries.

One expression of sympathy for the victims of the floods came from the children of United States servicemen at the Wheelus air base in Libya. They sent 500 pounds of candy for the children of Kairouan.

### AGNEW AND THE MEDIA

## HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, any number of positive things may be said about Vice President SPIRO AGNEW's recent dissertations on the mass media: It is good to remind the media from time to time that they cannot expect to be exempt from powerful attack; the speeches could prompt a useful public dialog about the role and performance of the media as partner institutions in our democratic society; one result of the speeches could be an invigorated examination within professional ranks of the shortcomings of the media; the resulting, widespread, enlightened discussion could make us all more intelligent consumers of media information.

These positive effects may, indeed, be forthcoming from the Vice President's speeches. But if they are, it will be a case of good wine being made from bad.

The Vice Presidential habit of viewing the world as one unrelieved melodrama led a national news magazine recently to conclude that Mr. AGNEW may go down in history as the great polarizer. In the Vice President's world there are the impudent snobs and the good Americans. The good Americans support the President, the snobs demonstrate in the streets. Reason is on the side of the one, corrupt mob instinct on the side of the other. In the case of the broadcast communicators, it is a handful of Northeastern liberals versus the views of America.

This melodrama syndrome is not characteristic of the Vice President alone, of course. There is Mrs. Mitchell's assessment of the two kinds of participants in the antiwar demonstrations; such demonstrators are obviously either members of the liberal Communist element, whatever that may be, or they are kids out for a lark. One must admit a certain progress in this Nixonian dichotomization: one always used to face three choices.

Even a practitioner of instant analysis might be able to see, however, that such neat classifications of the world have a tendency to be overly simplistic. It would seem at least possible that any crowd of a quarter of a million people might contain more than two kinds of individuals. It is at least academically possible that

there are more than two ways out of Vietnam. And there at least used to be a time when there was some middle ground between noble loyalty to the unquestionably right course of the government and villainous dissent against the American values.

Mr. AGNEW's speeches on the media suffer from this delusion of simplicity and from other delusions which one charitably assumes are the products of an information deficiency. Mr. AGNEW seems to be working from several odd assumptions when he talks about the media: First, that he is daring and original in his attacks on the media; second, that the deficiencies Mr. AGNEW finds in the media have not been thought of or discussed by media professionals; and third, that as Vice President he exercises the same powers of free speech that any ordinary citizen in, say, Des Moines, Iowa, exercises.

None of these apparent assumptions is true.

The media have been under strong attack ever since the earliest days of the Republic, and not one of the Presidents has missed the opportunity to express his bitterness about the media at some point in his administration. Thomas Jefferson wrote:

A truth now and then projecting into the ocean of newspaper lies serves like headlands to correct our course. Indeed, my skepticism as to everything in a newspaper makes me indifferent whether I ever see one.

Grover Cleveland said in an address at Harvard College in 1886:

... the President of the United States should not be put beyond the protection which American love of fair play and decency affords to every American citizen. This trait of our national character would not encourage, if their extent were fully appreciated, the silly mean and cowardly lies that every day are found in the columns of certain newspapers, which violate every instinct of American manliness, and in ghoulish glee desecrate every sacred relation of private life.

Woodrow Wilson wrote in a letter to a relative:

Do not believe anything you read in the newspapers. If you read the newspapers I see, they are utterly untrustworthy. They represent the obstacles as exciting which they wish to have exist, whether they are actual or not. Read the editorial page and you will know what you will find in the news columns. For unless they are grossly careless the two always support one another. Their lying is shameless and colossal!

When Mr. AGNEW says as he did recently: "The day when the network commentators, and even the gentlemen of the New York Times, enjoyed a form of diplomatic immunity from comment and criticism of what they said is over," he speaks of the passing of a time which never was. When he speaks of an unelected fraternity of newsmen, he speaks with equal ignorance. Vice Presidents are elected once every 4 years; newsmen are put to the popular test every day. The daily pressures from readers, news sources, and advertisers determine whether they will survive, and if there is a problem of media monopoly today, it is at least in part because the pressures have been too strong and too successful.

There is no more substance to the apparent assumption that professional broadcast and print journalists have not already thought about and sought reasonable solutions to the problems Mr. AGNEW discusses. For all of his brawny rhetoric, Mr. AGNEW has yet to say anything as perceptively critical as this, by one of the fraternity members he so ardently attacks:

The journalism we throw on our screen is still two-D journalism, the flat fact accompanied by flat opinion. That was never good enough, and it is perilously inadequate now. We have not really moved into the era of three-D journalism, although some are trying; we are not providing the depth, not illuminating the background, making it a living part of the picture with the third dimension, which is Meaning.

The Vice President, for all his gusto, has yet to say anything half so constructive as another of the men he so arrogantly attacks:

The problem is to present the great issues as a series of practical choices: let the people look at the alternatives as the President has to look at them and try at the end to decide among the hard and dangerous courses. We need simple case-study outlines containing, first, a statement of the facts of the policy question; second, a definition of one course of action, followed by arguments for and arguments against; and so on through definition of a second course, and a third and a fourth. The difficulty with the presentation of foreign policy news today is that it comes out a jumble of important and trivial things and personalities, so that the people cannot quite get clear the questions for decision and end up either by giving up or by choosing up sides for or against the President. . . . If I may engage in a little heresy, it may be that news and analysis of news in a democracy are too serious to be left to newspapermen.

These men, Eric Sevareid and James Reston, and hundreds of their colleagues have long been engaged in a serious examination of their performance, an examination to which the Vice President, unwittingly, has come lately and clumsily.

Still a third apparent assumption of the Vice President's is that he holds the same powers of free speech that any average citizen does. When he says, as he did in Montgomery the other day, "This is a great country—in this country every man is allowed freedom of speech, even the Vice President," Mr. AGNEW is not precisely correct, because the fact is that Vice Presidents have freer speech than most citizens. To write a Congressman or to publish a letter in a local newspaper, to add a body to the numbers at a protest march or to wire the President, to vote in an election or to discuss politics with one's friends: that is about all the free voice the average citizen has. But when Mr. AGNEW exercises his right to free speech, he gets thousands of letters of comment, and he gets them because his words are carried live on television and played back on radio and discussed widely in print. The Vice President's voice is louder than most people's voices, no matter how softly he speaks, because it is amplified thousands of times all across this country by the great and small media he attacks.

The mass media, because they are vital institutions in our democratic system, must willingly expect to be tested

and tempered by public criticism; at times they must even expect their conduct to be found wrong and at such times the mass media must be prepared to correct themselves. It is the same with the Presidency. Presidents must have the courage of leadership to accept the possibility that they may be wrong, and when they are wrong they must have the vision and the courage of spirit to correct their policies. When Mr. AGNEW finds grave fault with a distinguished servant of our Nation simply because he appeared on television "challenging and contradicting the policies of the President of the United States," when the Vice President finds television commentators seriously at fault simply because they contradict a President's statement, or challenge his abilities as a politician, or claim that the President follows some agency's line—when these actions are found to be per se a disservice to the country, then the democratic system in this country is at an end, because one of its fundamental liberties, the right to free speech, is at an end. Apparently Mr. AGNEW seeks to invest the Presidency with an infallibility and an imperviousness to criticism that are antiethical to democracy. The right to free speech means nothing if it does not mean the right to criticize, and the right to criticize means nothing if it does not mean the right to criticize the highest policymakers of the Nation.

Mr. AGNEW is right when he says that the power of the great broadcast networks to distill the information the Nation gets, to inspire its imagination, and to color its opinions is unprecedented. He is right when he suggests that this vast new power has the serious potential to undo an essential element of the right of free speech, the right to have access to numerous and multifaceted channels of communications. One of the assumptions about the efficacy of free speech is that the truth in a democratic society will out not by official proclamation but rather by free competition among a variety of versions of the truth.

But the same thing is true of the modern Presidency. Armed with the bureaucratic apparatus of the modern Presidency, equipped with the symbolic power of his office, burdened by a responsibility and authority in the world community not envisioned by the Nation's founders, the modern President has at his hand unprecedented power. And this power is immeasurably enhanced by the availability to the President of the equally unprecedented power of the mass media. By informal convention the President has available to him the immediate attention of the Nation through the very communications networks Mr. AGNEW attacks. When the President chooses to make use of this enormous communications power to further the ends of his administration, as he did recently in behalf of his Vietnam policy, he must properly, out of respect for the massive power he wields, and with an eye to the maintenance of a healthy democratic balance, encourage the fullest and most prompt discussion of his views, even when this discussion is critical.

To himself take advantage of the awesome authority of the mass media while

simultaneously impugning the integrity of those who later take exception to his views before the very same audience, as he did the other day through Mr. AGNEW, is for the President to deal a double blow to the free inquiry which is the basis of our democratic political system. The media as an instrument of power cuts many ways. The President shares with the other manipulators of the mass media a responsibility for its proper use, and that shared responsibility is, regrettably, no part of the Vice President's speeches.

Mr. AGNEW's talks have been dangerous in another way. The Vice President finds that the views of the news media do not represent the views of America and concludes:

As with other American institutions, perhaps it is time that the networks were made more responsive to the views of the nation and more responsible to the people they serve.

This is perhaps the most alarming sentence in the Vice President's recent pronouncements. Professional newsmen have rightly believed that they should be representative of no one. They have been perceptive enough to realize that the phrase "the views of America" is for all practical purposes an empty phrase, that there is not any single right and proper opinion for an American to hold, that the strength of a democratic society such as ours lies in the diversity of its views and talents and peoples. Ours is a heritage of strength through diversity; the views of the majority have been strengthened at times, at times changed, and often tempered and clarified by the views of the minorities. One of the most vital features of a democratic system such as ours is that its communications networks facilitate the regular and orderly hearing of minority voices. To give all this up in place of a polarized, acutely stereotyped picture of U.S. opinion as divided into two neat little camps, "the views of America" and the views of the rest of its citizens, would be to give up a fundamental aspect of our democratic national character.

And finally, I am alarmed by the Vice President's recent speeches because they have liberally distorted and falsified the facts, and the surest way to circumvent the free flow of information on which our society depends is to promote confusion about what the facts are. Mr. AGNEW in his Des Moines speech characterized Mr. Harriman's appearance on ABC thus:

All in all, Mr. Harriman offered a broad range of gratuitous advice—challenging and contradicting the policies outlined by the President of the United States. Where the President had issued a call for unity, Mr. Harriman was urging the country not to listen to him.

There is a certain exquisite irony in Mr. AGNEW calling the advice of Mr. Harriman on a matter of public policy gratuitous while he himself is offering advice to a profession in which he has absolutely no experience. But aside from that, what Mr. Harriman actually said bears no resemblance to what Mr. AGNEW claims he said. Mr. Harriman began his discussion with words, "Well, John,

I'm sure you know that I wouldn't be presumptuous to give a complete analysis of a carefully thought out speech by the President of the United States. I am sure he wants to end this war, and no one wishes him well more than I do," and ended it with the words, "There are so many things we'd like to know about this, but I want to end by saying I wish the President well. I hope he can lead us to peace. But this is not the whole story we've heard tonight." Such a discussion simply cannot be characterized as one in which the public has been urged not to support the President.

Other aspects of the Vice President's speeches are no more fair or accurate: commentators exploring the concept of news objectivity are characterized as admitting their guilt, the President facing Vietnam is likened to Churchill facing the Germans, television analysis of President Kennedy's Cuban missile crisis speech is made to disappear, New York Times coverage of congressional support for the President's Vietnam policy is obliterated. Such sloppiness, if, indeed, it is only that, confuses the facts and makes rational discussion much more difficult. If the Vice President is truly concerned about the free flow of information, he will in the future confine himself in his speeches to honest remarks.

The issues raised, for better or for worse, by the Vice President are basic to our political way of life, and we will be wise, now that the initial flurry of emotional reaction is over, to give them the thoughtful consideration they deserve.

#### POLLUTING OUR ENVIRONMENT

### HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, on November 8 I had the great privilege and tremendous personal satisfaction in celebrating my third anniversary as a Member of this legislative body. In this 3 years I have grown, I believe, in my understanding of the House of Representatives and the forces which motivate its actions. On November 13, for example, President Nixon had the opportunity to thank the House for its strong support of his course of action concerning Vietnam. Both the President and the House of Representatives recognize this course of action to be one to which the vast majority of the people of our Nation subscribe. In the difficult problem of Vietnam, with its grievously complicated foreign policy implications, the people have a basic understanding of what is best for America.

However, I am not making this speech to discuss the Vietnam war. I have done this on other occasions, at other times. But what I do want to talk about today is another great challenge to our Nation. It is the challenge of the problems which we have created for ourselves in the pollution of our environment. Rather than the death and destruction of Vietnam I want to talk about the death and destruction of our rivers and lakes, the

degradation of the air which we breathe, the depletion and waste of our natural resources, the irresponsible behavior of us all in our treatment of the environment in which we exist and in which our children and our children's children must exist.

There has been a vast awakening in this Nation in recent years to these problems. The people have become aware of this destruction. They have become aware of this destruction and they have begun to cry out for answers. They want to know what can be done to solve these problems, they want to know when it can be done, and they want to know why it is not being done.

There are those visionaries who have long recognized the lack of interest which man has had in his environment. One such man was Aldo Leopold who wrote "A Sand County Almanac," published in 1949, 1 year after his death. The book is a classic. At the time of its publication it was a cry in the wilderness, if you will pardon the irony in that expression, for an understanding of the essential unity which exists between man and the land.

In his introduction of a 1966 edition of the book, Aldo Leopold's son, Luna, states:

This generation of Aldo Leopold's grandchildren is rebelling on college campuses, demonstrating and working for social causes, and fighting on foreign soil. This same youth is maturing at that moment of time which is pivotal in the struggle to preserve "things wild and free" that Aldo Leopold understood so wisely and expressed so eloquently.

Of all the causes that attract the attention of these young people, the plight of nature is one which may be truly a last call. Things wild and free are being destroyed by the impersonality of our attitude toward the land. What better way to fight the destruction of nature than to place in the hands of the young this powerful plea for a land ethic?

With the Vietnam moratorium so recently at hand need more be said? The concern and dedication and idealism of the young have a potential role of great responsibility in this battle to improve our environment.

The history of our Nation has been one of growing concern. From Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt to our conservation leaders in the House of Representatives today—and I hesitate to mention any names because there are many, but JOHN DINGELL and JOHN SAYLOR deserve special praise—we have grown in concern. The Congress has passed meaningful legislation in the past. Accepting of the House-Senate conference report last week in approving \$800 million for construction of water pollution control facilities, points out our growing concern. It is not often that more than 40 different conservation minded organizations, "The Citizens Crusade for Clean Waters," can get together behind one legislative proposal, but they showed iron resolution on this one.

We have not contaminated our earth and sky knowingly and intentionally. Our vast and immensely fruitful technology has grown more rapidly than our understanding of all of its implications.

Rachel Carson in "The Silent Spring" threw down a gauntlet, along with many others. She helped to stimulate interest in the need for this undersanding. Our education on the need for pollution control and conservation has caught up with our unmatched abilities to produce material wealth.

And the citizens of this Nation have recognized the need to do battle in this war on pollution. They have illustrated this willingness in many ways including in many States the ultimate in the expression of interest: overwhelming support of bond issues for construction of pollution control facilities, at a time when the screams against higher taxes have been the loudest. The people want to wage a war against pollution and I am totally convinced that we must wage this war and I would at this time like to declare my own personal war against the continuing pollution of our environment. I call upon the Congress and the administration to join me in this declaration. We must get with the people in this great conflict.

The question then becomes can we win this war? Can we cleanse our rivers and our lakes and our air? Can we halt the waste of our resources? Can we bring human populations into a state of balance, a state of unity with the land? Does man bear in him the seeds of his own destruction which are now germinating in an irreversible growth? It is the challenge of man. In this Nation it is the challenge of free men. But we are free to make the toughest kinds of decisions. We are free to control our own future. We are free to accept the responsibilities for voluntarily limiting our freedoms, for our own long-term good, for the long-term good of our children and our children's children.

I have often heard someone say "wouldn't it be wonderful to have a benevolent dictator who felt this way or that way and imposed his will upon the populous." And in this situation that thought will frequently occur. But there is no such human being and there never will be such. We must recognize the fact that only in freedom can men respond to the need for change in a manner which does not impose upon the dignity of the human spirit. Freedom is an explosion of ideas and incentives and an ever growing stimulus to human betterment. Freedom allows man to do in a voluntary way those things which he ought to do, for his physical and spiritual well being and the physical and spiritual well being of his children and his children's children.

The objectives of this war are simple. I envision an America and a world where man and earth are in basic harmony. We have seen enough in our triumphs in space to know that there is great hostility to the existence of life on other planets in our solar system. If there is life in the far reaches of space it may well be that distance alone will prevent benefits from that knowledge to man from earth for many generations. It is time to give up ideas of escape from this planet which God has created for us. It is time to use our God-given abilities and create a world of harmony.

We must establish goals to accomplish this harmony. Our water after use by humans or industry must be returned to

its natural course to the sea as clean or perhaps in better condition than when it was first used. But under any circumstances we must understand what the effects are of changes we bring to that water. We must give ourselves the opportunity to decide what is in our own long-term best interests in water use.

Is it better to pay a small amount more for a car today knowing that in so doing a Lake Erie can be saved? Is it better to pay a few cents more for a dress or a suit knowing that in so doing a Grand River can be saved? Is it better to pay a few dollars more in income or property tax knowing that in so doing the "old swimming hole" will once more be clean and safe for our children? Our goal must be restoration of our water resources so that they exist in a condition which will allow maximum human use and the quiet, tranquilizing beauty of an environment where man is in harmony with nature.

We must establish as a goal clean air—air which will not cause disease and suffering, air which will not choke and irritate, air which does not carry needless dirt and waste and contamination. But we must develop a better understanding of the air we breathe, the air which supports the food we grow, the air which helps to warm the earth and protect us from space-born radiation. Should we continue to burn our fossil fuels at prodigious rates? Can we burn our waste products with continued impunity? What are the long-term relationships of oxidation and photosynthesis with respect to our atmosphere? We want clean air, and we must learn what it is.

The littering of our landscape with junk cars, and other forms of human waste is a tragic illustration of another grave problem facing this Nation. There is irony in this problem because we are proud of the fact that America consumes more raw materials and natural resources than almost all of the rest of the world put together. We are the most efficient producers on earth. And this is a great tribute to our people and our system. But we must become something more. We must become the most efficient users of natural resources.

It is time for this Nation to take inventory of its natural resources and the natural resources of its supplier nations. And then we must do more. We must explore methods for resource conservation. Can we afford to lose our basic metals through disposal in city dumps and land fills or in automobile graveyards or along our roadsides? Can we afford disposable products today made from raw materials that will be scarce tomorrow? Can we allow automobiles to lie in ravines and barnyards rusting into pools of nothing? Can we dump cans and broken tricycles and battered refrigerators in a city dump and ever expect to use their basic metals again? We cannot. The concentrations of basic ores took billions of years to develop on our earth's crust, and we have the audacity to scatter them to the winds in a few minutes of geologic time.

There are answers to these problems. Reynolds Aluminum has begun pilot programs for the salvage of aluminum

cans—\$200 a ton in Los Angeles and Miami, 40,000 cans to the ton, one-half cent a can. I understand the program has been so successful that it will be expanded. I hope so. And I would hope that steel manufacturers and glass manufacturers would find similar programs possible. The problem is not just one of waste, of course. It is also one of gross impairment of the beauty of our roadsides and backwoods trails and lawns and lakeshores and river banks and cities.

I have been told that automobile manufacturers require high-grade steel for their products and that scrap steel has too much impurity in it for use in producing the sheet steel automakers need. And what is the basic source of scrap steel? Junk automobiles. Too much copper and nickel and chromium in a No. 2 bundle of scrap steel—one junked car. The copper comes from the wiring in the car. The nickel makes steel stainless. Chromium makes the bumpers shiny.

The answer is greatly complicated. But the goal is the return of all possible scrap metals to the use cycle. To use our raw materials efficiently we must use them over and over again. In some way we must develop incentives for greater salvage and reuse of our basic raw materials so that our children and our children's children will not curse us for our selfishness and lack of foresight.

We must encourage efforts to limit the number of people who will share the resources of this earth. There are a few million over 200 million people living in this Nation today. By the year 2000 the forecast is for 300 million people. That is 50 percent more in only 30 years. And the earth's population may well double in that same period, from 3 to 6 billion. The problems of today are nothing compared to the problems tomorrow will bring if this uncontrolled growth continues. Our goal must be a stable human population on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, it is a relatively simple matter to state the problems which face us. It is another matter to solve those problems. And I am not presumptuous enough to claim to know the answers. But there are some paths which have been laid by those before us in the accumulation of human knowledge which we have followed in other matters. We do not really have to strike out into any great unknowns. Granted, some of the studies remain to be made and some of the technologies need to be further developed. Our communications techniques need to be improved. But by and large I believe that what we need most is the incentive to wage this war.

Let me just suggest a few steps which might be taken if my logic and perspective are correct.

We need to establish a Department on the Environment in the executive branch of Government. Only in so doing will we be able to concentrate Federal Government attention in this war on pollution. The Department would have the responsibility for establishing and carrying out programs to control air, water, and noise pollution, and to preserve our natural resources including our minerals and our soil. The Department would have new responsibilities in our Federal Govern-

ment to include the encouragement of land use planning, raw material use planning, population planning, and related international programs.

I would envision the transfer to this new agency of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Health, Education, and Welfare's solid waste disposal program and National Air Pollution Control Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Pesticide Regulation Division and small community and rural area water systems and waste disposal programs of the Department of Agriculture, and Housing and Urban Development's waste disposal programs. It would seem in order to give this agency some final word on a multitude of Federal programs affecting the environment such as highway construction and location, Corps of Engineers dredging and construction programs, airport construction and location, agriculture irrigation and drainage programs, powerplants location and operation, certain military weapons testing, and so on. We have reached the point where someone must evaluate the effects of Federal programs on other than those who receive direct benefits.

There can be little doubt that such an agency would have great powers over human activity. But the Congress would retain basic control to direct these activities as the people see fit. And what is the alternative?

To provide this basic control I would recommend the establishment of House and Senate Standing Committees on the Environment. Give them responsibilities for air, land, and water management including the research, education programs, and facilities involved. They would have the basic responsibilities for our natural resources. They would establish the broad framework within which assistance would be provided to State and local governments to carry out related programs. I would anticipate that such committees would find an immediate need for substantial increases in the funds for water pollution control facilities. I would anticipate that such committees would find an immediate need to revise FWPCA priorities to match the dire threat to the Great Lakes of continued pollution. I would envision a maximum use of tax sharing in these programs.

How can we finance all of this considering the great inflation and budgetary problems of today? Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the great needs in education which the Congress recognized several weeks ago in adopting the Cohelan amendment to the continuing resolution covering HEW. We recognize the great need for welfare reform and the high initial cost of the President's program to break the welfare cycle. We have supported the President in his plan to end the Vietnam war and should not count on funds from that source until an honorable peace has been achieved. But there are Federal programs which are low priority if not altogether wasteful and I would suggest that these programs be substantially reduced or eliminated so that we can effectively fight this war on pollution.

I am speaking of the \$4 billion which can be saved annually in our farm subsidy programs. Adopt legislation to help the marginal farmer train for meaningful employment and phase out those price support programs which only encourage high prices to consumers and low prices to farmers.

There are the possibilities of substantial cutbacks in public works projects. Substantial savings can be made through a reduction in our Armed Forces in Europe with a greater share of the defense burden then falling on those there whose interests are equal to our own, but whose contribution to their own defense has been insufficient.

At least \$5 billion each year could be made available from these sources. Could that amount of Federal dollars each year for the next 10 years help to win this war on pollution? I am confident that it could and I am confident that the American people want their tax dollars spent in this way. Mr. Speaker, you know and I know that this war on pollution will not reach its full force without a total commitment from the public, without the encouragement of individual participation, without the vigor and idealism of our college students, without business and labor and industry support and a great deal of help from local, State, and National Government.

We need to enlist every civic organization in this Nation to play a specific role. We need to call on as many individuals as possible to fight in this war on a voluntary basis.

Congressman JIM O'HARA has just distributed to Members of Congress the story of volunteer efforts to clean up the Clinton River in his district. A magnificent job has been done here by civic organizations and individuals to clean up the accumulated wastes and evidence of human misuse of this once beautiful stream. The citizens of Owosso, Mich., had enough of junk and old tires and despoiled banks along the Shiawassee River there and voluntarily pitched in and cleaned up the mess. BILL STEIGER has a great program in his district. And no doubt there are hundreds of other examples of such individual and civic effort when the idea has been presented and developed.

We need to ask business and labor and industry to take on specific objectives. State and local governments have obvious tasks.

It will take a tremendous organization to accomplish the monumental job of bringing all of the forces of free men to bear for victory.

My Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources has suggested the establishment of a privately supported task force to carry out our objectives, to marshal the support we must have. I would strongly encourage that proposal.

I would like to see this committee act as a watchdog on the progress in this war. We should set up a long-term systematic program for followup. As a corollary to this it would be helpful to the Congress, I believe, if a regular report were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicating our progress. It could

be something reported in a similar way to the thermometer in a United Fund fundraising drive. What is our national goal for nutrient removal from our lakes and streams and how far along the path to reaching that goal have we come? Could it be reported on a weekly basis as pollution control facilities come on-stream? On a monthly basis?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait longer to make this all-out effort to bring man into harmony with his environment. I cannot see why the next decade would not be the proper time framework in which to fight and win this war. He might want to call them the sobering seventies because it will not be an easy struggle. It will not be without wrought emotion and anguish and distress. It will not be without political battles and narrow vision conflicts and legitimate differences. But let us set January 1, 1980, as the date for victory over pollution and waste and the ecologic follies of the past.

And just one other thought, Mr. Speaker. This war requires a theme song, a rallying cry, if you will. There is such a song. It is called "America The Beautiful." And I will insert the words to that great national hymn at this point in the RECORD. I would like to recommend that it be made our national anthem—on January 1, 1980.

#### AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

Oh, beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain, for purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain! America! America! God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea!

Oh, beautiful for Pilgrim feet, whose stern impassioned stress a thoroughfare for freedom beat across the wilderness! America! America! God mend thy ev'ry flaw, confirm thy soul in self control, thy liberty in law!

Oh, beautiful for heroes prov'd in liberating strife, who more than self their country lov'd and mercy more than life! America! America! may God thy gold refine, till all success be nobleness, and every gain divine!

Oh, beautiful for patriot dream that sees beyond the years thine alabaster cities gleam undimm'd by human tears! America! America! God shed his grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea!

Mr. Speaker, the people have a basic understanding of what is best for America. They want an end to the filth in the air we breathe, in the waters of the earth, on the land where we live. Let us get with the people.

#### SOVIET MISTREATMENT OF JEWS— A FERVENT PLEA

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the country has been shocked, and all of us are dismayed, by the reports we receive from time to time concerning mistreatment of Jews by Russian officials under the Soviet regime in Russia, and that these outrages have been confirmed by documentary evidence corroborated by statements of officials and the people.

I am pleased to join with my distinguished friend from New York, the Honorable JONATHAN BINGHAM, and other esteemed colleagues, in associating myself with them in asking the State Department to urge the Secretary General of the U.N. officially to recognize and circulate among its members the request of the Israel Government on the specific case they cite, and to refer the matter for action to the Human Rights Commission.

In addition, Secretary of State Rogers is being requested to urge New Zealand Ambassador Baxter to the U.N. to recommend to the Secretary General that this matter be officially referred to the Commission and placed on the Commission's agenda for consideration at the earliest possible date.

Further, it is recommended that the concern of the U.S. Government be expressed immediately over Soviet anti-Semitism with a firm request for thorough investigation.

I strongly endorse this protest and action, and respectfully urge Secretary of State Rogers to take this matter up with the U.N. and do everything in his power to achieve official U.N. action on this serious problem, which disturbs so many people all over the world, particularly in our own country where all men and women are equal under the law and are entitled, regardless of race, class, creed, or status, to be treated fairly, justly, and honorably, and to be protected in all their individual rights.

Anti-Semitism is a curse and a scourge to humanity and it must be banished by all mankind, and this Nation must set the example, as we have done in the past.

The Jews must be freed from the cruel bondage of Soviet discrimination and mistreatments, and I urge our Government to take a determined lead in striking down these crass violations of ordinary human rights and plead with all my heart with the Soviet Government and the Russian people to end these deplorable practices that shock world conscience.

#### TIME FOR START ON TENNESSEE- TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as our population soars above the 200-million mark, our Nation's waterway transportation network must be expanded to relieve congestion and pressures on land transportation routes.

In this connection the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway would perform a vital and important function by linking Tennessee and the Midsouth to the Gulf of Mexico.

The Nashville Tennessean in a recent editorial underlined the importance of this project and I am placing the editorial in the RECORD because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter.

## The editorial follows:

## TIME FOR START ON TOMBIGBEE

Federal Budget Director Robert P. Mayo has promised that his department will try to find room in next year's budget for funds to begin construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway.

Officials from five states met with the budget director Thursday to urge some move on the long-awaited project. Rep. Joe Evins of Tennessee's Fourth District, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, said the group would like to see \$5 million in the budget for the beginning of construction.

Although there is no assurance that construction funds will be included in the new budget, Mr. Mayo's reaction is the most promising sign that has been seen in some time.

Even if the full \$5 million figure mentioned by Mr. Evins is not realized, an amount of \$2.5 to \$3 million would be encouraging. The important thing is to make some beginning on construction. After this is done, it should be less difficult to acquire funds later for continuation of the construction.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee project—which would open up a direct water route from Middle Tennessee to the Gulf of Mexico—has been in the planning stage for many years. It is time that all the planning and hopes that have gone into this needed project are brought to fruition. It is hoped the budget director's try to include construction will be more than just another putoff.

## THE MINERAL KING CONTROVERSY

## HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, shortly before he died, Walt Disney was quoted as saying about the Mineral King Valley of California:

I thought it was one of the most beautiful spots I had ever seen and want to keep it that way.

Much as I agree with Mr. Disney's opinion, I do not find myself in accord with his means of sharing Mineral King's natural values.

Mineral King already represents a major battle between commercial interests and environmental protectors, between conservationists and recreationalists. While the Disney organization moves ahead with plans for a huge \$35 million resort complex in Mineral King, conservation groups such as the Sierra Club are attacking the project as a travesty upon the public interest.

The issue at Mineral King is not that of development or no development; all sides concur that the recreational and natural values Mineral King offers can be built up and protected. The key question is one of degree.

I recognize the desire for additional recreational facilities in southern and central California, but I believe a complex of the size planned by the Disney organization would cause irrevocable physical damage to this region—which includes the surrounding Sequoia National Park.

For that reason I have introduced H.R. 13521, a bill, which, if enacted, would include Mineral King within the existing

Sequoia National Park. Giving Mineral King National Park status would be the best long-range solution providing adequate protection for natural values of the area, and, at the same time, allow for new recreational development which would be more limited in scope than the Disney plans.

Over past months I have collected a valuable group of analyses, articles, and editorials concerning the Mineral King controversy, and I would like to place them in the RECORD at this point:

## SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED MINERAL KING PROJECT

(Prepared by John Rettenmayer and Albert Hill from information supplied by Walt Disney Productions and the U.S. Forest Service, revised March 30, 1969)

The mountains provide variety for our lives—clean air and water, quiet, solitude, uncluttered vistas, and beauty. These things we prize, but they must be guarded, for they can disappear as quickly in the mountains as they have elsewhere. Clean air and water can be polluted, quiet and solitude can be lost to the crowds, the vistas and beauty overwhelmed by the structures of man. That is what may happen to Mineral King.

## THE DEVELOPMENT IS TOO BIG FOR MINERAL KING

## Too many people

1. The developer, Walt Disney Productions, expects 1,000,000 visitors annually. This is roughly half the number that causes a serious overcrowding in Yosemite Valley, an area which is approximately 7 times the size of Mineral King.

2. It is primarily a summer resort. 60% of the total visitation is expected during the summer months—5,000 to 10,000 visitors per day. Dispersal into the back-country, which the Forest Service proposes, cannot be adequate to spare the valley, but will render the high-country unattractive for hiking, fishing, and other summer mountain recreation.

3. The acoustics of the high lake basins is excellent. Noise from hundreds of downhill hikers will degrade the quiet, remote atmosphere of the back-country. The camaraderie of the trail will be lost to the impersonality of the freeway. (The noise problem will be severely aggravated by the regular helicopter service which is planned.)

4. Trampling, littering, and pollution are other likely problems.

## Too many structures

5. The hotel complex with 1030 rooms (the 11-story Disneyland Hotel has only 608 rooms) will dominate the valley.

6. Numerous restaurants (one atop a peak) will serve 2300 guests at one time.

7. Parking will be provided for 3,600 automobiles in an 8-10 level parking structure adorned with a heliport.

8. 22 ski lifts, penetrating into every major lake basin and to the ridge-top boundary with Sequoia National Park, will mar the landscape like powerlines. Service roads for lifts and other facilities will further scar and mechanize the back-country.

9. Specialty shops, conference center, theatre, swimming pools, and a golf course distract from the area's primary use as mountain recreation. They serve only to attract more people to an area that will already be too crowded to be fully enjoyed.

## DESTRUCTION OF NATURAL BEAUTY

10. Walt Disney said: "Our plan for the area is being guided by one other very important consideration: Mineral King's great natural beauty must be preserved at all costs." Yet the Disney company reports state: "... grooming and manicuring of most slopes . . . will require extensive bulldozing and blasting in most lower areas and exten-

sive rock removal at higher elevations" and "Extensive cuts and fills and site grading will be required in the parking area and in the village area." The result will no doubt be a well-manicured resort, but it will not be the preservation of the natural beauty of which Walt Disney spoke.

11. Other alterations of the natural scene will be the relocation and channelization of the Kaweah River (in two places) and of Monarch Creek, and the creation of a reservoir which will destroy the choice meadow land in the middle of the valley. A golf course may be located beyond the reservoir. Avalanche control will require an extensive amount of earth-moving.

## IMPACT ON SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

12. The new high-speed highway across the park to Mineral King would endanger half of the Giant Sequoia trees which lie below the road.

13. Of great concern is the potentially dangerous precedent which would be set if this road for non-park purposes is allowed to cross the park. Precedents are important in the American system of government, and this one could well lead to further invasions of the National Park System.

14. The noise pollution in the Kaweah canyon will be greatly aggravated by heavy auto traffic and helicopter transportation in and out of the resort. It is expected that 1200 cars per hour will pass through the park during the main arrival and departure times.

15. Powerlines to service the development will be strung across the Park.

16. A separate private development planned for 160 acres adjacent to the park at Silver City will add to the impact on the area in general and on the park in particular. This development will not be under control of either the Forest Service or the Park Service.

17. Testimony presented by Disney Productions at wilderness hearings proposed exclusion from wilderness classification of portions of the park next to Mineral King and in Hockett Meadows. The company said these park areas would be desirable for expansion of their resort facilities! It is exactly this expansion-minded attitude, particularly where the park is concerned, that bothers many people.

## COST TO THE TAXPAYER

18. 90% of the cost of the new highway to service the Disney development will be paid for from gas taxes contributed by Southern Californians. The rest comes from U.S. taxpayers. The stated cost of the highway is \$25 million, though some highway experts think it will be closer to \$50 million.

## THE FOREST SERVICE ROLE

19. There have been no public hearings for the expression of responsible public comment on the appropriateness of the proposed resort development on public land, despite several requests for such hearings by concerned citizens.

20. While minimum standards for the development have been set, no limits on the maximum size have been indicated. Indeed, although the prospectus specified a minimum expenditure of \$3 million, the bid which was accepted was for \$35 million.

21. The Forest Service requested and accepted a bid for the large-scale development of Mineral King three years before completing a study of the impact that such a development would have on Mineral King.

22. The development appears to be contrary to the intent of Congress. The area was recognized by the 69th Congress as being of park quality and was given special status as the Sequoia National Game Refuge. Congress should decide whether that status should be drastically changed.

## PROLIFERATION OF RESORT AREAS

23. The Spring 1969 issue of "Skiing" magazine announced that "... at the risk of being accused by one of its major lease-

holders of 'overbuild', the USFS has offered a prospectus on Trail Peak, another on Dunderberg, another on Yuba Gap—and is about to offer one for the development of Sherwin Bowl, practically in Mammoth Mountain's backyard." Clearly Mineral King is not the only place in the Sierra which is desirable for skiing. (Note that Trail Peak is directly east of Mineral King and is even closer to Los Angeles.) The article closed with, "Another school of thought adhered to by some Forest Service officials is that eventually the additional areas will tend to generate more business rather than oversaturate the market." We can only ask, "Is it the proper role of the Forest Service to generate business for the ski industry?"

24. Perhaps the various jurisdictions of the Forest Service should get together and arrive at a "zoning" plan for the entire Sierra. New recreation/entertainment complexes should be put in areas which are already used for that purpose. Uncommercialized natural areas such as Mineral King should not be sacrificed to local empire-building within the Forest Service.

[From the New York Times Magazine, Aug. 17, 1969]

PROTECTIONISTS VERSUS RECREATIONALISTS—  
THE BATTLE OF MINERAL KING  
(By Arnold Hano)

High in California's Sierra Nevada nestles a small alpine valley, ringed by bold and snowy peaks. Towering stands of pine, cedar and fir rise up from granite beds to set the air tingling with the smell of Christmas all year round.

Mineral King Valley, located within the northern tip of the Sequoia National Forest, 228 miles northeast of Los Angeles, is a serene-appearing place. Backpackers come each summer to hike over the ridgeline into the wilderness beyond. Fishermen angle for trout in 20 emerald lakes that sparkle in hanging basins above the valley floor. A tiny community of cabin dwellers move back into their shingled shacks to escape the heat of the San Joaquin Valley towns below the Sierra's western slopes. In winter, snows sometimes bury the cabins until nothing is visible but white-mantled peaks and lonely evergreens, and the only sound is a coyote's howl.

The single road into Mineral King, partly paved, partly dirt and narrow, steep and winding as a goat path, is blocked by the first heavy snow of late fall. It remains virtually impassable until late spring. I drove the road this May, switching from car to four-wheel-drive truck to snow tractor. The 25 serpentine miles took two and a half hours.

Serene the valley appears, though serene its history seldom has been. Paleozoic seas buried the valley 200 million years ago. Volcanos later split its crests and poured molten lava down its flanks. Ice Age glaciers peeled back the volcanic magma and gouged through the rock to shape peaks, fashion stream beds, scoop out lake basins and polish the naked granite slopes until today they gleam like marble.

Now Mineral King is again the scene of a bruising struggle. If the opposing forces are somewhat less titanic, they make up for their size by their acrimony. On one side are major commercial interests, and their supporters in state and Federal governments, who have in mind developing the valley for public recreational use, at a profit. On the other side are a host of outraged conservationists, including the Sierra Club, which, on July 26, obtained a temporary Federal injunction that blocked the development. Named as co-defendants in the suit: Department of Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin, Interior Secretary Walter Hickel, Sequoia National Park Superintendent John McLaughlin, Regional Forester J. W. Deinema and Sequoia National Forest Supervisor M. R. James.

The valley is public land, 1,500 acres in all, superintended by the U.S. Forest Service. Its magnificent ski bowls and its dependable snow pack from fall to spring have long been eyed by skiers and resort operators. Back in 1949, the Forest Service invited developers to submit proposals to turn the valley into a year-round recreation resort. But no bids were received; the problem of constructing a new access road to the valley appeared too difficult and too expensive.

By 1965, however, when bids were again invited, interest had grown mightily, and so had Southern California's ski population. A major ski resort was badly needed; this time six developers submitted plans. One bid was approved late in 1965. The bidder, Walt Disney Productions, was granted a three-year permit to develop its master plan. New Disney's master plan has been approved by the Forest Service, accompanied by cries of anger and anguish from such traditional protectors of the primitive scene as the Wilderness Society, the National Parks Association and the litigious Sierra Club.

Nor is opposition restricted to these groups. The public has become involved. Bumper strips have begun to appear in California—"Keep Mineral King Natural." College youngsters talk of taking their militant tactics to the Sierra hills, threatening "lie-downs" in front of the highway bulldozers to come. Letter writers, urged on by Sierra Club chapters, are pressuring Congress to help block the development. The temptation is to call this a conservation battle, but because both sides claim to be conservationists, let me try two other words—recreationists and protectionists.

At Mineral King, Walt Disney Productions intends to build a \$35.3-million, year-round resort to accommodate skiers in winter and such warm-weather activists as hikers, swimmers, fishermen and campers the rest of the year. An Alpine Village will be built on the 7,800-foot-high valley floor, with five-story hotels, restaurants and shops. Twenty-two ski lifts and gondolas will rise to the magnificent skiing surfaces, 3,000 and 4,000 feet above the valley. An enclosed lift will take the hungry tourist to a restaurant midway up one peak, and the more ambitious, or less vertiginous, to another eatery, at an 11,100-foot summit. In winter there will be skiing, skating and skibobbing. Novice skiers will see their mistakes on a closed-circuit TV screen via taped replay. In summer, the valley turns into a wonderland of gurgling streams, limestone caves and grassy meadows; rugged trails to sightseeing points will permit the viewer to spot, 30 miles at a distance, Mount Whitney, American's highest peak below Alaska.

Plans have been drawn for skating rinks, heated swimming pools, horse corrals, a chapel, a theater and a five-acre sublevel parking structure for visitors' cars. A cog-assist electric railway will transport visitors from the nine-level parking facility, cut into a natural swale, to the village, a mile and a quarter up the valley. If all had gone well, construction of a new 20-mile access road, to replace the steep goat path and reduce the two-and-a-half hour trip to 35 minutes, would have begun early next year, at a cost to California taxpayers of more than \$1-million a mile. And if all had continued well, Disney hoped to collect its first \$1.25 (or maybe \$1.50) parking fee in December, 1973. By 1978, the resort expected to attract nearly a million persons a year, to sleep up to 3,000 each night and to accommodate as many as 8,000 skiers on its slopes at one time. All this in a valley not much more than two miles long and a mile and a quarter wide.

The protectionists are aghast. They believe that the construction of the Disney development and the access road will overcrowd and desecrate the tiny valley, pollute air and streams and compromise outdoor values. They point to the official designation of

Mineral King (the Sequoia National Game Refuge) and decry the plundering of a game refuge by private development with, they say, the likelihood that wild animals and their habitats will be abused. Finally, they charge that the planned access road, now blocked by the Federal injunction, must pass through nine miles of the Sequoia National Park and violate national park values.

The road would be capable of carrying 1,000 cars an hour, at speeds up to 50 miles an hour, one lane in each direction, with occasional third or "safety" lanes for passing. Just how safe is a matter of dispute. The Clarkson Engineering Company, in a report prepared at the request of the associate director of the National Park Service, declares "the safety-lane design proposed by California is . . . very unsafe and should not be used."

Safety aside, the road poses a threat to the national park and its vegetation, particularly the giant sequoias, those Sierran redwoods that are the earth's largest living organisms and among its oldest. Drainage from road construction might wash away the thin soil that protects the astonishingly shallow root structures of these forest giants.

Michael McCloskey, new executive director of the Sierra Club, emphasizes the probable damage to trees along the road from auto pollutants that will coat trunk, branch and leaf. "Smog has poisoned trees in the hills around Los Angeles," McCloskey points out. "Those trees are not protected by national law. These trees are." Protectionists do not pretend that the situation will be as bad as that of Los Angeles, where an inversion layer keeps contaminants from being blown away. Sierra winds will blow most of the smog away. Most, but not all. Morison R. (Jim) James, supervisor of Sequoia National Forest, in referring to the 20-mile access route leading up to Mineral King, says: "On a hot August day, you can see the smog and haze climb up the canyon from below, even now. To some extent, this will be compounded by all the cars climbing the new road."

In reply to protectionists' arguments, both Disney and the U.S. Forest Service—landlord of Mineral King—issue a general demurrer: no pollution, no erosion, no desecration, no threat to a single sequoia, no alienation of public land or of public trust. Forest Service officials insist that the designation of the area as a national game refuge in no way affects its right to put the land to other use. The Forest Service runs its land under a "multiple-use" philosophy, assigning to each area a use or a variety of uses that seems best adapted to that area. The uses are five in number—water and watershed management, timber, grazing, wild life and recreation. Understandably, this often leads to conflict between "users." Loggers see forestland as construction material; watershed people see the same trees as necessary to prevent runoff. Concessionaires want to build hot dog stands where prairie dogs make their homes. At Mineral King, the Forest Service has decided that the valley can best be used for recreation.

Recreationists see in Mineral King a piece of primitive land once practically inaccessible and now about to be made available for the playtime pursuits of thousands of Southern Californians, five driving hours away, among whom are hordes of skiers with no major ski area closer than overcrowded Mammoth Mountain, 340 miles from Los Angeles. Mineral King, with its slopes shaped into the classic U-bowls that are the relics of glaciation, will provide superb skiing. Any of its five ski bowls marked for development is larger than the total ski surface of either Mammoth Mountain or Squaw Valley, scene of the 1960 winter Olympics.

The Disney people and the Forest Service are not unaware of esthetic and ecological considerations. Robert B. Hicks, an economist

hired to run the Mineral King project by Walt Disney personally, before Disney's death in December, 1966, is adamant that the natural beauty of the area will remain unblemished, and the numbers of visitors will not unduly tax the small valley's dimensions.

The Disney staff has received 37 awards for its past work in wilderness conservation. Walt Disney was a life member of the Izaak Walton League and—the observer is gently reminded—was elected in 1955 an honorary life member of the Sierra Club.

Bob Jackson, a Disney publicist, calls the project's objective "a controlled introduction to nature experience," and he emphasizes the word "controlled." Though construction has not started, Disney has plunged over \$500,000 into site surveys, reports and the hiring of consultant engineers, hydrologists, architects, meteorologists, soil scientists, foresters, resort operators and ski experts. Disney snow-survey teams have lived in Mineral King the past four years, to map snow data and plot avalanche activity. In 1967, Disney people visited 22 ski resorts in five European countries. They came back contemptuous of what they had seen: overcrowded facilities, a hopeless mix of auto and pedestrian traffic, cumbersome ticketing procedures at the ski lifts, primitive luggage handling, what Disney's John Hench calls "a general disregard of a guest's comfort." All of this, of course, will be vastly different at Disney's Mineral King.

The Forest Service is elated with such super-organization, such promised efficiency. Jim James, forest supervisor, says: "For the first time, we have a developer planning everything from scratch, and planning it far better than any ski development has been planned before. We're happier with Disney than a frog in a mud puddle."

Project manager Hicks brings to his job excellent credentials. An economist, he also holds a degree in engineering. He is a one-time resident of Visalia, 55 miles east of Mineral King, so he knows the area. He has skied for more than 20 of his 47 years. He is a friend of Willy Schaeffler, director of ski events at the 1960 winter Olympics, who serves as Disney's ski consultant. The two men often ski Mineral King, learning what they can of the slopes.

Hick spends other time visiting service clubs in Southern California, speaking to Rotary, Kiwanis and the like, softly selling the Disney plan, armed with slides of the area as it now looks and as Disney artists foresee it. He devotes a few minutes of his presentation to "correcting the misstatements of the press."

One such "misstatement" is the inclination to prejudice the Mineral King project as a transplanted Disneyland—cute, colorful, supercalifragilisticexpialidocious and out of keeping with the rugged setting of the High Sierra. Nothing so infuriates the Disney people. Says Hicks: "It is unfair to think that Disney did a good job at Disneyland, but will do a bad job elsewhere. Why not assume this project will be just as appropriate for Mineral King as Disneyland was for the recreation needs of Anaheim?"

To the Disney side of the debate have come a cluster of politicians, including U.S. Senator George Murphy, Gov. Ronald Reagan and past Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown; civic groups; state and Federal agencies; local newspapers; local businessmen. The Disney project will be big business, not only for Disney. The Forest Service will receive back from the Disney operation an estimated \$300,000 the first year, graduating to \$600,000 by Year 5-1978—based on a percentage of receipts. The building of a \$23-million road is a pork barrel of much succulence. The influx of tourists means money to the gateway cities in the San Joaquin Valley below. The city of Visalia, astride a freeway that runs north from Los Angeles, is the capital of Tulare County; county officials are fairly slavering over what

they expect to be \$500-million in taxes, payrolls and the like within 10 years after the project opens its doors. Tulare County is afflicted by high unemployment; Pat Brown, while he was Governor, wangled \$3-million from the Federal Government toward the cost of the new road because it will run through this economically depleted area.

Not that crassly fiscal advantages are the only considerations of politicians. Friendship may be another consideration. George Murphy, Ronald Reagan and Walt Disney were close personal friends. Before he left office, United States Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, long identified as a champion of wilderness, strongly endorsed the Mineral King project in words the Disney people circulate whenever the debate begins: "If we fail to develop selected areas such as Mineral King, the 50 million people who will be in California before the end of this century will spill over the sides of the coastal cities and ravage the Sierra with unplanned and undirected enthusiasm for the vanishing outdoors."

Such are the arguments in favor of the Disney development on national forest land. They are persuasive and delivered by persuasive and talented people. They know what they are doing. They are the same people who have turned Disneyland into one of the minor financial miracles of our time, with its more than nine million visitors each year. They are the same people whose films and television shows are among the most popular and financially successful of their media. At present they are building a mammoth vacation-recreation resort on 27,000 acres of former marshland and cypress forest in central Florida, to open in 1971, at a cost to Disney of \$165-million. When Walt Disney died, his older brother, Roy, a bald folksy look-alike for Ed Wynn, said of the organization: "We're trying to be as smart collectively as Walt was individually." Yet even during Walt's life, Roy was the financial wizard of the team. In 1968, two years after Walt's death, the corporation had one of its finest fiscal years.

At Mineral King, they surely seem to know what they are doing. During this past winter—California's most severe in a century—avalanches crushed nine of the old cabins. Yet the site Disney had chosen for its new Alpine Village remained untouched by avalanche activity. The Disney snow-survey teams had mapped out exactly where avalanches might occur and where they would not. The winter proved them right.

Disney and the Forest Service expect to do something about future snowslides at Mineral King. The Forest Service has been experimenting with bringing on avalanches by firing blanks from 75-mm. howitzers and by dropping dynamite from helicopters. We know how to move the snow," a Disney official says. "We can make it move when we want, not when it wants."

Yet this confidence and the cold, efficient ability to manipulate nature to man's needs do not still the debate. In a sense they spur it on. Within the valley are two creeks—Monarch and Kaweah—that merge to form the east fork of the Kaweah River, one of the major watering sources of the San Joaquin Valley farmlands below.

Monarch Creek is a young stream, still carrying glacial debris as it cuts through the valley floor. It is, in fact, one of the ongoing architects of the valley, a jubilant stream that kicks up its heels once in a while. When Monarch Creek becomes bored with its old channel, it changes course and begins to carve out a new direction. Disney and the Forest Service cannot countenance such initiative that might one day send Monarch Creek waters tumbling through the lobby of a new hotel. "Disney will put the stream into a permanent channel," explains W. S. (Slim) Davis, chief of recreation for the National Forests of California, "and keep it there."

Does Forester Davis approve of this tampering with nature?

Davis chuckles. "Let's say, we'll complete nature's job sooner."

It is this chuckle that chills protectionists, the sound of smug man maneuvering nature at his whim. "That's typical of the Forest Service," says the Sierra Club's McCloskey. "'Nature doesn't know what it is doing. We know better.'"

Protectionists point out that glaciers and streams, without the help or hindrance of man, created Mineral King. The valley knows how to survive its own catastrophes, but it is defenseless before man's. Mineral King has lived through flood, volcanoes, glaciers, changeable streams and storms, not for just a century, but for 20,000 centuries. Avalanches this winter tore out several thousand trees. To the protectionists, this is nature's way. The trees will grow back. Once, millions of years ago, giant sequoias covered most of the Northern Hemisphere. Then the Ice Age swept all before it, except for a few pockets in the west slopes of the Sierra Nevada. Only here, in all the hemisphere, did giant sequoias survive. Today their offspring live, growing and vigorous. The sequoias have lived through the Ice Age. Can they live through the Disney Age?

Strictly speaking, it is not the Disney development that threatens Sierra vegetation, but the proposed access road. Mineral King has been saved from human hands, for the large part, because of its inaccessibility.

From the town of Three Rivers, at the east edge of the San Joaquin farming valley, to Mineral King—the route of the new access road—the terrain rises from 1,200 feet to 7,800 feet, a dizzying ascent by any means, and totally forbidding in the days before any road at all existed.

In 1858, a stockman, Hale D. Tharp, made his home in a fallen redwood log in what is now the Sequoia National Park and occasionally hacked his way further east, to Mineral King. A few years later, Harry O'Farrell discovered silver in Mineral King, and through the eighteen-seventies, miners worked the land for silver, gold, lead and copper. The first road to Mineral King was a wagon trail, built by Chinese labor and completed in 1879. That year, the heyday of activity in the valley, 10 mining companies worked their claims. But when the mining claims did not pan out, deterioration set in. Just a few stubborn miners clung to their picks and their dreams.

In 1890, when the Sequoia National Park was established, Mineral King, though ecologically a part of the park, was not included, because of the miners. The national park system does not take in land where commercialism exists, and where man's works are as evident as they were at Mineral King, in the form of the primitive road and a few cabins.

Mineral King became, instead, part of the less sacrosanct national forest reserve. But all about it lay the Sequoia National Park, and to get to Mineral King, you had to cross the park.

In 1945, the Forest Service began to look on the area as a possible winter resort. Naturally the problem was access, and the solution was to persuade the State of California to allocate the funds for a new road. But with the migration of Americans to California, at the end of the war, the state had road-building projects enough. No state money was available when the Forest Service asked for bids from private developers in 1949, and no private developer would build a road with his own money.

In 1960, Walt Disney inquired whether the Forest Service might not again be putting the land out to bid. In 1965, a prospectus went out, and six developers responded. Even before the Disney bid was selected, the California Legislature voted to add the Mineral

King road to the state highway system. After Disney was picked, the pace continued to accelerate. Funds came from Federal and state coffers.

But there remained one final step before road building could begin. The Forest Service and the Park Service had still not agreed on the road's nine miles through the Sequoia National Park. The Forest Service is part of the Department of Agriculture; the Park Service is part of the Department of Interior. Historically, these two giant Federal departments have not got along well; on this project, friction has been pronounced. The Park Service, custodian of the area through which this part of the road must run, has been traditionally more protective of the natural elements than has the Forest Service. In this instance, the major question has been whether the Sequoia National Park's giant sequoias will be endangered by the road.

Nature lovers were concerned that numbers of sequoias would be cut down to make room for the road. This fear appears groundless. California highway engineers have come up with a route that will not touch a single sequoia. Another fear remains. Will road construction, with its removal of eight million cubic yards of soil, its cuts and fills and subsequent runoff, undermine the giant trees' root structures?

The answer may depend on how carefully the California Division of Highways builds its road. Large cuts presuppose large fills, which can ravel and run off, and erode the drainage channels below. In these drainage ways many of the giant sequoias stand. If cuts are kept small, and roadbuilders immediately replant vegetation to stabilize the soil, the runoff problem is mitigated somewhat.

And the care the highway division takes may depend on the money available. It has \$23-million to do the job. One consultant engineer privately estimated that building such a road properly, meeting esthetic and ecological criteria, will run closer to \$45-million. Protectionists fear that, if he is right, the road will prove to be a hasty job, with much runoff and devastating soil disturbance.

There are 103 sequoias along the road right-of-way, of which 45 are said to be in a position of "possible jeopardy." But not only the sequoia is in danger. The last three miles of new road within the national park will be through thick stands of redwood, incense cedar, fir and pine.

Asked what would happen here, a Disney official said, "We will avoid the redwoods."

"How about the others?"

"We'll chop 'em down."

Perhaps the most concentrated felling of trees will occur just where the road ends, at the proposed new parking facility, below Mineral King Valley. Trees by the hundreds will be axed, to make room for cars by the thousand.

So the question is not whether there will be physical change in the area leading to Mineral King, or in Mineral King itself. The question is, how much? The question is not whether there will be disruption in the valley, but how severe? Such questions, of course, are as answerable as asking how high is up. "It is all a matter of philosophy," says Jim James. "The development will change the looks of the valley. I'd be a fool to deny it. But it will not ruin the looks of the valley. It will be an acceptable change."

It depends on what you are looking at and looking for. Certain changes in Mineral King would be welcome. The development of cabins on the valley floor is today a hodgepodge of groaning slats and shattered shingles. The Disney people tell visitors that the use of pit toilets (and the bushes) by cabin dwellers and summer campers and the presence of a horse-renting stable have contaminated the river below so that it is unfit for human drinking.

Yet all this is easily changed, as the Sierra Club's Mike McCloskey points out. "A little enforcement by the Forest Service would keep the place clean." Nor does McCloskey think the river is that contaminated. "A recent park report says the water quality is excellent for fish. It can't be very polluted."

The problem at Mineral King is that recreationists and protectionists look at the same thing with different eyes. One sees public land unused and considers it a waste. The other sees the same public land unused, and considers it preserved. One sees the tampering with nature, and considers it necessary. The other sees the tampering with nature, and imagines a biotic community jeopardized. One views ski slopes and wild animals, in that order. The other views wild animals and ski slopes, in that order. One seeks immediate gratification for himself; he wolfs down pleasures and seeks out more. He is hedonist, recreationist. The other defers his gratifications, saving them for later generations. He is puritan, protectionist. The recreationist at Mineral King says: "Look beyond the ridges; there are still nearly two million acres of adjacent wilderness. What's wrong with using this tiny piece of land, this mere 1,500 acres, this less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of all the national forest land in California?" The protectionist sees population growing and public land shrinking, and he wonders where it will ever stop.

The recreationist sees public land put to use; the protectionist sees it put to auction. In California alone, 46 ski areas have been built on national forest land; throughout America, the figure is nearly 200. The only thing unique—say the recreationists—is that the Disney resort will be better than any other. The only thing unique—say the protectionists—is the magnitude of the Disney development.

One wonders, today, whether the Forest Service does not secretly agree that the proposed development is a wee bit bigger than the service originally conceived. The Forest Service prospectus, calling for bids, speaks of a development "conservatively estimated at \$3-million." The Disney investment will be \$35.3-million. The Forest Service prospectus suggests accommodations for "at least" 100 overnight visitors. Disney plans to bed down 1,505 the first year, and 3,310 by 1978. The prospectus calls for parking 1,200 autos; Disney's nine-level facility will handle 3,600 cars the fifth year, with plans for two supplemental parking lots in case of overflow crowds.

Do these quantum jumps give the Forest Service occasional twinges concerning the ability of the tiny valley to absorb such a crush of visitors and installations? Forest Service recreation specialist Peter J. Wyckoff says: "I'm not worried about the winter and skiing. But in the summer the country is fragile and overuse could easily destroy it." Mike McCloskey testifies to the fragility: "At this high elevation, the growing season is short, and vegetation has a tenuous hold on life. Only a narrow balance of conditions allows vegetation to thrive here. Upset the balance, and you destroy that hold on life."

So the Forest Service must know it has taken a chance.

The Sierra Club has also worried that the Disney development would trigger similar developments in the area. Even Disney had been concerned, remembering how—in Bob Hicks's words—"honky tonks and beer parlors" had sprung up on private land all around Disneyland, giving the area a cheap and garish look. Hoping to avert this at Mineral King, Disney had bought up the small parcels of private land near the site of its proposed development to insure unified control of the area. But a parcel of 160 acres within the boundary of the Sequoia National Forest, near the town of Silver City, five miles west of Mineral King, remained in other private hands.

Early in 1969, the Tulare County planning department approved an application for construction of a residential and commercial community on this 160-acre site, the Seaborn-Wells project. The development would include a 30-unit motel, a 72-unit lodge, 20 condominiums, 48 single-family units, a gas station, a swimming pool, stores and a restaurant. All virtually check by jowl with Mineral King.

Now the Forest Service finds itself in an embarrassing position. On one hand, it endorses development on public land by a private investor—the Disney organization. On the other, it finds itself opposed to development of private land by a private investor—the Seaborn-Wells people.

"We are against a development of this magnitude in the valley," says Jim James, and he is talking about Seaborn-Wells, not Disney. "It competes with the idea we have of the total capacity of the place." Jim James spoke to the Tulare County board of supervisors, and in May Seaborn-Wells was turned down. But Seaborn-Wells will now appeal.

If Seaborn-Wells wins its appeal, the Forest Service will institute condemnation proceedings to buy the land. But 160 acres in this area of suddenly inflated real-estate values could cost as much as \$2-million. All this should have been taken care of before the Forest Service put Mineral King out for bid in 1965; the 160 acres could have been bought up for a song.

The Sierra Club fears of "piggy-back" developments were further confirmed in June when plans were announced for the construction of a 12,000-acre resort at Three Rivers, gateway to Mineral King.

Withal, the Forest Service has emerged as something less than heroic. In its Mineral King prospectus in 1965, the service estimated the cost of the new access road at \$5-million. It missed by \$18-million. When asked about this discrepancy, the Forest Service explained: "We were using 1953 cost figures." This is the service that superintends 186-million acres of public land.

Something else is needed. We all have suffered too long over Federal and State abuse of public land. Dams in the Grand Canyon; oil wells drilled in the Santa Barbara channel that seep tar over the golden beaches of Southern California and murder birds and sea life in the bargain; state tidelands in Maryland slickered away from the people and given to a real-estate developer; now, Mineral King.

You can't blame Disney or his ilk. That is the nature of the beast. But someone or something must keep a check on development; somebody must say: "All right, that's enough. Any more and the place bursts at the seams." When Disney's Bob Hicks was asked: "How come you've got a chapel in your plans? Isn't that the beauty of Mineral King—that you don't need to get inside a building to commune with God?" he answered: "I agree. I don't see the need. Somebody threw it in." The problem won't be getting Disney to leave out things, but to keep it from throwing in more. Yet there is nobody to keep it from throwing in more. The Forest Service is, by law, that check, but a Disney official says with contempt: "Our standards are higher than the Forest Service's."

What we have at Mineral King is another absentee landlord. It is easy enough to be offended by the Disney project, and its threat to the ecology of Mineral King. Something is going to be taken forever from Mineral King—nature with the bloom of creation upon it. In its place, Disney will leave another pleasure palace, for Southern Californians, who have more pleasure palaces per capita than any other people in the world. So it is easy for the protectionist to take his potshots at the Mineral King development.

But more significant is how government landlords—Park Service, Forest Service and

the like—continue to allow massive violations of public land. Yellowstone National Park—our oldest national park—is today a chaos of urbanization within a bewildered wilderness. Yosemite National Park is so overcrowded, a trip becomes more drudgery than pleasure. The scars to the terrain of our national forests, left by indifferent loggers, turn public land into festering sores.

What can be done? The President's new Cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council might help, though its first action—to suggest further oil drilling in the Santa Barbara channel—boggles the minds of protectionists in the coastal cities of California. What is truly needed is a Federal Department of Conservation, to protect all our natural resources—to handle pollution of air, water and land; to study population growth; to establish public-land policy; to meet recreation needs without disturbing wild-life ecology. All the parts tied together in one department, not sundered among a half-dozen.

As for Mineral King, the whole struggle may be past history. It is not likely the Sierra Club will win a permanent injunction against the development, although the granting of a temporary injunction may force Disney to postpone its opening. Even the most optimistic conservationists know the score—Progress always beats Protectionism. It is less likely that the Forest Service will now suggest to Disney: "Look, this is a great pleasure palace you have designed, but perhaps the valley can't take it. Can't you cut it back—leaving out the theater, the chapel, the closed-circuit TV, the restaurant on the summit, a few hundred parking spaces? Can't the people swim in the lakes; do we need heated pools? Can't it be a modest development, with five or six ski lifts, not 22; with two slopes for skiing, not five?"

But it is too late. The Forest Service will not sacrifice \$300,000 the first year, and \$600,000 the fifth year. Such money justifies its existence, come budget time. Mineral King has subtly changed in Forest Service eyes, from a remote and lovely alpine valley, to a playground with turnstiles.

Perhaps, then, the truest value of Mineral King is that it stands as the latest crass example of abuse of public land by the very agents to whom we entrust that land. One wonders how long America must tolerate such stewardship.

[From Natural History magazine,  
November 1968]

#### THE KING BESIEGED (By Jack Hope)

Standing upon one of the treeless peaks that surround California's Mineral King Valley, surveying the wilderness of the southern Sierra Nevada, provokes a certain spirit of uneasiness. The feeling is not unpleasant, but is disturbing only in the sense that it is one that we aren't used to dealing with.

I don't think it's the height that brings about the sensation, or the vast abyss that suddenly opens in front of you. Nor is it simply a product of the powerful alpine panorama. More than anything else, it seems to stem from a feeling of inappropriateness on the onlooker's part. But then—perched atop a mass of granite that thrust its way from the earth's crust 30 million years ago; gazing down from a height of 12,500 feet upon an incredible array of jumbled, snow-streaked peaks, alpine meadows, and evergreen-covered mountainsides; recalling a passage from the guidebook, which notes that 200 million years earlier this land rested at the bottom of a sea—what can you do that "fits" the occasion? Take a picture? Identify wildflowers?

I don't mean to imply that Mineral King (commonly known as Mineral King National Game Refuge) is unique. In fact, most of the Sierra Nevada contains similar features—

the mountains and the giant sequoias, the glacial lakes, and the wide eyed mule deer. However, as wilderness (with the exception of a few hundred acres) it is at least exceedingly rare. For in the United States only about 2 per cent of our land falls into this "wild" category—about one-fourth the area now taken up by cities.

One of your first reactions to Mineral King is that you would like to show it to others who have not had the chance to see it. Your friends primarily, but others as well: a delegation of lawmakers, perhaps, or the boys who drive grocery carts around Manhattan. It seems that if more people could see such places, the job of caring for them would be much simplified—people would want to protect them for themselves, for their children, and for their friends.

There is some truth to this thought, but there is a great naïvete as well. For wilderness is by definition a perishable commodity. It can easily be loved to death in the attempt to display it to the greatest number of people. Building roads, for instance, to "make wilderness more accessible to the millions"—despite its democratic overtones—is self-defeating; something like carving up Michelangelo's statue of "David," so that each of us might own one splinter.

For another thing, not everyone looks at the land in the same way. Mineral King's 15,000 acres are regarded by different people as a setting for a beautiful photograph, a hike, a fishing trip, or as a place for the study of biology. Some see the terrain as ideally suited for a ski resort, while others welcome the wild country as a means of getting out of contact with other people for a few hours or a few days. There are those who classify the land and its creatures as "natural resources" to be used for the generation of income; and some who regard it as important in itself—whether or not it is seen, smelled, heard, touched, or tasted by humans—its own reason for being.

Each group has its own notion of what should, or should not, be done with the land, and as you might guess, these notions conflict at least as often as they coincide. Yet, within the past 20 years, each faction has come to regard itself as the champion of a cause called "conservation" (whether their real interest lies in hiking, in hunting, or in cutting trees). This is the situation at Mineral King, where, within the next few months, the proponents of one of these viewpoints will be awarded the privilege of shaping the future of this region according to their own conception of this popular term.

On the surface, it is not always clear whether a group's choice of the conservationist label is appropriate—whether it stems from a misuse of the dictionary, or whether it is, in fact, a product of a good public relations department, which knows that the word has a high "acceptance value." The story of Mineral King may be instructive in this regard; may serve as a prism through which the apparently single beam of "conservation" can be separated into its components for the purpose of closer examination.

In February, 1965, the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service issued a *Prospectus for a Proposed Recreational Development at Mineral King in the Sequoia National Forest*. The purpose of this rather stark little document was to solicit bids from private developers for the privilege of constructing and operating a year-round recreation resort within the Mineral King National Game Refuge, a 15,000 acre neck of Forest Service land protruding into the southern boundary of Sequoia National Park. In addition to serving as a wildlife refuge, the region is now used for a variety of activities—camping, hiking, fishing, and sightseeing.

This is not a new type of activity for the Forest Service, whose guiding principle of

land management is that of "multiple use." What this term means in regard to the natural environment is that the Forest Service is sanctioned to be one degree less protective than is an agency such as the National Park Service. Thus, on the 187 million acres of public land administered by the Forest Service, a wide variety of activities are permitted, including lumbering, hunting, livestock grazing, mining—even some private cabin building.

And within the last decade the focus of national attention upon the country's recreational potential, combined with the spiraling magnitude of the billion dollar recreation business, has "sensitized" the federal government's largest landholding bureaus to the task of accommodating a prodigious number of special recreation interests, ranging from motorboating to motorcycling and from skiing to skimobiling. Toward this end, the Forest Service has undertaken to make much of its domain available for a multitude of uses, and in the case of skiing, has leased public lands to commercial developers who now operate such well-known ski meccas as Aspen, Vail, and Sun Valley in the west; and Mt. Snow and Sugarbush in the east.

Thirty-seven of the 190-some ski areas on Forest Service land are located in California—more than in any other state. Nevertheless, that state's current population of about 19 million is growing rapidly; it is expected to reach about 25 million in 1976, and perhaps 40 million by the year 2000. The use of the state's outdoor recreation facilities—both winter and summer—is undergoing an even more rapid expansion. The Forest Service predicts that use of California's national forests for winter sports alone will climb from the present level of about 2 million annual visits to 6 million in 1976 and 12.4 million in 2000.

An interesting aspect of the country's recreation "boom" is the extent to which it is a middle-class (or at least a "non-lower" class) phenomenon. Participation in even the simpler forms of outdoor recreation calls for a certain income level. Gaining access to a national park or forest, for example, is frequently contingent upon automobile ownership. And such pursuits as skiing, motorboating, and the more elaborate forms of camping require a considerable investment to purchase and operate the necessary equipment, and perhaps to pay for the privilege of using it.

The typical ski-family in the western states, for instance, has an annual income of \$9,500 (\$2,000 above the average income for that area); an adult member of this family owns about \$300 worth of ski equipment, and spends over \$20 per day on his ski trips. Sporting-goods salesmen, restaurant owners, and motel operators are fond of these people.

In addition to their relative affluence, ski enthusiasts are generally well organized, vocal, and therefore influential, even though they make up only 1 to 2 per cent of the total population. And, like many special interest groups, skiers have regular means of broadcasting their requests that new regions be opened to their sport—the many ski magazines, the political friends, and so on.

Influences of this sort play a part in the decisions made on what to do with the country's public land. Some twenty years ago, for example, the Forest Service decided to develop Mineral King Valley, hoping perhaps to relieve the pressure skiers were exerting to have other areas opened, such as the San Geronio wilderness in southern California.

But in 1949, when the first attempts were made to attract private capital to develop Mineral King, no bids were received, because the only access to the area was, and still is, a serpentine, twenty-five mile road leading from the San Joaquin Valley up into the Sierra Nevada range—somewhat difficult to drive during summer months and completely

blocked with snow during the winter. Potential developers were not interested in building a ski resort that no one could get to. No sizable recreation complex could be installed without widening and straightening the roadway.

In addition, the road winds across eleven miles of Sequoia National Park before dead-ending within Sequoia National Forest at the small cluster of summer cabins and public campsites that make up Mineral King village. Thus, developers may have been intimidated by the legal and political complications of interfering with a road crossing land controlled by the National Park Service.

At the time the 1965 prospectus was issued, no solution to the access problem had been found; but in the 16 years that had elapsed since the first prospectus, knowledge had spread of the Forest Service's interest in the area. Learning of the intentions to develop the area's ski potential, ski clubs, developers, businessmen, and politicians in Tulare County (where Mineral King is located) began to regard the resort, along with its access road, as a real and desirable possibility. One hopeful developer (Walt Disney Productions) had speculatively purchased a small amount of private land in Mineral King Valley. Furthermore, the rapid increase in the number of California skiers had expanded the undertaking's potential support. Thus, in issuing the 1965 proposal, the Forest Service had some cause for believing that public and political support could be mustered for both the project and its necessary road.

The optimism was well founded. During the summer of 1965, the California state legislature voted to add a new highway to the state's road system. Highway 276, from the town of Hammond to Mineral King, would replace the old access road, would be kept snow-free by the state (the old access road was county maintained), and would ostensibly be wide enough to accommodate sufficient traffic at the proposed resort. The road is planned as a relatively straight, two- to three-lane highway, capable of handling about 1,200 automobiles per hour at speeds of about 50 mph. In addition, six bids were submitted to the Department of Agriculture for construction and operation of the recreation complex. These were narrowed to two, and finally, late in the year, a winning bid was announced. In December, Walt Disney Productions was chosen to carry out the Mineral King development and was awarded a 3-year permit to perform its initial studies of the region.

Up to this point, little opposition had been expressed to the project, except by local groups of outdoorsmen and by cabin owners in the Mineral King area who would be displaced by the development. National organizations that might normally oppose the area's commercial development were preoccupied with the problems of dam building in the Grand Canyon, cutting of redwoods (in the proposed Redwoods National Park), and other well-known issues. Some feared that opposition to the Mineral King ski resort would only serve to increase pressure by skiers to develop the San Geronio wilderness and were therefore reluctant to take a stand. Others, thinking outright opposition too late, felt that the best strategy was to try to limit the project's size. A few were even unsure of Mineral King's whereabouts, let alone its significance. But when the magnitude of the Disney development proposal was disclosed, the traditional champions of the natural environment—the Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, and National Parks Association—quickly realized that they were confronted with another major battle.

The Forest Service's original guidelines for the recreation complex were relatively modest: three or four ski lifts, parking for 1,200 automobiles, and resort accommodations for 100 overnight visitors—tempered by the warning that all facilities would have to

remain "compatible with the aesthetic values of the area." The Disney firm, however, is known for doing things in a big way, and Mineral King is no exception. The original Disney plans called for a \$35 million investment to include an alpine village, a heliport, a golf course, a reservoir-skating pond, swimming pools, an auto service station, two hotels, a 500-room dormitory, 1,200 cabins, a 20-acre parking lot for 2,500 autos, and ten restaurants within Mineral King Valley and on surrounding mountain peaks. In summer general sightseeing would be the main attraction; in winter skiing would bring as many as 20,000 visitors into the valley each day, from whence they would be whisked into the high country of the Sierra Nevada wilderness aboard 20 overhead lifts, which would radiate from the valley. Some of the lifts' towers would go beyond the boundary of Forest Service land and would be anchored in adjoining Sequoia National Park. Supplemental plans revealed the firm's interest in a facility, located well within Sequoia Park's Hockett wilderness area, that could accommodate cross-country skiers. Walt Disney Productions expects an annual income of about \$23 million from the resort during the first years of operation, with this sum increasing thereafter as the area's popularity grows. The Disney plans also noted that "Mineral King's great natural beauty must be preserved at all costs."

With the plans before them, opponents of the development felt pressed by a twofold threat. First, they feared the immediate damage to the alpine environment that would result from construction of a roadway and a resort, and from the heavy human traffic. The prospect of bringing 2.5 million visitors annually into the heart of the mountain country conjures up pictures of tourists picking the ground clean of unusual rock fragments, wildflowers, evergreen cones, and other portions of the alpine landscape; of skiers watching the white wrappers of their candy bars slowly floating to the ground after being tossed from the gondola of one of the aerial tramways; of erosion caused by construction activity; sewage pollution in the Kaweah River; and of the intrusion of automobiles, buildings, and large numbers of visitors upon the mountain landscape. In addition, project opponents object to the disregard by the Forest Service and Walt Disney Productions for Mineral King's current status as a national game refuge. Among naturalists aware of the development plans a favorite parlor game during the past few months has been the casting of Smokey, the Forest Service bear, and Disney's Mickey Mouse in Simon Legree roles—dispossessing their fellow creatures in order to build the Mineral King resort ("Smoking strikes again!").

The Forest Service is well aware of the potential danger to the Sierran landscape posed by the planned resort. They note that "Mineral King can 'stand' development to only a certain level," but also contend that "Walt Disney Productions does not plan, and the Forest Service would not permit, a development beyond that capacity threshold." But "capacity threshold" lends itself to subjective interpretation, and what the term means to the Forest Service is apparently quite different from the meaning given by most of those opposed to the project. To the former group, it probably means a general attempt to keep ecological damage to a minimum, whatever the level of construction and human visitation. The latter define the phrase in terms of wilderness, in which case the threshold will likely be exceeded on the resort's first day of operation.

In a way, these differences of opinion reflect the essential conflict between the protectionist groups such as the Sierra Club and those more inclined toward development. Both are aware of the perplexing problem of providing recreational opportunities for a population that doubles

every forty years, while our static land supply stubbornly refuses to expand despite the demands placed upon it. However, their approaches to this situation are quite different. The development faction seems to feel that the way to alleviate this difficulty is to make increasing portions of the environment easily accessible to the current demands of the population so as to spread the "visitor impact" over a larger land area. (Walt Disney Productions, for instance, notes that "the value of much public land . . . is lost because the land is inaccessible.") On the other hand, the protectionists view the growing number of claims upon the land as reason to stiffen its protection, perhaps to the point of rationing its use. This "pinch," they hope, will forcefully focus the attention of hunters, highway engineers, wilderness lovers, and resort builders on the real source of the growing real estate shortage, and will elicit stronger public sentiment to deal with the problem before the remaining public land is consumed.

From the viewpoint of the Sierra Club and its allies, the greatest threat posed by the Disney recreation complex and its access road is the influence these developments would exert upon the future protection of wild lands of the southern Sierra Nevada surrounding Mineral King Valley. Most of this land—in both Sequoia National Forest and Sequoia National Park—meets the criteria for "formal" wilderness status as defined by the 1964 Wilderness Act, and is now being considered for legal protection according to the provisions of that act. However, the presence of a high-grade highway bringing millions of people into the heart of the region would probably diminish its wild character in short order, obviate the inclusion of this land within the wilderness system, and encourage less rigid protection of adjoining land. In addition, there is some fear that the presence of a high-standard road reaching halfway across the Sierra Nevada range will be used as a rationalization for extending the pavement another 30 miles to create a new trans-Sierra highway through one of the country's last enclaves of primitive landscape.

In a way, it is tempting to apply the philosophy of "conservation democracy," advocated by Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt, to the Mineral King situation: "the purpose of Conservation is the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time." This concept invariably underlies the arguments in nine out of ten land-use conflicts, but despite its seeming simplicity, it poses questions that cannot be readily answered. Who can say, for instance, whether a ski resort, a semideveloped campsite, or a primitive landscape will be of greatest benefit to people who have not yet been born?

Nevertheless, the concept stimulates some interesting speculations about the future. In the case of Mineral King, you might ask what needs will characterize Californians in 2068: The need for convenience or for diversity? For material comfort or challenge? For sociality or solitude? Which need will be most in demand and least in supply?

Even at present, there seems to be a considerable difference of opinion over the proper application of these democratic guidelines. Both the Forest Service and Walt Disney Productions maintain that a new high-standard roadway into the Mineral King country will represent an improvement over the current situation because it will permit the rapid influx of large numbers of visitors ("Many people wish to see and enjoy Mineral King but won't drive the present difficult road."). To this argument however, their opponents reply that the area's present function of providing general recreation is inherently more democratic, for it does not impose an admission fee upon visitors. They further contend that in terms of meeting California's most urgent recreational needs, the \$35 million to be spent

on the Mineral King project might be put to better use by expanding the recreational facilities available to the non-mobile population in, say, the Watts ghetto of Los Angeles.

Throughout 1966 and into early 1967, the Mineral King issue continued to be fought at a local level. In that time, proponents of the Disney project succeeded in gaining political support for the venture. In September of 1966, Walt Disney and California's governor, Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, flew into Mineral King by helicopter to survey the area. Thereafter, Brown made a short speech in which he described the proposed development in glowing terms: "I hope that ten years from today I can stand here with Walt Disney again and look around at the wonderland that will have been created," and assured his audience that "we are going ahead with the [access] road." The Brown administration applied for and received a \$3 million federal grant to partially finance the road's construction; the California Highway Commission then voted to provide the remainder of the needed construction money (about \$20 million) from the state's highway tax fund.

These actions did not pass unchallenged. California's State Highway Engineer, J. C. Womack, attacked the financing of the Mineral King road stating that the highway could proceed only "at the expense of other critical [road building] projects," and that the use of funds set aside for other construction would prove "very disruptive to previously approved planning and scheduling of projects in the Southern Counties group." State Assemblyman Alan Sieroty assailed the proposed destruction of natural landscape, stating that the plans for the Mineral King road were "atrocious," then added: "It would be . . . outrageous for the Reagan administration [Reagan was elected in 1966] to give away more than \$20 million to facilitate a private venture when it has just cut the state Parks and Recreation budget . . . from \$33 million to \$1 million." In addition to this objection, two bills were introduced into the California state legislature in an attempt to block construction of the access road. Both died in committee before being brought to a vote.

By early 1967, although funding had been approved for the access road and its proposed routing established, and although newspapers in Tulare County were speaking as if the Disney resort was already a fact, the National Park Service had not yet granted permission for the road to cross eleven miles of Sequoia National Park on its way to Mineral King Valley. It is still unclear whether the Department of the Interior can legally grant permission for a road to cross a national park for non-park purposes, or whether this requires an act of Congress.

In any event, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall disapproved of the new road. He noted that it would prove a "blighting influence" upon Sequoia Park, that blasting of rock and planned removal of eight million cubic yards of soil would scar park terrain, cause erosion and consequent siltation of the Kaweah River, pollute the air with auto exhaust fumes, pose a threat to giant sequoias and other large evergreens, and would, in general, compromise "park values." With a first-hand sensitivity to the proliferation of the nation's vast network of highways, (3.6 million miles worth) he commented that developers "will be more honored 25 years from now for the roads they do not build than for the roads they do," and suggested that the Forest Service and Disney Productions explore other means (such as an overhead monorail or tramway) of transporting sightseers and skiers into Mineral King Valley to minimize destruction to the landscape.

To answer charges of road damage, the California Division of Highways commissioned biologist Richard J. Hartesveldt, an authority on giant sequoias, to study the ecology of sequoia groves surrounding the proposed roadway. The report's objectivity, however, has provided at least as much ammunition for opponents of the project as for its advocates, and each side has quoted and paraphrased the document upon numerous occasions.

As for Udall's proposal that a monorail or tramway be used to transport visitors into the resort, this plan was rejected by both Disney Productions and the Forest Service as being too expensive. The cost of installing such a system—unlike the tax-financed roadway—would be borne by the Disney firm.

By mid-year 1967, opponents of the development had finally managed to air some of their grievances to a national audience by means of articles printed in magazines published by the National Parks Association and the Sierra Club. Within these groups, the general feeling seems to be that the only way to provide Mineral King with adequate protection against commercial development is to make it a part of adjoining Sequoia National Park. In 1926, when Congress was wrestling with the problem of what to do with this area, the decision was made to award it to the Department of Agriculture in the belief that there were minerals remaining in and around Mineral King Valley that would become "locked up" if park status were granted. But since no mineral deposits have been discovered, there is a strong feeling now that these 15,000 acres should be given to the Department of the Interior.

This type of interdepartmental land transfer is invariably an unpopular procedure on the part of the donor agency, and is avoided by Congress whenever possible. Just now, the Forest Service is especially sensitive on this count for portions of forestland are being transferred from the Forest Service to the Park Service in order to establish a Redwoods Park in California and a Cascade Mountain Park in Washington. The history of transactions of this sort carries all the flavor of a range war between shepherders and cattlemen, and while reading these accounts, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that the ownership of federal property rests with the public rather than with the managing agency.

By this time, Secretary Udall was finding it increasingly difficult to maintain his opposition to the access road upon which the success or failure of the development depends. A hint of behind-the-scenes pressure appeared when the Secretary indicated that he would need a great deal more support from leaders of the protectionist movement than they had given him. In addition, the open opposition to Udall's position had assumed formidable proportions. California's two senators, several representatives, lieutenant governor, many state legislators, and Los Angeles Mayor Yorty now stood solidly behind the Disney plans. Senator Thomas Kuchel, who can usually be counted on to champion the position of the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club, reversed his role in the case of Mineral King and went so far as to write an article in a ski magazine praising the merits of the Disney firm and its proposed undertaking. Real estate speculators and businessmen in Tulare County, anxious to capitalize upon the anticipated influx of tourist gold, were beginning to make impatient noises. These were echoed by Tulare County politicians and newspaper columnists, and by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, all of whom viewed Udall's reluctance to approve the access road as an obstructionist tactic.

To add more fuel to the fire, Governor Reagan sent emissaries to persuade Secretary Udall to change his stand. Although Udall remained adamant, he was misquoted by a Reagan aide as having given his approval to

the Disney project. The story that Udall had conceded, followed quickly by his denial, served only to heighten tension and to increase pressure for a decision.

Of the obstacles faced by Stewart Udall and his supporters, one of the most formidable is the intangible something which Walt Disney Productions calls the "Disney Image." For after being honored by a number of nature-oriented organizations, ranging from the National Audubon Society to the National Wildlife Federation: after thirty years of producing such films as *Bambi*, *Beaver Valley*, and *Nature's Half Acre*, it hardly seems possible that the Disney firm would consent to undertake a project that would in any way prove detrimental to the great out-of-doors. The common conception of the Disney orientation toward the natural world, as the Disney publicity states, is one of a "proven interest in conservation." As noted in the organization's proposal for the development of Mineral King, issued to the Forest Service: "The integrity and quality image of Walt Disney Productions is already pre-sold in the public mind." This seems to be the case, particularly in California, where considerable fame and fortune have come to rest since the establishment of the Disney empire in that state.

In July, 1967, the nature of the suspected pressure on Secretary Udall was made public. To the consternation of those who had labored to defeat the Mineral King proposal, it was revealed that through the complicated machinery of Washington diplomacy, the fate of Mineral King had become linked to the ongoing negotiations between various federal agencies and the state of California over the size and location of the proposed Redwoods National Park. Apparently, the Johnson administration felt that Governor Reagan would be more amenable to the installation of a national park in his state if he were offered certain concessions in return. One of several concessions offered the state was the administration's active support of the Mineral King development and its access road. The nature of this transaction was spelled out in a letter of June 22, 1967, from an administration spokesman, Phillip S. Hughes, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President:

"Following is the Administration position on a number of items over and above the provisions of S. 1370 [the redwoods bill introduced by Thomas Kuchel]. . . . The Administration is prepared to implement these provisions immediately."

The Mineral King proposal is listed under a section labeled "Other Conservation Program Actions."

#### "6. MINERAL KING

"It is in the interest of the Administration and the State that the Mineral King area . . . be . . . developed. . . ."

"The Department of the Interior has been requested to consider issuance of a permit jointly to the Department of Agriculture and the State of California for a two-lane road through the Park [Sequoia] to provide access to Mineral King."

The letter's contents provoked a volley of angry protests from the project's opponents. Senator Lee Metcalf (Montana) assailed the administration's intention to "override the Secretary [Udall's] best judgment" as raising "fundamental questions of public policy, precedent and equity." Anthony Wayne Smith, General Counsel and President of the National Parks Association stated that the Forest Service had "put to auction a priceless asset [Mineral King] belonging to the American people. . . ." California Congressman Phillip Burton perhaps best summarized sentiment against the maneuver when he angrily labeled the Mineral King-Redwoods Park trade as "a desperate effort to pay the high political price needed to get along with California's new governor" and bemoaned

the fact that the executive branch "promises to pressure the National Park Service into compromising the integrity of Sequoia National Park by accommodating the opening wedge for massive development of Mineral King."

Whatever the processes by which pressure was exerted, Burton's fears were apparently justified and the intent of Hughes' letter carried out. In December, a high-level Mineral King meeting was called. Attendants in favor of the project included: Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, California Senators Kuchel and Murphy, Congressman (and former Olympic decathlon champion) Robert Mathias, and for the administration, Philip Hughes. Attendants opposed: Stewart Udall. Shortly after the conference, Freeman issued a press release announcing that the right-of-way for a road through Sequoia Park was being prepared by the Interior Department and that the Disney development would proceed as planned.

From the point of view of the project's supporters, it probably would have looked better if the release had come from the Department of the Interior with Secretary Udall's blessing. This was not the case, however. To this day, Udall has not voiced support of the access road, leading to the conviction that this decision was predetermined by the administration. Even so, the Secretary was for a time, nobody's favorite. At a press conference in which he was criticized for "his" decision, Udall retorted that things might have been different had preservation groups spent more of their time writing to Orville Freeman than to him.

The Mineral King development is now within one step of realization. But this last step has proven time consuming. For in the year that has elapsed since Orville Freeman's announcement, the Forest Service and National Park Service—never the friendliest of "sister agencies"—have failed to reach agreement on the dimensions of the proposed access road crossing Sequoia National Park.

The delay has proven helpful to the more tenacious of the project's opponents; has given them time to begin legal investigations and to renew efforts to gather public support. During the past five months, two to three thousand signatures have been added to an antidevelopment petition circulated by the Sierra Club, network television stations have hauled their cameras into the Sierra Nevada to cover a "hike-in" staged in opposition to the project, and students from UCLA have pulled up and burned survey stakes marking the location of the proposed access road. Some of the more militant even plan to picket Disney films and to stage "lie-ins" in front of highway department bulldozers if construction begins, as scheduled, next summer.

It seems that the era of modern conservation weaponry is upon us. Whether or not this will aid the case for Mineral King will depend on public opinion and on the orientation of the new President-elect toward the issue. Resolution of the conflict will not be long in coming.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1969]

#### MINERAL KING FOLL

The decision to turn Mineral King Valley over to private developers exposes the essential fraudulence of the Forest Service's much-vaunted "multiple use policy." Created to protect the nation's forests from exploitation, the Forest Service has gradually evolved into the ally and protector of the private lumber companies. As a public relations maneuver, it has promoted the idea that it is developing the forests for recreation as well as profit, that is, for multiple use.

This idea is acceptable if it merely involves providing campsites or incidental tourist facilities in the national forests. But there is no excuse for turning over an entire valley

to the Walt Disney interests for a gigantic recreational complex rivaling Sun Valley.

Mineral King, a lofty valley in the Sierra Nevada north of Los Angeles, comprises 15,000 acres of rare and beautiful wilderness which ought to be part of the adjoining Sequoia National Park. Into this ecologically fragile area would be intruded an "Alpine Village," ski tows, hotel, restaurants, a parking garage and thousands of automobiles. The absolutely certain result would be erosion of the land because of heavy construction, destruction of animals in what is now a game refuge, sewage pollution in the nearby Kaweah River and air pollution from automobile traffic. In addition, there would be the visual pollution caused by the building of 6,000-volt power lines to service this "Alpine Village."

The only word to describe this hideous project is scandalous. Has Southern California not been raped, polluted and desecrated enough already? Have the Forest Service bureaucrats no sense of shame about taking a wonderful portion of the nation's rapidly dwindling natural heritage entrusted to their care and surrendering it to the exploiters?

This perversion of public land to private profit would not be possible if it were not for the acquiescence of the Interior Department and the active collaboration of the officials of the state of California. It is necessary to construct a highway across Sequoia National Park to enable cars to reach Mineral King Valley and make this project economically feasible. Former Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall reluctantly approved plans for a road last year, arguing that his control of the highway route would give him a veto over the size and character of the Disney project in the valley.

Now that Mr. Udall has left office, however, the Forest Service has approved a major undertaking which will attract nearly a million visitors a year. The proposed two-lane highway will soon prove inadequate and the pressure will mount for four or six lanes. Meanwhile, California plans to spend \$25 million in public funds to build a highway to Mineral King for the sole purpose of benefiting the Disney interests.

The Sierra Club intends to file suit in court to block this misuse of Forest Service authority. But it should not be left to a private organization to defend the public interest. Secretary of the Interior Hickel and Secretary of Agriculture Hardin have a responsibility to review this outrageous project. If they fail to act, Congress can intervene to see that a deal of this magnitude is not approved without public hearings and explicit Congressional approval.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1969]

#### THE SCANDAL OF MINERAL KING

The attempt of the Forest Service to turn Mineral King Valley in California over to the Walt Disney Organization demonstrates how an ingrown bureaucracy and an aggressive private developer can collaborate to defeat the public interest. The lawsuit filed against this scheme by the Sierra Club is an effort to demonstrate that citizen conservationists can invoke the power of the law to protect the public interest.

The intensive development of this valley in the Sierra Nevada would scar its natural beauty, ruin its ecological balance, and pollute its air and water. The Disney interests propose to build an "Alpine village" complete with ski tows, swimming pools, a golf course, a hotel complex, ten restaurants, and a huge underground parking lot. This would be a year-round resort with at least a million visitors annually. It would produce the same kind of serious overcrowding that has already blighted the much larger Yosemite Valley.

The stated intentions of the Disney interests make unmistakably clear what is to befall Mineral King: "Grooming and manicur-

ing of most slopes . . . will require extensive bulldozing and blasting in most lower areas and extensive rock removal at higher elevations . . . extensive cuts and fills and site grading will be required in the parking area and in the village area."

Hundreds of resorts and country clubs already exist and more can always be manufactured, but beautiful, unspoiled Alpine valleys are rare. When the last one has been groomed, manicured, bulldozed and blasted out of existence, no human being can create another.

This unalterable fact imposes a most solemn obligation upon public officials who administer the national parks and forests. With regard to the fate of Mineral King, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior in the Johnson Administration compiled an abysmal record. Former Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman pushed aggressively for the Disney plan which his Forest Service subordinate sponsored. After considerable initial resistance, former Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall caved in and granted permission for the construction of an access highway across Sequoia National Park, without which the development of the valley could not proceed.

Their successors—Secretary of Agriculture Hardin and Secretary of the Interior Hickel—have an opportunity to right this wrong. They can still quash the Disney plan. But in the absence of action on their part, the Sierra Club has taken the issue to the courts. Its suit points out that the Forest Service approved the Disney project without public hearings and without making a prior study of the ecological effects of intensive development. Moreover, the Disney project would directly involve 300 acres and indirectly involve another 1,300 even though the law forbids the Secretary of Agriculture to put more than 80 acres under long-term lease.

Who watches the watchmen? The question is as old as Plato and as modern as the Mineral King case. Private greed, bureaucratic empire building, and official irresponsibility are a recurrent threat to the common good. The Sierra Club is performing a public service in standing up to this threat.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon, June 19, 1969]

#### TREES VERSUS DISNEY

Man's ingenuity has resulted in wondrous things. Great rivers have been harnessed for power, and vast acreages have been reclaimed from the sea to become productive.

But marvelous as these accomplishments are, Joyce Kilmer was right—only God can make a tree.

This is not to say that there isn't a need for mass outdoor recreation, but in weighing the use of America's remaining natural assets, the wilderness needs its supporters.

In the Mineral King Valley dispute, the Sierra Club raises the issue of the wilderness' priority over commercial-recreational development.

The club, whose members are prominent conservationists, has sued government officials in an attempt to stop a commercial venture of Walt Disney Productions.

The Disney enterprises plan to make a valley—which is 8,000 feet high in the California Sierras, south of Yosemite—into a \$35-million, 300-acre recreational development including ski slopes.

The Sierra Club charges that the project would violate the 80-acre limit set by federal law on national forest land projects, and that the land was set aside by Congress as a game refuge in 1926.

Conservationists fear that the heavy traffic (2.5 million people a year are expected) threatens the valley's usefulness as a water resource. In addition a new highway would have to be cut through a portion of the

Sequoia National Park, and some of those majestic old trees would have to be sacrificed.

Even if it were granted that the Disney interests could develop the valley, and somehow avoid these dangers, people swarming daily from a proposed 3,600-car underground garage cannot help but change the remote and peaceful character of the valley.

As the Christian Science Monitor suggests, there are other, already partly developed recreation sites in California. Why not apply the bold Disney concept to these?

Or better yet, why not select one of the many sections of natureland that have been gouged and scraped by mining and lumbering and reclaim them instead of sacrificing land that can hardly be improved upon?

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, June 18, 1969]

#### ENLARGED THREATS TO THE SEQUOIAS

The Sierra club, an activist conservation organization based in San Francisco, has gone to battle to prevent construction of a mammoth resort in the lovely Mineral King valley of Sequoia National forest. The projected "alpine" playground also threatens Sequoia National park, one of the nation's finest public preserves.

Because of the Sierra club's record of victories, this effort must be taken seriously. In recent years, the club spearheaded both the drives to create a Redwood National park and to block two dams that were planned for the Grand Canyon. This latest move takes the form of a suit filed in United States District court with the secretaries of Interior and Agriculture as the principal defendants.

When the ski resort was first proposed by Walt Disney Productions, Inc., it was a relatively modest development. It has since mushroomed into a 35-million-dollar complex of ski lifts, shops, accommodations and other facilities. The plan also calls for a 9-mile California freeway and a 66,000-volt electric transmission line, both of which would be cut through Sequoia National park.

In addition to scarring the earth, the power line and the superhighway place at least 45 giant sequoia trees in jeopardy.

The sequoias are not only the world's largest trees in bulk, but they are believed to be the oldest living things on earth. Some of them were reaching skyward more than 1,000 years before the birth of Rome. So what if 45 of the trees are cut down to make way for a freeway? This reminds us of the quotation attributed to Gov. Ronald Reagan of California who reputedly said of the coastal redwoods, "If you've seen one, you've seen them all."

Conservationists do not agree. Since man developed the West, fire, pestilence and the saw have claimed many sequoias. Those that remain have been protected by law since 1890, when Congress established the national park.

In this era, just about everyone in the United States favors parks as long as they don't interfere with some private scheme. If they do, the public's land has too often proved expendable.

Whatever the result of this latest action by the Sierra club, it serves to alert the American people to what is being proposed for their land. A few ski lifts and cottages in a national forest make little difference. But large-scale developments that must be served by creeping freeways and power lines are out of character with the purpose of either the national parks or forests.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, June 9, 1969]

#### HOLLYWOOD IN SEQUOIA

The Sierra Club deserves widespread gratitude for its suit in Federal Court at San Francisco to block a \$35,000,000 mass recreation development in Sequoia National Park, in California, by Walt Disney Productions. Development there should be, but the question is whether the development on so colos-

sal a scale would leave anything of the peace and grandeur which make the park a national sanctuary.

The Disney people are proposing to build a simulated Alpine village with an eventual capacity of 3300 guests and a cog railway which would connect the village with facilities for camping, fishing, horseback riding, skating, swimming and skiing in five natural mountain bowls. The U.S. Forest Service originally proposed limiting development to \$3,000,000 and the Sierra Club thinks even that is too much. The Hollywood-scale development the Disney organization plans would involve putting a 20-mile expressway through 8½ miles of the park and the club says it would also threaten destruction of 45 sequoias or giant redwood trees.

The California conservationist group stands to come out ahead regardless of the decision in the action it has brought; for the suit will serve to focus national attention on the issues and on the Sierra Club's contention that the form of development should be determined only by Congress itself and only after public hearings have thoroughly explored what will be lost as well as what will be gained.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 11, 1969]

#### SAVING NATURELAND

There may be real pleasure in visiting a man-developed coastline or forest margin. But the experience differs from the stillness of a remote alpine meadow or the exhilaration of a natural seashore.

This is not to say the nation's needs for mass outdoor recreation should be ignored. Nonetheless, when weighing the use of America's remaining primitive assets, the unique claims of the wilderness need vigorous support.

In the Mineral King Valley debate, the Sierra Club raises the issue of the wilderness' priority over commercial-recreational development. To make its point, the club has filed suit against the secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture and other government officials. The government has contracted with Walt Disney Productions to make the valley—which lies 8,000 feet up in the California Sierras, south of Yosemite—into a \$35 million, 300-acre recreational development. The Sierra Club charges that the development would violate the 80-acre limit set by federal law on such national forest land projects, and that the land was set aside in 1926 by Congress as a game refuge and not as a recreational site.

Conservationists fear that the heavy inflow of people (25 million a year) threatens the valley's usefulness as a water source, its delicate alpine ecology, and the majestic trees of a portion of the Sequoia National Park through which a new highway would cut.

Even if, for the sake of argument, one were to grant that the Disney interests could so "develop" the valley as to avoid the ecological dangers, one would still be faced with whether the daily ant-swarms of people emanating from the proposed 3,600-car underground garage cannot help but disastrously change the remote and peaceful character of the valley. And where the developer goes, can the honky-tonk be far behind?

There are other, already partly developed recreation sites in California. The bold Disney concept could be applied to these. In fact, there are many sections of natureland that have been gouged and scraped by mining and lumbering which are ironically analogous to urban blight areas. Why should not these be reclaimed by developers, instead of sacrificing land that in no real way can be improved?

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 14, 1969]

#### DISNEY IN THE VALLEY

The National Forest Service has decided to permit the Walt Disney concern to set up a recreational facility in the King Valley area

of the Sequoia National Forest. Predictably many conservationists are expressing their outrage over the decision. And one local group of conservationists, the Sierra Club, has threatened to sue the Forest Service for "alienating" this public land.

A side issue raised by the decision can be disposed of in a hurry. The Disney name does indeed evoke images of Disneyland with its plastic whale, life-sized replicas of all the well-known Walt Disney cartoon characters, and so on. There is, however, no thought of turning the King Valley into Disneyland II. The idea for this project did not originate with the Disney people but rather with the Forest Service, which in 1965 invited firms to submit their bids. The Disney firm was picked from among six organizations that responded to this invitation.

What is, in fact, intended for the King Valley are facilities for sportsmen who will eventually be able to ski, hunt, fish, skate and ride horses in these breathtakingly beautiful surroundings. And so we come down to the real issue. Should the peace and tranquility of the valley be left undisturbed for the sake of the handful of hardy campers who seek spiritual renewal by sleeping on mountaintops? Or should sportsmen be permitted to enjoy their athletic pastimes in the valley at the cost of some of its present serenity?

Each of these viewpoints has its own special validity. So what was called for in this case was a kind of Solomonic judgment. And this, it appears, is what the Forest Service's decision is all about. The 200 or so outdoorsmen who tramp around the King Valley daily will now share their wooded haunts with an estimated 3,000 newcomers. Either that or they can do their tramping elsewhere in the Sequoia National Forest.

The unacceptable alternative is to deprive their fellow citizens of the opportunity for athletic outings and other organized activities in a setting so favored by Mother Nature.

#### NEW CAREERS PROGRAM INVOLVES COMMUNITIES IN FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

#### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, crime is a razor in our freedom, a thorn in our lifeline to progress. Like virus which kills the human specie, crime's causes and antibodies do not combine to produce a simple solution.

We are all searching for ways to solve the serious crime problem, and, hopefully, the answer will be found through experimentation with various social tools. Congress must always encourage and pursue the use of relevant policies and mechanisms in an attempt to alleviate this national disgrace and dilemma.

One constructive contribution comes from the Department of Labor in the form of its New Careers program. New Careers trains and places indigent adults in jobs which have built-in career achievement levels. For example, in Oakland, Calif., 15 ghetto residents are being carefully moved up the law enforcement vocational ladder. All have been gang leaders in their crime-ridden neighborhoods; some have arrest records.

New Careers utilizes leadership abilities and energies for constructive social objectives—a most laudable and difficult task. I agree with the proposition that members of a community plagued by

crime are excellent workers to bridge the communication chasm between their neighborhood and the police. After all, who knows the criminals, the causes and remedies of crime better than those who have often been the culprits and principals of the crime community?

The New Careers approach represents a significant advance in the battle to reduce crime and increase employment and living standards. I recommend this type program very highly and I hope that it soon will be ever more widespread.

Two recent magazine articles outline in further detail these New Careers programs as they operate in Oakland and Los Angeles, and I insert the articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From Manpower magazine, April 1969]

FAMILIAR FACES BRIDGE POLICE-GHETTO GAP  
(By Joe B. Kirkbride)

(Mr. Kirkbride is a U.S. Department of Labor information officer in San Francisco.)

Fifteen hard-core disadvantaged men in Oakland have started on careers as bridge builders. But the bridges they are trying to build won't span a river or a bay. They are attempting to bridge the communication chasm between their neighborhoods and the police.

Under a U.S. Department of Labor contract, the 15 men, aged 20 to 39, are being moved carefully up the law enforcement career ladder. In 2 years or so, they are slated to be full-fledged employees of the Police Department in Oakland—either as patrolmen or General Services officers.

New Careers trains and places poor adults in jobs supporting professional employees—jobs which have built-in levels of career advancement. The tasks they perform free such professionals as police officers and nurses for work which puts their training to more effective use. Many of the New Careers training slots in Oakland are with State and local government agencies and lead to positions in an existing civil service structure. The employer is reimbursed for 100 percent of the payroll and training costs of the first year of employment of a New Career trainee and 50 percent of the payroll costs and 100 percent of the training cost the second year. After that, the employer bears the entire cost.

Altogether, 155 poor adults are being trained under New Careers in Oakland. But the 15 police trainees are being watched with special interest.

Thirteen are Negroes; two are Mexican Americans; all live in neighborhoods where police are not generally welcome. Though not hardened criminals by any means, some of them have arrest records for juvenile offenses and petty thefts.

The Police Department is not overly concerned with their past records. "We wanted our guys to be somewhat hostile to the policeman," said one lieutenant. "We looked for men who had leadership traits, not gang leaders, but men who were tough and were respected in their neighborhoods."

Getting them aboard was a tricky assignment. The department was willing enough to have them, whatever the reservations of individual officers. Chief Charles R. Gain passed the word to his disciplined force of 682 uniformed officers and 263 "civilians" that he wanted the program to succeed. The department suspended educational and other professional requirements to let in men who normally could not qualify for police training.

But Oakland is the home of the Black Panthers, an extremely militant organization which has clashed repeatedly with the police. Other militant black groups are also active in the city's slums. In such a setting, conventional recruitment methods could make no headway. The ghetto is united by a strong

sense of brotherhood. Nobody wanted to be identified with "the man" downtown in Oakland's Hall of Justice.

The police and the New Careers staff turned to the ghetto's authoritative grapevine. Here they struck paydirt. The militants could not be expected to endorse jobs in the Police Department. Some of their leaders are in jail, others are fugitives from the law. On the other hand, they decided not to scuttle the program. Other types of New Careers trainees were making it in the city. The word was passed along to give the cops a try.

Last September, the 15 trainees were recruited and certified by the Employment Service. After approval by the police, they joined the force and were assigned to the Community Relations and Youth Division of the department's General Services Unit. The reaction in their neighborhoods has been mixed—but usually understanding.

"It's been quite a surprising experience," said a Mexican American trainee in his late twenties. "Sometimes people welcome me, sometimes they reject me. Right away I explain that I'm not a policeman but a General Services aide and that relieves the tension."

A 27-year-old Negro said his friends treated the whole thing as funny. "They took it in a jokin' way, knowing the feelings between the community and the Police Department," he explained. "They kinda backed up a little, but it was done in good humor. I haven't had any problems with my real friends. Our friendships are still the same."

Generally the trainees like the work and want to make a success of it. "I feel like this—if I can help my people by working here then it's my job to work here," said one older Negro. "I enjoy the work so that makes it beautiful."

The trainees' personal knowledge of the slums has already proved valuable. Because they knew where to look, they were able to locate three youthful runaways who could not be tracked down by regular patrolmen. And they are credited with cooling down explosive unrest at a black high school recently by making a series of personal home visits to students and parents.

The trainees' uniforms consist of neat blue blazer jackets with grey flannel slacks. Over the breast pocket is a police emblem and the legend "Oakland Police Department—General Services Unit." They do not carry guns, wear badges, or have the power to arrest anyone. They are being trained to help officers in non-criminal tasks including working with juveniles, locating missing persons, community relations, and the bicycle detail.

They are not expected to "rat" on their friends. Otherwise they would be shunned in their neighborhoods. "Our friends know that what they tell us won't be told to a policeman," said one Negro. "They have to confide in someone, and they don't want to confide in someone that every time they open their mouths they know you are running off and telling 'the man.'"

The educational and work history of the trainees is typical of the hard-core unemployed. Although most had attended high school at least 2 years, many scored at the seventh- and eighth-grade level on achievement tests. The highest income any of them ever earned was \$4,000 a year—and this by a man with a wife and six children.

As General Services trainees, the first rung of a well-structured career ladder, their pay now ranges from \$395 to \$415 monthly. The next step up the ladder is General Services aide, a job paying \$415 to \$445. To make this grade, they must complete 6 months' satisfactory service and enroll in job-related courses at Merritt College.

The second promotion is to General Services assistant. This job pays \$460 to \$490 and requires a high school diploma and completion of 35 quarter units at the junior college level. The trainee is paid his regular wages

for hours spent in class and the Federal Government pays his school costs. At this stage in his career, the trainee has a choice. He may, if he wishes, take the standard civil service examination and, if qualified, leave the General Services Unit for training as a patrolman.

Otherwise, he can move up to the top of the New Careers ladder as a General Services associate at pay of \$555 to \$585 monthly. By this time he will be bondable (a requirement at this job level), will have a junior college associate of arts degree, and will have successfully passed a civil service test.

The New Careerists are learning while on duty both in the field and at main headquarters. Though they may never have to do it themselves, they are shown how police control a rioting crowd. They are taught the structure of the police force, its mode of operation, and under what circumstances an officer may enter a private dwelling without a warrant.

This new-found expertise on law enforcement is valuable to both the trainee and his neighborhood. He gets a view of the police officer as a hard-working human being trying to keep the peace and protect lives. Hopefully, he carries this message back to his neighborhood, while arranging athletic events, counseling restless youngsters, and carrying out other community relations duties.

Said one Mexican American trainee, "I know we're doing a good job relating the Police Department into the community and at the same time helping the people."

The trainees appreciate the confidence the police have shown by giving them free run of the Hall of Justice. One older Negro said he felt the regular officers were disturbed at the outset of the program, not because so many trainees were black, but because they feared "civilians" might take their jobs. When they learned this wasn't true, they relaxed. "Policemen are nice people when you get to know them, but getting to know them is a different problem," he said.

Some of the men are still doubtful whether they really want to be police officers. "Four months isn't enough time to know," said one Negro. "I got a feeling on the job, but I don't know if I want it permanent."

New Careers in Oakland grew out of a unique experiment conducted in 1965 and 1966 at the California Medical Facility at Vacaville by J. Douglas Grant, a noted social psychologist. Eighteen young felons with histories of juvenile and adult crimes including car theft, armed robbery, and narcotic offenses were brought to Vacaville from prisons throughout the State.

Funding was obtained from the National Institute of Mental Health. The project trained the recruits in poverty program planning, operation and evaluation. It sought to demonstrate that ex-offenders could return to society in useful jobs.

The experiment was a success. Of the 18 felons, only one has returned to prison, and 12 are active in various poverty programs. Three of these men are staff members for Oakland's New Careers Development Agency, which oversees all New Careers programs in the city, including the Police Department's.

The agency's work is now funded by the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration, which has been administering New Careers for 2 years.

New Careers director in Oakland is Charles Jackson, a young black man who joined the agency 2 years ago. Jackson, a hard-driving administrator, has a staff comprised of roughly equal numbers of professionals and laymen—counselors, program developers, and social scientists.

Jackson has hammered out a variety of agreements with 17 public and private organizations, in addition to the Police Department, to open up subprofessional jobs for his 155 trainees. Some are now community workers with the State Employment Service,

others are field staff aides with the Girl Scouts. The University of California has hired several as laboratory assistants.

Once a prospective New Careers trainee has been screened, tested, and certified as meeting the poverty guidelines, the path up the career ladder begins. Starting salaries range from \$330 to \$480 a month. Entry workers receive heavy loads of formal and job-related education. Ideally, each man or woman spends 4 hours a day on the job and 4 hours in a classroom.

Many of the trainees attend Oakland's Merritt College to work on high school equivalencies or freshman college-level courses. They advance in their new career as they demonstrate proficiency on the job and accumulate high school and college credits.

Jackson acknowledges that his agency's path in Oakland has been rocky at times. There have been the inevitable misunderstandings that arise when job duties are carved out of established career public service programs. Feathers have been ruffled and feathers have been smoothed. But by and large, the trainees, the planners, and the employers are enthusiastic over the breakthrough that has been made.

The police feel that the program is working well. "Our guys are the best we've seen of the New Careerists," said one 18-year veteran on the force. "They're the best dressed and the smartest. They've already made a contribution to the department and we're all extremely satisfied with the progress they've made thus far."

[From Parade magazine, Aug. 24, 1969]

#### COPS AND COPOUTS—EX-CONS JOIN THE POLICE FORCE

(By Lloyd Shearer)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—What do you think of a police department which boasts among its members a wide assortment of ex-convicts—former thieves, dope addicts, prostitutes, forgers, the whole gamut of criminals?

In Los Angeles, the people and the police believe that ex-convicts can play an important and beneficial role in law enforcement, that no group knows as much about crime as ex-criminals.

Twenty men and four women who a few years ago were bitter enemies of the Los Angeles police are now their devoted colleagues.

These former felons advise rookie cops on basic underworld truths. They explain the secrets of successful thievery, why girls become prostitutes, where youngsters buy their dope. They reveal firsthand the inside story of crime.

More important, they move into the city's most depressed and poverty-ridden areas from which they themselves spring—the black and Mexican districts—and here they try incredibly hard to prevent young boys and girls from going wrong.

Because they themselves are members of minority groups and accepted as "one of us," they are most effective in reducing hostility toward the police.

Such hostility is understandably high among non-whites, who often accuse the police of being unfair, corrupt, incompetent, and unsympathetic, and yet at the same time, demand zealous protection by police who are unwelcome in their community.

The unlikely alliance between cops and robbers in Los Angeles began in early 1968. Taking advantage of a federal program (Department of Labor—Concentrated Employment Program of New Careers) which finances organizations willing to hire "hard-core unemployed," the Police Department asked for a grant of \$340,000.

When the federal government came across with the money, the police advertised for "community relations aides" at \$2 per hour who met the following qualifications:

1. Twenty-two years or older.
2. Fifth-grade reading level.
3. Unemployed.
4. Family income below the poverty level.
5. No homosexuals.

#### EXCONVICTS APPLY

Police Sgt. Lou Reiter, a graduate of UCLA and a major in political science who handled the first response, says: "You should have seen the crop of applicants we got. They were almost exclusively ex-cons. Of the first 20 we chose for the program, we had ten Negroes, eight Mexican-Americans, and two Anglos.

"Of these 20," he recalls, "18 were ex-convicts, with records for theft, assault, burglary, manslaughter, and attempted murder. Ten were also ex-heroin addicts, and one fellow, 30, had spent more than 16 years in jail."

The ex-cons didn't know what to expect from the police, and the police had little or no idea of how the men would react to training. Surprises were in store for both groups.

"On the third day," Reiter remembers, "one of our trainees held up a bank because he needed \$35 for rent money. Another went back on heroin, a third died of a heart attack, a fourth simply disappeared, a fifth followed his wife back to Texas, and a sixth was jailed three times during his ten weeks of training."

What did the ex-cons learn in their ten weeks of training? They learned first that the Police Department had no intention of using them as informers or stool pigeons.

"What we plan to do with you men," one police officer explained, "is to assign you to various police divisions and have you handle the public. We want you to go into the poorer districts of the city, to organize, recruit and register kids for various athletic programs.

"We want you to talk to student forums, to parents, to help the kids go straight. We want you to tell the people about the Police Department activities and services, that you and we are here to serve them. We want to improve our image. We want you to get idle kids off the street corners and into some meaningful work, to tell them what programs are open.

"You can tell us how burglars work, how criminals think. But we don't want any stoolies. That's not your function. Once you inform on somebody in the community to which you're assigned, no one in that community will trust you. We're not going to use you in law enforcement, either. You're not going to be armed or charged with helping to make arrests. You'll be given a Los Angeles police civilian employee identification card with your photo on it. But you'll work in civilian clothes.

"After a year you'll be making \$428 a month with a chance for continued raises."

#### CIVIL SERVICE STATUS

The first year of "The Community Relations Aides Program" has passed. It has proved so successful that the aides have been granted civil service status, and the project has been extended to include females.

Four women, all ex-dope addicts who once did "anything and everything" to feed their narcotics habit, all of them paroled from the rehabilitation center at Corona, Calif., are enrolled in the program.

Where formerly they feared the police, they now stride nonchalantly through the department, exchanging confidences with officers, but still always remembering what life was like on the other side of prison bars.

They know how to empathize with the young, how to help teenaged girls resist the lure of heroin and prostitution, how to identify with the depressed, the downtrodden, the disappointed.

To talk, for example, to gentle, soft-voiced Terry Leon, 23, one would never imagine that she was a former heroin addict who only a few years ago had wallowed in the muck of degeneracy.

"To tell the truth," she confesses, "I was incorrigible as a kid. I went to seven different schools around Los Angeles and got in trouble in every single one. Then when I was 15, I quit to get married. I married a 17-year-old boy. He was a truck driver.

"My father was also a truck driver. He came from Arizona. My mother worked as a waitress and she came from Texas. My folks never gave me much supervision as a girl. I started smoking cigarettes when I was 10.

#### ON MARIJUANA AT 12

"By the time I was 12, I was on marijuana. I was dropping pills, ditching schools, staying out all night. That's pretty common routine for Mexican-American kids in East Los Angeles."

At 18, Terry had her third child, then was separated from her husband.

"I was stuck in the house with three kids," she explains. "I was depressed. Life seemed hopeless. I had no skill, no ambition. To cheer myself up, I had friends come over to my house. One time I found somebody 'fixing' in the bathroom. So I said to myself, 'I'm going to see what it's like. Why is everybody always getting loaded?'"

"So at first it was curiosity, just trying something to cure my depression. Heroin seemed to do the trick. So from my first fix I just kept fixing. To get the stuff I started living with this guy. He was dealing dope and I just hung on to him. Because he was living in my house and dealing from there, he used to turn me on for being his old lady, for supplying him with meat.

"One day my mother came over. I was loaded from dropping some reds (Seconal tablets) and when I went to the grocery store, she called the police. When I got back the officers were there and they brought me here to the glass house (police headquarters)."

Terry was sentenced to the California Rehabilitation Center where she had time to look back upon her life and realize that like other adolescents she had needed love, understanding, and supervision, but had been given none of these. She realized that for her, marriage and heroin had served as escape mechanisms. With the help of group therapy and individual will power, she kicked the habit. But only for two years. A year ago she reverted to heroin. "But then I had the good sense to turn myself in."

Released five months ago, Terry went to friends and asked for a job. One of them told her about the Community Relations Aides Program at the Police Department. She applied and was taken.

Since then she has been attending remedial classes four times a week, learning and earning her way to a high school diploma. She lives in a suburb with her mother, says she is good with kids. "They open up with me. They admit to using drugs. They're begging for help. And I know that by showing interest in them, getting them involved in some project, that I can help them. What minority kids want most is a little hope, a little opportunity to share in things. They want to become part of the city and not to be treated as unwanted outsiders. They need a purpose for living."

#### A PURPOSE IN LIFE

Don Roberts, a 29-year-old ex-thief who used to burgle three houses a day for five years to satisfy his heroin craving, says that he has found a purpose in life as a community relations aide.

"My purpose," he declares, "is to help people. I know a good deal about robbery so I advise people how to protect their property. I know something about kids, so I advise them how to avoid the pitfalls."

Roberts, from Bell Gardens, a low-income area of Los Angeles, started "popping pills" and "smoking the weed" when he was 15. "It seemed like the thing to do, so I did it."

Arrested for stealing tires, he was sent to Juvenile Hall "where I learned the most about crime. The older boys talked about what they had done and explained how to do it.

"When I got out I went to live with my sister and discovered that my brother-in-law was taking heroin. At 20, I was a full-fledged addict.

"From 1960 to 1965 I lived in half a garage. I didn't see or speak to anybody. I lived in this dirty, cramped garage next to a car with only one goal—my next fix. I was an animal. I lived by stealing. When the police finally caught me, I honestly felt relief."

#### URNS HIMSELF IN

Sent to the rehabilitation center at Corona, Roberts resolved to go straight when he was released. "My resolve lasted five hours. I was taking heroin before the day was out. I knew I was hooked, so I turned myself in."

While he was serving time, Don discovered that his younger sister had started taking dope. He was so shocked that he began to assess seriously what heroin had done to him and what it would also do to his sister.

He was determined to make an honest living upon his second release. "But it wasn't easy. Once you have a felony on your record, and I had 20 on mine, hardly anyone will give you a job, rent you an apartment, extend even a buck's worth of credit. That's why this community relations program for ex-cons is such a break.

"My parole officer told me about it. And well, it's made a new man of me. It's given me self-respect, decency, authority, a regular salary, the feeling of belonging to society, of not being an outcast.

"I not only go around lecturing to kids, but I talk to the class of police rookies, explaining how things are different on the other side of the tracks and how they can best operate in those areas. I also explain the various methods of housebreaking and burglary."

Working as a community relations aide is not exactly a picnic for Roberts. He's achieved a new stability but his old pals in the neighborhood ostracize him for going straight, and while the police appreciate him, they don't necessarily embrace him.

#### LETTER FROM A GIRL

His major satisfaction, he says, comes from helping the young. Following one of his lectures in a Los Angeles high school, he received a letter from a young girl: "You were able to convince a friend of mine to stop taking drugs, something I hadn't been able to do. Thank you."

According to Roberts, "kids will listen to a police officer when he talks about crime prevention, but they don't really hear. When an ex-con like myself talks, they not only listen and hear, but later they ask questions. That's when I know I'm doing something good."

#### DR. DRAPER'S GENIUS

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I revise my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very timely article by Mr. Victor K. McElheny of the Boston Globe staff which recently appeared in that distinguished publication entitled "Draper Believes MIT Will Keep Moon Work."

This article quoted Dr. Charles Draper of MIT, world renowned space and guidance scientist, whose contributions to the space program were so meaningful in making the recent moonshot success-

ful and in other epochal guidance advances.

It is reassuring to know that Dr. Draper is continuing his great work in space and guidance for defense exploration and industry and the good of the country.

I hope that the work of this great scientist will continue for many years to come in all the areas that his genius has so greatly enriched in solving many space guidance problems that heretofore have been regarded as impossible of solution.

I hope that any difference between academic scientists and Dr. Draper will be reconciled for the good of science and the benefit of the Nation and the world.

Let us get on with Dr. Draper's great work and make sure that, whatever the cost, it is not interrupted by unfortunate personal controversy, or ideological confrontations between scholars and their disciples that sometimes spark serious dissension in academic communities. The article follows:

#### DRAPER BELIEVES MIT WILL KEEP MOON WORK

(By Victor K. McElheny)

Dr. Charles Stark Draper, outgoing director of the Instrumentation Laboratory at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, made it clear yesterday he does not feel that Apollo guidance work is threatened by MIT's plans to "civilize" the lab.

I-Lab, which operates in a number of buildings near MIT's Cambridge campus, does some \$25 million worth of research for the Defense Department each year and about the same amount for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Draper is stepping down Jan. 1 as head of the laboratory. He will be replaced by Professor Charles L. Miller, an expert in "systems analysis" of urban problems.

Draper regards Miller's appointment, announced Sept. 25 as part of an MIT policy to shift I-Lab and Lincoln Laboratory in Lexington toward more civilian work, as a sort of dismissal. He will continue as a consultant and supervisor of projects he started. "I didn't resign—I got fired," he says.

This week, he indicated that changes in the laboratory's course could so weaken its established work in defense and in space that the engineers working on problems of missile, submarine and spaceship guidance might have to leave MIT and form an independent company. He has mentioned this possibility before.

But yesterday through an MIT spokesman, Draper said, he understood that the work for NASA was not being called into question.

Last Spring, a committee on MIT's relations with its two large defense-related laboratories recommended that I-Lab wind up its work on guiding submarine-launched Poseidon missiles as "inappropriate for Institute sponsorship."

#### HONORING GEORGE JUE

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House, the honor which has been bestowed upon a distinguished

San Franciscan and leader in San Francisco's Chinese community.

Mr. George Jue, a valued and long-time friend, has been cited by the Department of the Army for his years of generous service to the recreation program for wounded servicemen at Letterman General Hospital at the Presidio of San Francisco.

George Jue has been cited for his humility and generosity repeatedly, and has had resolutions adopted honoring him by the legislature of the State of California, and by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco.

I am taking the liberty of placing in the RECORD at this time the text of the certificate of appreciation. I am sure that my colleagues join with me in extending this warm expression of appreciation to this most singular man:

THE CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION FOR PATRIOTIC CIVILIAN SERVICE IS AWARDED TO GEORGE JUE

Citation.—During the period 1951 to 1968, Mr. Jue, and the staff of the Lamps of China Restaurant, supported the patient recreation program of Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco, California, in an outstanding manner. The actual number of free dinners for patients over this seventeen-year period cannot be calculated, but is estimated to number in the thousands. Mr. Jue's concern for the entertainment of wounded American servicemen represents a chronicle of devotion and generosity. He has set an example of patriotism and civic responsibility, demonstrated in countless tangible ways, worthy of emulation by all American citizens.

#### IN MEMORY OF A GOLDEN SENATOR

### HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, I introduced House Joint Resolution 891 designating the American marigold as the national floral emblem of the United States. As we all know, the late Senator Everett Dirksen was an enthusiastic champion of this flower. To honor the deceased senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. David Burpee has named a new golden hybrid marigold "Senator Dirksen."

At this time I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the November 19 issue of the Chicago Tribune which provides a more detailed explanation of Mr. Burpee's efforts. The text of the story is as follows:

#### IN MEMORY OF A GOLDEN SENATOR

(By Art Kozelka)

A new, golden hybrid marigold has been named Senator Dirksen in honor of the late senator from Illinois, who for a decade had championed the marigold as the most appropriate flower for America's national floral emblem.

Naming the new flower was disclosed by THE TRIBUNE by Sen. Dirksen's close friend, David Burpee, president of the W. Atlee Burpee Seed company, because, Burpee said, "We believe his many friends in his home state should be the first to know about it."

The flower will be introduced to the public for the first time at the Chicago World Flower and Garden show in the International Amphitheater March 7 to 15, where it will be featured in Burpee's marigold garden. The garden will be dedicated in memory of Sen. Dirksen.

Burpee, who has devoted more than half a century to the development of marigolds regards the Senator Dirksen as the best he has created.

It bears large, golden yellow blooms in profusion, on strong, stout stems. Flowers often are 5 inches across, equally spectacular in the garden or when cut for indoor arrangements. Like all marigolds, they are easy to grow from seeds and rarely are troubled by disease or insects.

Gardening was a hobby of the late senator, and marigolds were his favorite flower. Early last February, addressing Congress in behalf of a joint resolution to designate the marigold as the national floral emblem, he said: ". . . It is actually an American native [flower] and really not native to any other place on earth. It is grown in great profusion in every one of the 50 states and strangely enough is not the official flower of any state.

"I grow thousands of them every year for my own delight and the delight of my neighbors, and I know what this flower will do.

"I class it, therefore, with the American eagle when it comes to a symbol of our country that manifests stamina; and when it comes to beauty, I can think of nothing greater or more inspiring than a field of blooming marigolds tossing their heads in the sunshine and giving a glow to the entire landscape."

Burpee said he had been wanting to name a marigold in honor of Sen. Dirksen, but until now never thought he had one good enough.

"Now," he said, "people from all over the United States have been urging me to do it, and I am proud to have the privilege of naming this best of all marigolds in honor of the great senator from Illinois."

Sen. Dirksen's widow, Louella, and daughter, Joy, wife of Sen. Howard H. Baker [R. Tenn.], were delighted that Burpee wanted to name the new marigold after Sen. Dirksen.

The Burpee seed company's 1970 catalog, which goes to more than 2½ million home gardeners right after Christmas, will feature a full color picture of the Senator Dirksen marigold.

With all this interest in marigolds, it is not inconceivable that it someday may actually become the national floral emblem.

It was just a few days after the senator's death on Sept. 7 that Congressman Jack McDonald [R. Mich.] urged Congress in a joint resolution to grant Sen. Dirksen ". . . in death that wish which he failed to see fulfilled in life."

**THE NATIONAL AMPUTATION FOUNDATION: HALF A CENTURY OF DEDICATED SERVICE**

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to speak for a few moments at this time to honor an organization which has been performing a great service for certain special members of our Armed Forces for half a century. This organization is the National Amputation Foundation and the people they serve are those brave young men who, while wearing the uniform of their country, have suffered the amputation of one

or more limbs. The National Amputation Foundation has for 50 years, since 1919, been offering valuable assistance to veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and now the war in Vietnam, who were so seriously injured.

The amputation of limbs causes tremendous physical and psychological problems for a young man, and poses obstacles to surmount that those of us who have not lived through it can only begin to imagine. This is why the National Amputation Foundation's program of assistance and encouragement is so vital and so successful. For who can better help these young men only just beginning to try to cope with their losses than a dedicated group of mature men who have lived through this experience themselves? Their advice and the very example of their own lives can be invaluable to the young amputee.

The services provided by the foundation—legal counsel, vocational guidance and placement, social activities, liaison with outside groups, psychological aid, training in the use of prosthetic devices, and since 1961 manufacture and repair of these artificial limbs in its own shop—are services needed desperately by the newly returned amputee as he faces the strange and sometimes frightening new world his loss has created.

Returning to his home community and a resumption of what he considers normal life, a young amputee must make any number of important adjustments in his life. He may be forced to abandon his former plans for his vocational career because of the limitations imposed upon him by his handicap. He may encounter within himself uncertainties about his social life. These are the areas where the sympathetic counsel the staff of the foundation offers can be so essential if the necessary adjustments are to be made.

Sometimes these problems are simply too tough to be faced alone, and the understanding of those men of the foundation can make all the difference between success and despair. For these men, too, have suffered the loss of a limb and have faced the readjustment to normal community life.

In the last few years the foundation has made a particular effort to reorient the returned Vietnam amputee socially. With visits to both the Walter Reed Hospital in the District of Columbia and the Valley Forge, Pa., hospital, they have helped to cheer up these young amputees and to turn their minds from their disabilities to the lives they will live after rehabilitation. The foundation has sponsored several excursions of amputees to New York City for a good time there, and this past Labor Day some 40 amputees were flown to Las Vegas, Nev., for a happy holiday.

While these activities may seem somewhat frivolous to the casual observer, they are highly effective in helping to reorient and adjust these young men. Many of them are very much concerned about living with their handicaps and the effect of them on their social life. In fact, many of the older members of the foundation report that one of the first questions they are asked by the young

amputees is whether they got married before or after the injury.

Again I must express my sincerest admiration for the National Amputation Foundation and for its tireless efforts on behalf of the young men of our country who have given so much. The 50 years of selfless service to the needs of the amputee are a remarkable achievement indeed.

A few of the many laudatory comments the National Amputation Foundation constantly receives, I think, also conveys just what a marvelous, humanitarian effort this voluntary organization has undertaken. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting a few letters Mr. Sol Kaminsky, the foundation's secretary, has received from the branches of the Department of Defense:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,  
Washington, July 28, 1969.

Mr. SOL KAMINSKY,  
Secretary, National Amputation Foundation  
Whitestone, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAMINSKY: On behalf of President Nixon, I am replying to your recent letter regarding military air transportation for 40 amputee servicemen from Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D.C., to Las Vegas, Nevada, to be guests of Caesar's Palace during September 1-4, 1969.

The interest displayed by the National Amputation Foundation in the welfare of our hospitalized servicemen has done much to boost their morale and attitude towards rehabilitation. Under the circumstances, military air transportation for these 40 amputees has been authorized. Please contact Captain Gordon Hoelscher, Social Work Service, Room G67, Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D.C. 20012, as soon as possible for final arrangements.

It is a pleasure to have been of service to you in this worthy endeavor.

Sincerely,  
JOHN C. GIRAUDO,  
Brigadier General, USAF.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Mr. SOL KAMINSKY,  
National Amputation Chapter #76, Disabled  
American Veterans, Whitestone, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAMINSKY: You were most kind to advise me of the whole hearted support that you and other members of National Amputation Chapter #76 are giving to entertain our soldiers who lost their limbs while serving our nation in the Republic of Vietnam.

It is this type of activity which reveals to our servicemen who are so valiantly fighting in distant lands that their efforts are of the utmost importance to the American civilian population, especially those such as you who have given so much in previous conflicts. It is indeed commendable that you and your fellow chapter members are giving the time and facilities to not only entertaining these Vietnam veterans but also the tremendous insight you are offering these men toward a future productive life.

May I take this opportunity to add my appreciation to that of General Hughes and Colonel Coates for the wonderful manner in which you have shown your concern for our patients from Walter Reed General Hospital and Valley Forge General Hospital.

The listings you requested are inclosed, I trust they will be of some assistance for you to continue your invaluable service to our hospitalized Vietnam veterans.

Sincerely,  
LEONARD D. HEATON,  
Lieutenant General, The Surgeon General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, WALTER  
REED GENERAL HOSPITAL, WALTER  
REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER,  
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1969.

Mr. SOL KAMINSKY,  
National Amputation Center,  
Whitestone, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAMINSKY: On behalf of the patients and staff of Walter Reed General Hospital, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to you and the members of the National Amputation Center, Chapter #76, for arranging for a group of our patients to be your guests in New York City following your annual Spring Rehabilitation Ball.

The accommodations for our patients and the numerous social and recreational functions that you coordinated were outstanding. Particularly significant was the warm hospitality and friendship they received throughout their time in New York.

These events provide a most welcome break in hospital routine and have assisted greatly in maintaining a high level of morale at Walter Reed.

Thank you for your continued support and interest in our patient entertainment program.

Sincerely yours,

CARL W. HUGHES,  
Colonel, MC, Commanding.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, WALTER  
REED GENERAL HOSPITAL, WALTER  
REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER,  
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1969.

Mr. SOL KAMINSKY,  
Disabled American Veterans,  
National Amputation Chapter,  
Whitestone, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAMINSKY: I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the Disabled American Veterans for making the recent trip to Las Vegas possible. It was truly an unforgettable experience for the patients as well as for the staff which accompanied them.

As a physical therapist, it was a privilege and an educational experience to have gone on the trip. It gave me a greater awareness of the problems which the disabled face out of the hospital environment.

The patients displayed a high level of adaptability to new situations becoming quite independent in all activities of self-care and daily living. If they were cautious or dubious as to their being accepted by society, their fears were quickly overcome.

Both physically and psychologically the therapeutic value of the trip was remarkable.

Respectfully,

GILBERT SOSA,  
Capt., AMSC.

#### AGNEW AND THE TV NETWORKS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the national debate which Vice President AGNEW has sparked by his comments on television political commentary continues and I believe that an objective discussion of the subject will be in the national interest.

One of the more objective articles on the subject which I noticed appeared in the November 22 Daily Calumet in a comprehensive report from the publication's Washington reporter, John D. Lofton, Jr.:

#### AGNEW AND THE TELEVISION NETWORKS

(By John D. Lofton Jr.)

If network television reporters are no better at reporting the news than are the presidents of the networks themselves, then we are in real trouble. Consider the reaction to Vice President Agnew's recent remarks about the television news medium.

CBS President, Frank Stanton replied, in part: "Whatever their (newsmen) deficiencies however, they are minor compared to those of a press which would be subservient to the executive power of government."

Echoed N.B.C. President Julian Goodman: "It is regrettable that the vice president of the United States would deny to television freedom of the press. Evidently, he would prefer a different kind of television reporting—one that would be subservient to whatever political group happened to be in authority at the time."

Unfortunately for these two network presidents, what they had forgotten was that the American people had seen the vice president make his speech, live on television, and nowhere in it were government or political controls advocated. As a matter of fact, Agnew had very wisely headed off this chimera and said very specifically:

"I am not asking for government censorship or any other kind of censorship. I am asking whether a form of censorship already exists when the news that 40 million Americans receive each night is determined by a handful of men responsible only to their corporate employers and filtered through a handful of commentators who admit to their own set of biases . . . Tonight, I have raised questions. I have made no attempt to suggest answers. These answers must come from the media men. They are challenged to turn their critical powers on themselves. They are challenged to direct their energy, talent and conviction toward improving the quality and objectivity of news presentation."

Hardly a call for the intervention of Big Brother. More like "physician heal thy self."

The reaction outside the media itself was equally maladroit but Teddy Kennedy's comments were singularly hypocritical. The senior Senator from Massachusetts said that the Vice President's speech was "an attack designed to pit American against American . . . an attack with the ultimate aim of dividing this country into those who support and those who do not support our President's position in Vietnam."

This charge of divisiveness from a man who only nine days earlier had denounced President Nixon's televised Vietnam talk saying:

"And so this Administration, by clinging to the policies of the past, when the time for peace has come, must expect those who feel differently will rise to this test. The call for unity cannot be responsibly heeded when a leadership has exhibited no policy or plan that unifies. It is difficult to ask a people to join in support of a position that is no different from that which has split our country before."

Undoubtedly what has bugged the networks the most about Agnew's criticisms is not the criticisms themselves, because they have been voiced before, but the fact that they were made at the vice presidential level and with the approval of the President.

Writing earlier this year in the "American Legion" magazine, the syndicated father and son team, Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond, made a similar appeal for "perspective and balance" and a "wider awareness" by the media that they have a responsibility to do more than sell bad news because it is more exciting.

"The peril is that if any large number of Americans are induced to accept the false image of their nation—the image that wherever you look, virtually nothing is right—then we will be standing at the brink of na-

tional impotence, political lethargy and the pervasive conviction that nothing can be put right because so much is wrong," wrote the column-writing duo.

Joseph P. Lyford, liberal Professor of Journalism at the University of California at Berkeley put it another way:

"Today television is relaying versions of a group theater . . . The purpose of the new play is largely the play itself. The script has concerned itself with proclamations and ultimata rather than questions. The language is loud and verbose and increasingly aimed at the destruction rather than the restoration of the dialogue . . . Time given by television and the press to the staged event is time taken away from reporting the happenings that are not contrived . . . If the day comes when television is freed from its dependence on what this or that angry crowd is doing, we will get a very different perspective on what is going on inside this country and inside our heads."

Television reporting of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago last year is a case in point. A report submitted to the chairman of a House Commerce subcommittee speaks of one-sided coverage favoring the cause of the demonstrators:

"In general, there seems to be substantial evidence of animosity by members of the TV news organizations against the Democratic Party, or at least certain of its prominent members, and the administration of the city of Chicago. This seems to have been reflected in the slanting of the reporting of the events as they took place . . . In an attempt to give an over-all impression, it might be said that the coverage presented over the air does, in retrospect, seem to present a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protestors and indicts the city government of Chicago, and, to a lesser degree, the Democratic Party."

Not only distorted, but dull, too, the first Alfred I. du Pont-Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism called television's coverage of the two national political conventions "profound journalistic ennui for purveyor and consumer alike."

In raising certain questions about the media, Vice President Agnew noted that while there is great concern about the financial connections of Senators, Congressmen and Judges, network newsmen seem to be immune from the same close scrutiny.

"When a single commentator or producer, night after night, determines for millions of people how much of each side of a great issue they are going to see and hear; should he not first disclose his personal views on the issue as well?" asked Agnew.

The case of Chet Huntley illustrates why this suggestion is not an idle one.

The Federal Communications Commission last year sharply rebuked N.B.C. for having failed to disclose Chet Huntley's financial interest in the livestock business after he made broadcasts attacking Federal meat inspection requirements.

The commission asserted that a "substantial conflict of interest appears" to have existed with Mr. Huntley's broadcast on meat inspection. In addition, they went on: "N.B.C.'s conduct fell short of compliance with the requirements of the fairness doctrine," which requires "a reasonable opportunity for the presentation of conflicting viewpoints."

In short, Vice President Agnew's remarks about the media were simply a reiteration echo of what FCC commissioner Nicholas Johnson said over a year ago:

"Radio and television mold minds, 200 million of them, in numerous ways every day. It is long past time that we find out just what it is these potters are making out of the clay they knead inside our heads."

**DR. WILLIAM T. PECORA RECEIVES  
DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD**

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend and constituent Dr. William T. Pecora received last week a distinguished award for his outstanding contributions to public service. I am certainly delighted to see this recognition come to one whom I have known and admired for many years.

Dr. William T. Pecora, an earth scientist of international stature who directs the many, far-reaching missions of the U.S. Geological Survey, was named as one of seven winners of 1969 Rockefeller Public Service Awards given annually in recognition of "distinguished service to the Government of the United States and to the American People."

Conceived and financed by John D. Rockefeller III, and administered by Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs as a national trust, the awards are the highest privately sustained honors for American career civil servants. Each award carried with it a \$10,000 cash grant.

Dr. Pecora, selected for the award in the category of the General Welfare or National Resources, was honored Wednesday, December 3 at the Rockefeller awards luncheon at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C. The presentation was made by Dr. Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton.

As Director of the 9,000-member U.S. Geological Survey, largest scientific agency in the Department of the Interior, Dr. Pecora—an expert in mineralogy, petrology, and geochemistry—is responsible for planning and directing programs concerned with such fundamental matters as distribution of the Nation's resources, the basic geological framework of the United States, and protection of the environment.

In 30 years with the Geological Survey, for the last 4 as its chief administrator, Pecora, a 56-year-old native of Belleville, N.J., has won wide recognition for his innovative approaches to the earth sciences. He initiated the EROS—earth resources observation satellites—program—an effort in which the Geological Survey joined with NASA and other interested institutions in a project aimed at gathering facts about the natural resources of the earth from earth-orbiting satellites carrying sophisticated remote sensing observation instruments.

Responding to the 1964 Alaskan earthquake disaster, Dr. Pecora established the National Center for Earthquake Research in Menlo Park, Calif., an undertaking designed to develop new instruments for monitoring earthquake faults and through laboratory and field investigations producing important information to aid engineering planning in earthquake-prone areas.

A 1933 graduate of Princeton, with

honors in geology, Pecora did his graduate study at Harvard receiving his Ph. D. there in 1939, the year he began his career in the Federal service with the Geological Survey. For nearly two decades he carried on basic research related to the occurrence and distribution of hitherto little known or unknown mineral resources. During World War II he directed field investigations in Brazil which led to the discovery of important mica deposits during this period of national emergency.

His work on carbonatites and sulfide-bearing silicate carbonate rocks were major factors in his election in 1965 to the National Academy of Sciences for continuing achievements in original research; he is one of only 40 geologists in that distinguished body.

In 1957, Pecora moved into scientific research administration with his appointment as Chief, Branch of Geochemistry and Petrology of the Geological Survey, and 7 years later was named Chief Geologist. In 1965 he was appointed Director of the U.S. Geological Survey by President Johnson, and was reappointed to that post by President Nixon this past spring.

Dr. Pecora is currently president of the Cosmos Club of Washington, and a resident of this city. A former athlete, he won a national intercollegiate fencing championship in 1933 and in 1936 was a member of the U.S. Olympic fencing team. He is married to the former Ethelwyn Elizabeth Carter; the Pecoras has two children, a son, William C., and a daughter, Ann.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Dr. Pecora many more years of distinguished service, and many more years of happiness and fulfillment.

**JOSEPH ELI KOVNER ON POLITICS  
AND THE WAR**

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the third month of activities organized by the Vietnam moratorium committee, and, of course, I expect the administration will whip up some more of its special backlashes which seem to be reserved for all critics of our tragic adventurism in Southeast Asia.

But, even though the war leaders prefer to believe that they "own" the "great masses," I feel they are sadly misinformed. Backlashes always seem to reverberate into new lashes, and I will not be surprised to see even greater protests developing this month and through coming months until this cruel war is over.

My longtime friend, Joseph Eli Kovner, head of Kovner Publications in southern California, made many of the above points in a moving column he wrote last month. I agree with Mr. Kovner's outlook on dissent, politics, and the war, and I now place his column in the RECORD at this point:

**GALLUP POLL IS WRONG AGAIN! VIETNAM  
MORATORIUM BACKED BY VOCAL MAJORITY**

(By Joseph Eli Kovner)

Some comments on the address by Vice President Spiro Agnew at the Penn. Republican Dinner, Harrisburg, Pa., Oct. 30, 1969.

Coyly, Agnew said, "A little over a week ago, I took a rather unusual step for a Vice President . . . I said something."

As I recall, he hasn't stopped talking before and after his election, or rather, Nixon's election. If he means that everything he said before this particular speech was nothing, I'll have to agree with him.

Guardedly, Agnew said, "Particularly, I said something that was predictably unpopular with the people who would like to run the country without the inconvenience of seeking public office . . . I criticized those who encouraged government by street carnival and suggested it was time to stop the carousel."

This is sheer arrogance. The people should run the government, even when they are not in some kind of public office. The elected officials must not govern without the consent of the governed. If they try, they must be removed, just as Johnson and Humphrey were removed. Agnew is trying to impose a George Wallace type of tyranny over the minds of the populace. And this business of "street carnival" . . . let me say this, last Tuesday, Veterans Day, which used to be known as Armistice Day, being staged were "carnivals" all over this land of ours, propagandizing for this unwanted war in Vietnam instead of memorializing the peace that came about at the end of World War I, and remembering the soldiers who died in defense of our cause, which then, was just. This is what happens when the ultra-conservatives take over the role of patriotism. They have made a mockery of "Armistice Day" or "Veterans Day" and if they have subverted the spirit of this day, and have made this day a day for mongering the Vietnam War, against the wishes of the people of these United States, they will be the ones to suffer the consequences of their folly. The fact is, they will remove Nixon and Agnew faster than you could say "So what's with you, Agnew!"

Belligerently, Agnew said: "It appears by slaughtering a sacred cow I triggered a holy war. I have no regrets, I do not intend to repudiate my beliefs, recant any words, or run and hide."

First, Agnew, brings India's sacred cows into the picture, then, he compares the illustrious members of the United States Senate and Congress, his peer group, mind you, to those engaging in holy war in India. Then, he says, he's not sorry . . . and like a child about to be spanked he utters he won't run and hide."

Paradoxically, Agnew said, "I believe in Constitutional dissent . . . But I do not believe that demonstrations, lawful or unlawful, merit my approval or even my silence, where the purpose is fundamentally unsound. In the case of the Vietnam Moratorium, the objective announced by the leaders—immediate unilateral withdrawal of all our forces from Vietnam—was not only unsound but idiotic. The tragedy was that thousands who participated wanted only to show a fervent desire for peace, but were used by the political hustlers who ran the event."

What he meant to say was, "I don't believe in Constitutional dissent," because you can't have it both ways. If a demonstration is lawful and Agnew doesn't buy it . . . that's really tough!

Our boys will continue to die until we stop this crack-pot realism of Agnew's . . . that an immediate withdrawal will massacre our fighting youths in Vietnam. The tragedy is that wherever we send our soldiers to

fight the holy crusade of anti-communism that is where they are going to die. And they will continue to die until they are told by President Nixon to come on home.

### CONGRESS MUST PROTECT SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 10 years the Congress has had before it proposals for the creation of a national lakeshore encompassing the Sleeping Bear Dunes area of Michigan.

The proposal has been on the verge of passage in the past; in the 89th Congress it died in the Rules Committee when time simply ran out and Congress adjourned.

We are most hopeful of passage this Congress.

Today the Sleeping Bear Dunes legislation enjoys broad bipartisan support.

My distinguished colleagues from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA and Mr. VANDER JAGT) have introduced Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore bills that are very close in substance. Sixteen members of the Michigan delegation have sponsored one or both of these bills.

The need for passage of this legislation was well stated in a recent editorial in the Michigan State University State News, and I am including its text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### CONGRESS MUST PROTECT SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

In 1961 Philip A. Hart, D-Mich., introduced the first bill to make Sleeping Bear Dunes a national lakeshore, owned and managed by the National Park System. He successfully brought the bill through the Senate twice, but it still is in the Interior Committee in the House.

Meanwhile, land value continues to escalate and people are still without recreational resources. If Congress doesn't act soon, the opportunity may be lost because private development is proceeding rapidly.

Wayne Aspinall, D-Colo., and chairman of the House Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs, refuses to hold hearings because the Bureau of the Budget will not allocate funds for the project. There is a \$275 million backlog for national parks already authorized by Congress. The bureau doesn't expect this to be paid off until 1974.

On June 17, Guy VanderJagt, R-Mich., introduced another bill to establish a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore of 61,000 acres. Its primary objective is the preservation of natural and scenic values of the area.

Sleeping Bear Dunes, towering 460 feet above northeast Lake Michigan and adjacent inland lakes, is known for its massive dunes, white sand beaches and deciduous forests.

The area offers a variety of outdoor recreation—swimming, boating, water sports, camping, picnicking, hiking, hunting and fishing. Scientific features of the area attract people interested in geology, biology and ecology.

Preservation of land and inland water surfaces are an alternative to uncontrolled use and development, loss of shoreline access and public outdoor recreation opportunities. The National Lakeshore will preserve the natural scenic and scientific values that first attracted people to the dunes.

The people of Leelanau and Benzie counties, the home of Sleeping Bear Dunes, are opposed to the Lakeshore because they are worried about tax loss and ownership of their property.

Vander Jagt's bill allows many owners of unimproved land continued use of their property, subject only to certain restriction defined in scenic easements purchased from the owner by the federal government. Prior proposals offered protection against condemnation only to improved lands.

This will lower the overall cost of the Lakeshore project, reducing the land the federal government will purchase outright.

With the federal acquisition of lands, local school systems will suffer a loss of tax base. Part of this will be made up by state and federal school aid funds. In addition, Gov. Milliken and several leaders of the Michigan Legislature promised they would work for the passage of state legislation to make up any deficits the area school districts might incur.

National conservation groups are jumping on the Nixon administration, considering it inadequate in meeting the country's growing outdoor recreational needs. Rupert Cutler, East Lansing graduate student who has worked in Washington, D.C., with the Wilderness Society, a conservation group, said the administration seems totally callous and indifferent to conservation and parks.

The Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources supports federal ownership and management of the Lakeshore. Sixteen of the 19 Michigan representatives in Congress have proposed or supported legislation for the Lakeshore. Charles Chamberlain, R-Lansing; James Harvey, R-Saginaw; and William Broomfield, R-Royal Oak have not supported the proposal.

The amount of land under state ownership in the Sleeping Bear Dunes is constantly dwindling. If we wait five more years to pass legislation, more of the land will be in private hands, with many natural features impaired. Congress must act now to protect and preserve the Sleeping Bear Dunes, and make them accessible to visitors through a national lakeshore.

### FUTURE OF OUR SPACE PROGRAM

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made by Dr. George Mueller of NASA, Associate Administrator of Manned Space Flight in which he talks about the future of our space program:

ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE E. MUELLER, NASA, BEFORE THE 25TH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION, AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS—OCTOBER 23, 1969

It is indeed a pleasure to talk with you on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of this unique organization. The international cooperation which characterizes IATA has been a dominant force in expanding the use of aviation technology, so that every place on earth is accessible to every other, in the relatively short span of fifty years, the airplane has changed the world.

The flight of Apollo 11 has again changed the world. We have now taken the first steps to man's free movement throughout the solar system. Within the next fifty years the solar system may be as accessible to our children as the world is to us today.

We now stand at what is undoubtedly the greatest decision point in the history of this planet. Never before has man been in a position to make a conscious decision to follow a path that would change the future of all mankind. Are we to choose the path that leads to men colonizing the solar system, or will we turn back?

If we choose to go forward, then it would seem appropriate for the nations of the earth to associate themselves in an organization, similar to IATA, which would focus the space efforts of all countries for the greatest benefit to all mankind. The developments now being planned in the United States space program will facilitate and eventually lead to the internationalization of space.

Aviation and space, so similar in many respects that the word "aerospace" has been coined to describe the total activity, have enjoyed an interchange which is only beginning to show its synergistic effects in both disciplines. Our space capability was built upon the solid foundation of a healthy and innovative aviation industry and upon the experience of the teams who built the ballistic missiles. But these were only the foundation. Upon that had to be superimposed the Apollo program structure, harnessing the creative work of scientists and investigators in over 200 universities, the work of 20 major manufacturers and over twenty thousand subcontractors, in which more than 300,000 people were employed at the peak of program activity.

Apollo is the largest engineering program that has ever been accomplished. It was done, as it had to be, by the development and employment of new methods and materials as well as the judicious use of the old. Government, science, and industry were so blended that they worked as a single cohesive organization for the attainment of this difficult goal.

New management techniques had to be invented which would be strong enough to maintain the pace and the perfection which the program demanded, and still be resilient enough to withstand accident and accommodate change. It was necessary to plan for opportunities afforded by success as well as for setbacks which could be expected in connection with any research and development program.

Hardware was being manufactured in almost every state in the nation. Millions of parts had to be factory tested, certified "manufactured" and then shipped to Cape Kennedy where they would be integrated into the total system.

Three major centers and a score of smaller ones, each under the direction of strong and innovative people, needed to be carefully focused upon the goal—the lunar landing. A total systems approach was obviously necessary. A pattern of project management was instituted which Fortune Magazine recently called a "management revolution".

Apollo offices were set up at each Center as well as on the premises of the major contractors, much as airline technical offices are installed in the plants of major suppliers of equipment. These project offices monitored design, schedule, cost, performance and quality control and formed a separate network headed by the program offices in headquarters in Washington. Communication lines between all offices remain open at all times. Visibility of all problems at the earliest possible moment was essential to prevent their escalation.

A most experienced group of individuals, the chief executives of the manufacturing companies which were producing the bulk of the hardware were asked to serve as members of the "Apollo Executive Group" which acted both as an advisory board to us, and at the same time, because an effective communications link between Apollo management and their own companies. The dedication of these men has been one of the greatest assets of

the program and a continuing source of real help to me.

In another area of equal importance, the Science and Technology Advisory Committee was formed. This group of 15 renowned scientists, led by Dr. C. H. Townes, included three Nobel Laureates as well as Dr. Lee DuBridge, now Science Adviser to President Nixon. Their constant interest and thoughtful watch over the scientific and new technological developments were responsible for a great part of the success of the program, both in science and in execution.

It was the intent of the Apollo Program not only to create the capability to land men on the moon and return them safely to earth, but to do it within the time and cost constraints originally set. Therefore tight scheduling was obligatory for getting the job done in a timely fashion and was the major factor in cost savings. Toward this objective another new concept was introduced—"all-up" testing. Instead of the incremental testing which had been used in previous research and development programs, each part was thoroughly tested on the ground, and then the whole system was assembled and tested all together in the first flight of this totally new equipment.

Thus, the first Saturn V flight tested for the first time the first, second, and third stages of the Saturn rocket as well as the guidance system, and in addition simulated the flight out to the moon and back with the Command and Service Module. This simulation provided the first test at lunar re-entry velocities of the spacecraft heat shield as well as the first test of the Apollo recovery forces.

This successful mission allowed the third Saturn V to be manned and the first lunar flight (Apollo 8) to be carried out on this first manned test of the Saturn V.

One consequence of this highly successful activity is the fact that we now have nine Apollo-Saturn V's which stand ready to carry out further missions in space. And the program goal, the lunar landing, was completed within the time specified and at the lowest cost estimated in 1961.

The successful operation of hardware and software, of men, machines and systems, points up with extreme clarity one of the most significant influences which the space program is now exerting and which may be expected to proliferate throughout our industrial society. This is what I have chosen to call the "technology of perfection". Manufacturing of thousands of systems and millions of parts has forced a new element into the American manufacturing system. We have not formerly expected the precision associated with the manufacture of a fine watch to be applied to a giant engineering project, but every time a Saturn V is launched we know that more than three hundred thousand people did all the essential things right.

Of 15 million parts in the Apollo-Saturn vehicle which took off from Cape Kennedy and flew out to the moon on July 16, 1969, the fact is that only one non-critical part failed on that mission. That is a demonstrated reliability of .999,999,996—a really phenomenal level.

Another notable effect of this program is the great mixing of disciplines which has resulted from its needs. Parochial differences had to fall away so that medical doctors could work with aeronautical engineers. Electronics experts planned the portable life support system which sustained Astronauts Armstrong and Aldrin on the moon in company with fabrics manufacturers, chemists, biologists, doctors and engineers. Scientists and engineers worked in harmony to design and develop the complex of tracking stations which carry communications between earth and the spacecraft—no matter where it may be, all the way out to a quarter of a million miles.

In thousands of separate regimes the space program has forced the application of our knowledge of natural laws. These develop-

ments compare, at least in number, with those usually associated with a major war. However, it is important to note that wars do not produce new knowledge, but rather demand the application of all knowledge to the needs of the moment. On the contrary, the space program has produced a series of breakthroughs in weather, in communications, in our knowledge of the space about the earth, of the sun, and now of the moon. It has given us new tools and a whole new environment in which to search for fundamental information.

But this is just the beginning. Within the next ten years we can expect the full effect of the space age to be felt. New insights into our complex environment will spur the development of new industries, new products and the new jobs which we need to gainfully employ our expanding populations.

Probably one of the first areas which will be dramatically effected by our space experience is air transportation. Early benefits to the space program bestowed by the experience and the knowledge transferred from the aviation community, are now beginning to be reciprocated.

An inertial guidance system fundamentally the same as that which carried Apollo 11 to the moon is now being installed in the Boeing 747. Data concerning the flammability of non-metallic materials, accumulated for use in the Apollo Modules, is being utilized for interior fittings in that new aircraft.

Less obvious transfers from space to aviation include new composite materials which withstand stresses and temperatures not previously encountered. Optical tooling is already being used for large structures. Welding with new materials and by new processes, originally developed for space, is being used in new aircraft.

While many spacetechnology developments have already found their way into commercial aviation, there are others which will soon come into everyday use. Soon, each future generation aircraft will have its own general purpose on-board digital computer. The use of solid-state large-scale integrated circuits for multiplexing and self-checking circuits will eliminate most cabling and much maintenance.

The rate of technology development is directly related to the speed with which our society progresses, the speed with which the standard of living and the amount of each person's wealth increases. We can, because of the large number of space-inspired products and systems, expect a correspondingly large increase in the wealth of all sectors of our society within the next few years. Yet we are only on the threshold of space exploration. We have yet to reap the benefits of the capability to operate in this new territory mankind has acquired. These benefits will be great, beyond our ability to imagine.

We now have the opportunity to place observatories where we will in the space between the earth and the moon which can improve our understanding of the basic physical processes in our solar system. Spacecraft can range throughout our solar system exploring the space environment, and other planets, searching for forms of life.

Weather satellites, already in general use, will be improved so that dependable weather information will become available weeks in advance. The possibility of eventual modification of weather will move closer to realization.

Communications satellites are in use. Improvements in these will allow direct radio and television broadcast to homes, offices—and of major importance, to schools. Other types of satellites to survey the earth give promise of increasing food production, conserving resources and monitoring pollution of water and air.

Scientists are intrigued with the possibilities of making use of the unique characteristics of space for experimentation with materials and processes. Molten metal will take

the shape of perfect spheres in the weightlessness of space, so that perfect ball bearings will be produced. We discovered crude examples of this on the moon. Subject only to surface tension and free of the constraints of a mold, crystals of great purity and great size might be grown. Dissimilar materials might be combined, like glass and steel or ceramics with plastics. Bubbles blown into molten steel may yield a material with the strength of steel—and the weight of balsa wood. Simple experiments carried out in this new environment may produce materials and processes not possible on earth.

For the conduct of these and other experiments and for the efficient utilization of the space environment, a large space station accommodating many scientists and technicians will be required. The station will be designed for at least ten years of operational life. Spreading its cost over such a period brings its cost per year within the range of some of our earth laboratories. The station will be a modular installation so that segments can be changed to prevent obsolescence. The modular format also provides the flexibility necessary to a research facility. Three kinds of modules, utility, living and experiment, will form the basic station to which can be added whatever special facilities modules are appropriate at later dates. The installation of such a platform in earth orbit will give us a research development and operations facility for accomplishing the increasingly important space uses we envision for the next decade.

Our space activity thus far has been constrained by the high cost of putting things into orbit, and their inaccessibility once they are in space.

Therefore, the primary need for the continuation of all space activity is for a second generation of space vehicles, a completely reusable space transportation system, which I have called a "space shuttle".

The technology for the production of the space shuttle is more advanced today than was the technology for the Saturn V eight years ago. In addition, we have eight years of understanding of the space environment and the systems required to operate in this environment on which to base the design of this vehicle. One encouraging fact is that we now have several designs for such a transportation system which are capable of meeting our objectives. Studies to select the best concept are now being carried out. Using the management techniques which have been developed for Apollo, the chosen system could be flown in six or seven years. I believe that if we wanted to we could have a space shuttle in operation by 1976.

The space shuttle will reduce the cost of space activity by two or even more orders of magnitude, and at the same time it will greatly increase our ability to operate effectively in space.

The desired characteristics of this vehicle will be of particular interest to you, for in many ways they will anticipate those of the next generation of air transports. You may also note that a second, or perhaps third generation of the space shuttle might well be a global transport, so that no place on earth would be more than an hour from any other.

Those elements in the basic design philosophy of the space shuttle to which we are looking for cost reductions are aircraft manufacturing techniques, aircraft development test procedures, maximum flexibility for multiple use and volume production, long life components for repetitive reuse and airline type maintenance and handling procedures for economy of operation. So you see that the transfers from aviation to space are going to be very extensive.

A major point of difference however, will be in the manner of launching this craft, for it will be powered by rocket engines and take off vertically from a launching pad. We expect that some day these could be located

at many major airports since the cleared distance around the vehicle will need only to be in the order of a mile in radius. Many of the present jet ports could be used, especially those which have water on one or more sides.

A flight crew will fly the shuttle into earth orbit to dock with the space station. It will deliver and receive payload, perform its other functions which may include satellite maintenance and repair or space rescue, and return through the atmosphere for a horizontal landing at its take-off point on a runway which would not need to be over 10,000 or 12,000 feet long. This flight pattern creates a different noise situation than that of present aircraft. There is, or course, the huge sound of the blast-off which lasts for a few seconds but is localized, to the airport itself. The next sound is generated as the shuttle comes back into the atmosphere but this is hardly heard on earth as the transition to subsonic speed occurs at an altitude of about 100,000 feet. As the craft approaches earth, its speed is subsonic, and its landing sounds will probably be less than those of large jets.

As presently conceived, the space shuttle will consist of an orbiter vehicle containing crew, passenger, and cargo accommodations as well as power and fuel for orbital and landing phases, and one or more booster elements which will carry the bulk of the fuel necessary to achieve orbit. The boosters will also be manned and powered for return to earth and horizontal airport landing. Thus, the total vehicle is reusable. Some concepts propose identical basic configurations for the orbiter vehicle and the boosters, thus achieving production economies. The vehicle is being designed to carry a flight crew and up to 50,000 pounds of cargo and or passengers into and out of orbit, with a 10,000 cubic foot internal payload volume. A nominal orbital altitude of 270 nautical miles and 55 degree inclination is being used as a baseline.

These design parameters permit great operational flexibility so that this craft will be able to take off in any direction.

Designing the internal compartment to accommodate containerized cargo will assure that a wide variety of payloads can be carried.

The vehicle configuration will provide crew and passenger safety comparable to that of current commercial jets. Extremely reliable systems will operate redundantly where feasible; nonredundant systems will be operated well within established operational limits. This approach should allow for the graceful degradation of any system, precluding catastrophic failure and allowing time for a safe return to a landing site of passengers, crew, and vehicle.

The technology of all weather terminal flight control extending from the transition to subsonic flight at 100,000 feet through the final approach and landing of the several configurations under study is expected to be well in hand within the next several years. Extensive flight data from three lifting body configurations in regimes ranging from low supersonic speeds to approach and landing, show the feasibility of these designs. Related work on regular aircraft is continuing to investigate powered landings, automated control systems and operational problems. Results from this work will apply directly to the space shuttle.

The space shuttle will require additions to current technology in such areas as (1) efficient lightweight structures; (2) stage separation methods, (3) reusable, long-lived rocket propulsion, (4) lightweight airbreathing propulsion for terminal flight and landing, (5) automatic all-weather landing systems. In addition, detailed configuration analysis and wind-tunnel testing are needed to determine vehicle elements that can fly satisfactorily in all flight modes, considering different mission modes, variable cargo loads, and the large weights and areas as-

sociated with rocket engines at the base of the vehicles. Pertinent research is being expanded with a view to being ready to initiate a prototype design a little over a year from now.

The technology for thermal protection during entry into earth atmosphere for blunt vehicles is in hand as a result of the work done on Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo. Velocities up to 36,000 feet per second, which produce temperatures in the order of 18,000 degrees Fahrenheit are successfully withstood by ablative materials formed by any of three or four compounds and reinforced with glass fibers.

For reusable entry vehicles such as the space shuttle, studies are being made of re-radiative heat shield materials and design concepts that can withstand a number of entries without replacement or refurbishment of the structure. Considerable progress has been made in adapting high-temperature materials including refractory metals such as columbium, as well as more conventional materials such as titanium and some nickel alloys, to this use. Composites of graphite and carbides are also being examined. The combined use of re-radiation with heat sink or convective cooling techniques for hot spots seems to promise an indefinitely reusable vehicle.

The high pressure, staged combustion rocket engines for the space shuttle will differ from the expendable engines used in our previous launch vehicles since they will be designed to have many of the characteristics of the engines in use in modern jet aircraft, including stability over a wide range of operating conditions, variable thrust to permit vehicle control, time between overhauls measured in hours of operation, high performance and operational dependability.

The choice of liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen as propellants is based on our experience in Apollo, particularly on our ability to handle the propellants safely and relatively easily on the ground during loading and transferring. We feel that it will be possible to load these vehicles directly from tank trucks at the launch pad, thus greatly decreasing both facility and handling costs.

Another great advantage is that there are no toxic products or components of these chemicals and this propulsion system will not add to the pollution of the atmosphere. For simplicity and ease of ground handling we plan to use these propellants throughout the vehicle system, including using  $H_2$  for the subsonic engines for landing.

Onboard systems will provide the crew with necessary indications to make proper flight decisions. Today, there are some 20,000 people at Cape Kennedy who are directly involved with the checkout and launch of the Saturn V. Obviously, the space shuttle checkout and launch systems are going to have to be quite different if we are to radically lower operating costs. The approach we are studying employs complete automation of the option of crew override and leads to an airline type operation.

Some recent breakthroughs in electronics can supply the tools we need to achieve these which can provide as many as 1250 bits goals. The large-scale integrated circuits of memory in less than half a cubic centimeter of space are one of the tools which will be employed. Another is thin film memories. These advances will make possible the self-checking subsystems which we will need in the space shuttle. With immense capacity for logic, memory and multiple redundancy in a small volume, the self-checking black-box is going to be a practical reality.

A continuing goal in electronics is to perform more functions with less power, volume, and weight. Microelectronic circuits having a thousand active elements on a chip 150 mils (.001 inch) square are now available. It is estimated that through continued R&D, a million active elements can be placed on a

chip 500 miles square. This will require new processes, such as laser or electronic beam techniques, to replace photographic etching and the development of automated design, fabrication, and testing methods.

The necessity for new design for such electronic equipment creates the opportunity for an important advance toward simplicity. At the present time each of our subsystems, be it guidance, communications or engines, is interconnected by cables having literally thousands of wires. Not only does that represent one of the major components of weight, but it is by far the largest contributor to unreliability. We are ready for a breakthrough and I believe that there can and should be no more than six wires, in one connector, going into or out of any black-box. These six wires might be allocated in the following manner: one wire would connect to a small computer inside the black-box which evaluates all the information from the circuits inside and tells the pilot one of three things—"I am well," or "I am sick" or "I am about to get sick." The second wire will carry all signals into the black-box. The third will carry all of the output signals or responses. The fourth and the fifth will be used for a standard power supply—all electrical equipment will be designed to operate off a 110 volt 400 cycle bus; any different power required will be generated by conversion within the black-box. The sixth wire is a spare. It will be used for something which we have not yet thought of.

The philosophy which will permit this concept is relatively simple—to assign the responsibility for the welfare and checkout of each subsystem to that subsystem. The microminiaturization which has been so notably advanced by the demands of space, now makes it possible and practical to build a small general purpose computer in a volume of about 10 cubic centimeters with enough logic and enough multiple redundancy to make it practical to use it to (1) self-check the internal circuits and (2) to provide time division multiplexing with proper addressing so that six wires can indeed effectively provide all the communications and power connections required.

Another ideal use for a computer on board the space shuttle is to throw switches. As a program switching network a computer could not only flip hundreds of switches according to preset programs but could also assure that they were actually in proper position. Some of the switching functions in Apollo are controlled by computers on the ground, but that task as well as the manual task of throwing and monitoring the 1000 switches in the cockpit can easily and effectively be taken over by a computer on board.

Using a computer inside the cockpit can also greatly simplify the control panel, which in spacecraft now have five times as many switches and instruments as a 707 or a DC8. For the future, I envisage a spacecraft command panel which contains 3 cathode ray displays, one digital, input-output circuit which we call a DSKY, and an On/Off switch for the computer. Two of the cathode ray displays would be used for control information, one for navigation and one for attitude control. These would operate interchangeably so that if one failed all information would be available from the other. These would replace the conventional "8 ball" attitude display systems which, being mechanical, are subject to breakdown. The cathode ray tube, on the other hand, has turned out to be one of our most reliable and long-lasting electronic products, as we have learned from the fine performance of our home television sets. The third cathode ray display would give the pilot information about any part of the total system or his flight plan by displaying the output of his computer. He can ask for any information by punching in the proper code for any system or subsystem, or internal program. Stored in the computer

memory is his checklist for each part of the flight, alternatives available to him in the event of an equipment malfunction, and such special information as propellant reserve, plot of flight path angle, and operational configuration of subsystems.

The electronic advances which are going to permit onboard checkout and control should make the space shuttle much simpler to operate than present commercial jets. Further, our design criteria require that all subsystems should be designed to continue to operate after the failure of any part except for the structure and to gracefully degrade in performance with subsequent failures. Electronic systems will be designed to give adequate warning of potential failures, to continue operation after the failure of two critical components, and to fail safe after any failure.

Present inertial guidance systems are gimbaled, platform mounted gyroscopes and accelerometers. In the lunar module we have introduced a strapdown guidance system which replaces the mechanical gimbals with a somewhat more complex electronic system. It has demonstrated more than enough accuracy and computer capability to carry out the space shuttle missions. These strapdown systems with advanced reference devices, the next generation of gyroscopes and accelerometers with improved life and accuracy, should be capable of meeting all our requirements with increased reliability and life and a significant reduction in cost.

Star, planet, and horizons are basic references for navigation and present systems use gimbaled trackers for attitude, reference position alignment, and velocity measurement. I expect that we will continue to use this system in our shuttle and space station. However research is under way in several laboratories on holographic pattern recognition techniques for star patterns. This new reference system would have no moving parts and give three axis reference on any spacecraft orientation. This would also be true of aircraft navigation techniques. In another area, the technology of laser radars for rendezvous and docking, which is of course also applicable in clear weather to pinpoint landing, has been demonstrated in the laboratory for a range of 65 miles and a docking accuracy of one inch. Efforts in the next five years should increase its range to over 200 miles, and make it an effective competitor with our present radio frequency radars.

Crew and passenger compartments will be maintained in "shirtsleeve" environment. Spacesuits will not be required. As a matter of fact they are not now used in the Apollo program except for extra vehicular activity and in the event of certain emergencies, which, happily, we have not yet experienced. The atmosphere of oxygen and nitrogen in the space shuttle at a nominal pressure of 10 psia and a maximum flight load of three times earth gravity, will allow any reasonably healthy individual to travel in space shuttle without prior conditions.

Communications with the ground can be similar to those now provided by FAA Air Traffic Control, but for orbital operations will, I expect, be carried out through the use of communications satellites, thus greatly simplifying the ground network requirements.

Our planning projections forecast that the space shuttle will have a useful life of 100 missions or more. As is characteristic of aircraft maintenance today, we would expect to replace subsystems, particularly engines and thrusters on a progressive basis.

Launch operations will be simplified by the onboard system diagnostic instrumentation so that only vehicle erection, propellant loading and final boarding of payload and passengers will be necessary. Pre-launch checkout will be carried out on-board by the pilots.

There are several areas which we are studying. One is whether the shuttle should be designed with self-ferrying capability, so

that if it lands at an airport other than its home base, it will be able to return home in a subsonic flight mode under its own power.

Another is whether the reusable boost elements should have the capability to carry out their missions in an automatic mode, including a completely automatic landing system.

A third is whether the shuttle would have a "go around" capability in order to improve our ability to land under all conditions. We intend in any event to include a powered landing capability which appears to be desirable to increase the ease of control and to improve performance in winds and gusts. This capability would be compatible with both powered landing and self-ferry ability.

In any event our designs are providing landing visibility at least as good as that of high performance jet and SST aircraft and landing characteristics and handling qualities not more demanding than those of commercial jets.

One other feature we are incorporating in our design is that wherever possible modules be used which can be replaced when the technology advances, without redesigning the total vehicle. We know that changes will occur, but since we do not know which components will be affected, we are trying to introduce standard mountings and interconnections so that systems and subsystems can be replaced without basic configuration changes.

I believe that by the time we can produce the space shuttle that we will be receiving so many benefits from our exploration of space and of the moon, that many nations will want to use these economical space shuttles either by direct purchase or through chartering or leasing them from other nations.

If, as we expect, this shuttle will be the progenitor of a global transport, it will surely be necessary that multi-company and probably multi-national use of the vehicle be facilitated.

The exploration of space will of course, be an international activity. As space engineering capability increases many more nations will take more active parts. It is interesting here to draw an analogy between space and aviation. Although only a few countries of the world manufacture the bulk of air transportation equipment, it is used by almost every nation for its own individual purposes. Within the next decade, no matter which nations provide the mechanical equipment for getting into space, that equipment will be used by means of one or another kind of arrangement, to satisfy the space ambitions of all nations.

No really meaningful estimate of the price of an operational vehicle can yet be made, since the number of vehicles that will be needed is not yet clear. That number is a function, not only of the various jobs it will be called upon to perform, but also of the existence of the system itself. After all, no one needed a telephone, a computer or an airplane before they existed. However, we expect the development cost of the first prototypes to be about six billion dollars spread over a six year period.

I fully expect that by the end of the next decade a number of the people in this room will have flown into and out of space. Consider with me for a moment the possibility of travelling in the space shuttle from, say, Amsterdam to Los Angeles sometime in the 1980's. You will board the regularly scheduled vertical take-off jitney in downtown Amsterdam to fly quickly to Schiphol airport. There, in the center of the field, the Los Angeles bound shuttle will be erected, being fueled with liquid oxygen and hydrogen from tank trucks alongside. As the fueling operation is completed, your luggage will be put into the baggage pod, and with your flight companions, you will enter the passenger module. The passenger compartment will be swung into place in

the orbiter section of the shuttle. The flight crew will be conducting their final checkout of the vehicle, querying their on-board digital computer about the condition and configuration of each system and subsystem.

Passenger seats will swivel so that you will be sitting erect until power is applied, at which time the seats will recline so that the gravity load, not more than three times that of earth, will be more easily accommodated. Your seat will be cushioned and provided with its own shock absorbers to lessen the load.

The shuttle will fly west south west on a sub-orbital course as you attain maximum speed of approximately 12,000 miles per hour at 100 miles altitude. Seven or 8 minutes after lift-off from Amsterdam, the booster element will peel off and return for a regular runway landing.

Although there was a huge explosive sound at the airport as the rockets ignited, it lasted only a few seconds, and you will have heard no sound, since it was far below your vehicle. As a matter of fact your whole trip will be practically noiseless. You will not hear the sound of entry into the atmosphere, but neither will people on the ground as that entry will be made at about 400,000 feet above the earth.

While the passenger compartment will have no windows, television cameras mounted at strategic positions on the exterior of the orbiter vehicle will bring unobstructed panoramic views of the earth and of the sky into the cabin. As you leave the pad you will see the great thrusts of fire which propel your craft, and the blue of the Atlantic and the glistening clouds will occupy the television screens as you out-distance the sun on your westward journey.

While you are in flight you will, of course, be weightless. A cabin attendant will assist you to float about the cabin, or you may choose to remain in your seat which can now stay in the reclined position, or not, just as you like. Probably you will want to experiment with this new sensation. Certainly our astronauts seem to enjoy it. However, as descent begins, you will have to return to your seat and belt yourself in—just as in other aircraft. Your views of the sunlit surface will be memorable as the earth seems to come up to meet you at 11,500 miles per hour. For this flight has not only been noiseless and weightless, but there has been no vibration and no feeling of motion after the gravity pull at the launching. Upon entry into the atmosphere, however, you will again encounter the forces of the earth and your shock absorbing seats will return you to a reclining position.

Your next sensation will occur when the subsonic jet engines take-over for your landing on the runway at Los Angeles International Airport. Air traffic control will be programmed, using precise fixes on altitude and position verified by communications satellites, so you will not encounter any traffic delays. The sound of your craft coming in for its landing will actually be less than that of current jets.

Your landing at Los Angeles International Airport will be a subsonic jet runway landing and you will board the scheduled vertical take-off jitney there for its quick flight to downtown Los Angeles. Assuming that you took off from Amsterdam at noon on Monday, you would arrive in Los Angeles before 5 a.m. Monday, in less than an hour's travel time—in time for a swim before breakfast. And if you were really pressed for time and had to return to Amsterdam as soon as possible, you could, theoretically, leave the west coast after noon and be back in Amsterdam before the end of that Monday, after one hour of flight and eight hours of sun time.

We see no technological barriers to this kind of development. One lesson we have learned from the lunar landing, "impossible" as it seemed to most people less than a decade

ago, is that no technological development can really be called "impossible" any more.

This brief description of some of the products, results, and future goals of our National Space Program only hints at its significance in the life of every man.

Who in 1913, ten years after the invention of the airplane, would have guessed the far reaching and myriad changes which that single concept brought about? We can guess, extrapolate, wonder, but our imaginations are taxed when we consider that the space program opens so many new avenues at the same time.

Let me try in conclusion to outline what it is possible to accomplish in space by 1970 and 1989, using what we have learned from the Apollo Program as a base.

If we pursue a reasonably bold, aggressive program, by the end of 1979 we would have modular space stations in synchronous, equatorial orbit, in low altitude polar and in low inclination earth orbits, as well as having our first station in polar orbit around the moon.

The number of people involved may give some idea of the amount of activity I foresee. By the mid 1980's there could be as many as 100 people either living in or in transit through the space stations in low earth orbit, perhaps 50 living in the station in synchronous orbit and perhaps 25 in the space station orbiting the moon. Using basically the same or similar equipment, there may be at least one surface base on the moon with 50 people living there. Nearly daily shuttle flights to the low earth orbit station would be required to support these people and to provide for satellite repair and maintenance.

Nuclear powered space shuttles would be traveling between lunar orbit and earth orbit and between earth orbit and synchronous orbit. They might be flying once every two weeks to the moon and about once every two weeks to synchronous orbit.

There would, of course, be shuttles operating between lunar orbit and the lunar base and between the lunar orbiting station and exploratory sites on the moon.

By the end of 1989, if we have reasonable space activity, and I think, to some extent independent of how much is done in the 70's, I would expect that men would have established their first colony on the moon, and the first permanent base on Mars. And they would be beginning to fly out to the farther planets.

The kind of resources involved are similar to those applied to the Apollo Program.

The key to this program is the space shuttle. It opens a completely new era of transportation on the earth and in space.

It is literally man's key to the solar system. Thank you.

#### A NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN—NOW

**HON. J. J. PICKLE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the need for a national transportation plan grows with each technological development we make in the industry. The jumbo jets will be a reality soon and for almost 4 years we have been hearing the laments from our airports regarding their overcrowded and even unsafe traffic conditions. And air transportation is but one part of our jigsaw puzzle approach to the entire transportation picture.

Hopefully, the Department of Transportation will soon have ready their long-promised national transportation plan.

The need is dramatically portrayed in the accompanying article in the Evening Star, and I insert it as this time:

#### AIR JAM REQUIRES NATIONAL SOLUTION

(By William Hines)

The United States is about as well prepared for the era of the jumbo jets, which dawned this past week, as the State of California is for a force 7.5 earthquake. The difference between the new planes and a major natural disaster is that something could have been done to get ready for the former.

For almost four years now, airport authorities in every big city have been on notice that airplanes twice the size of those in general service could be flying by the end of the 1960s. With a special flight from Seattle to New York last Tuesday, the Boeing 747 superplane kept its date with the nation, but its punctuality was not reciprocated.

On the ground and in the air—but on the ground particularly—the 747 poses some problems which will be overcome in the long run only by development of a comprehensive national transportation policy. Such a policy does not exist today, and nothing in the mumbblings and fumbblings of Washington officialdom provides a basis for hope that one will emerge soon.

There is a mistaken impression, widely held, that the appearance of a new airplane carrying many more people somewhat faster than older craft necessarily constitutes an advance in intercity transportation. As good a case could be made for exactly the opposite point of view.

The basic problem in air transportation today is that most people who think about it at all regard it as a separate entity, somehow different from ground transportation. But a moment's thought will correct this notion, if one concedes at the very outset that the sole function of transportation is to move people (and goods, to be sure) from one place to another.

The name of the game, as played by someone traveling from coast to coast, is not to get from Sea-Tac Airport on Puget Sound to J. F. Kennedy on Jamaica Bay, but from say the L. C. Smith Tower in Seattle to 49th and Madison in Manhattan.

Viewed in this light, the airport is seen for what it really is: Not a point of origin or termination, but an interface between transportation modes—the place when one exchanges a 60-mph conveyance operation on the ground for one that travels through the air 10 times as fast. The longest journey, as someone once said, starts with a single step.

Somehow or other, this has never been officially recognized, although there is a wide awareness of this fact at subordinate echelons in the federal Department of Transportation. But prevailing transport policy, such as it is, holds an airplane to be a thing apart and the operation of an airport an end in itself, rather than simply a means to an end.

Even the airport is fragmented, with the Federal Government helping out with runways and navigation aids, but leaving up to airport authorities (usually the cities) creation and maintenance of terminal facilities—and to still someone else the furnishing of ground transportation to the city center. These things the localities provide according to their means, and often as not grudgingly.

The fiction that terminal facilities are solely the business of the big city nearest an airport is as ludicrous as the myth that airports are end-points in journeys from city A to city B. The mobility of Americans—particularly Americans traveling on business, but pleasure trippers also—makes every major airport a national rather than a local concern.

Take the case of a family from Concord, Mass., on a vacation trip to Disneyland, or

an engineer from Lexington with business in San Bernardino. Why should the cities of Boston and Los Angeles be responsible for the dispatch and reception of these travelers, none of whom originates or terminates in either city?

Another apt case in point is O'Hare Airport outside Chicago, the world's busiest in terms of scheduled passenger aircraft movements. More than half the people using O'Hare neither originate nor terminate anywhere near Chicago, but use the field simply to change airplanes. Atlanta is an even more extreme example; one of the busiest airports in the country, it's overwhelmingly a junction point for people who both start and end their voyages somewhere else.

Yet both Chicago and Atlanta are responsible for the operation of their airports, and as far as the federal government is concerned its obligations end where the runway meets the ramp. Among the big airports of the U.S., the chief exceptions are Washington National and Dulles International, 30 miles outside the capital. These are operated by the Federal Aviation Administration in the absence of a competent municipal or interstate authority to run them.

Most of the big airports in the United States are only now reaching the point where they can cope with the traffic generated by the first wave of jet transports, which came along 10 years ago—and now another wave has moved onto the scene. Another big airport improvement program, this time with more massive and comprehensive federal support, is clearly indicated at the dawn of the jumbo era.

#### CHANGES TAKING PLACE IN OUR NATION'S COLLEGES

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are changes taking place on the campuses of our Nation's colleges and universities. These are deeper and more sophisticated than the spectacular demonstrations and malicious conduct which makes the front pages.

Ronald J. Maselka, an able young reporter on the Washington staff of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, has made a tour of 10 college campuses and come up with some in-depth impressions of what is going on. Following is the third group of stories in his recent excellent series: PART XI—CAMPUS PAPERS, POLITICIANS AIM TO CAST OFF TRADITIONAL ROLES

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

NEW YORK, October 14.—Mention "student power" today and visions of violent campus radicals immediately come to mind.

But other forms of student power are developing, partially as a response to this dramatic din of protest, partially from a growing acknowledgment that students are genuinely concerned with their education and its future and deserve a role in many university matters. Sometimes this means a louder student voice; sometimes, a student vote.

This development of democratic student power is best seen in the proliferation of committees spouting up at many institutions, including Columbia, Fordham and City College.

But just as the degree of violence and the types of issues raised vary from school to school, so does the extent of student participation in policymaking roles. The range

of involvement, however, is diverse, from university fiscal matters to curriculum and discipline.

One effect of campus unrest has been a large-scale re-examination of the question of university governance, from boards of trustees down.

#### TWO ELEMENTS OF STUDENT POWER

Amid the campus complex too are two traditional elements of student power—student governments and campus newspapers—which are assuming, or trying to assume, larger roles.

Campus newspapers no longer are a collection of sometimes dated facts and lukewarm editorials. While the "source of information" role is still important, today's campus newspaper seeks to play a more diverse role, particularly through strong editorial positions.

Student governments also are fighting the image of impotency that traditionally saw campus politicians as dance organizers at the least, distributors of funds to other school organizations at the most.

Generally, today's student editors and politicians are liberal, reform-minded.

"They are activists, rather than extremists," a Fordham University spokesman explained.

As Fordham's student body president, William J. Toppeta, a senior from Schenectady, said: "We want to use the channels available to accomplish change. But if those channels get clogged, we will take our causes to the streets in demonstrations without violence."

#### UNIVERSITYWIDE TREND

The trend toward being universitywide in scope applies to both student government structures and newspapers.

Columbia University, for instance, has a University Senate, which includes faculty, administrators, students and alumni. The old university council and student government have been abolished.

Fordham now has a separate university-wide Faculty Senate and Student Senate, but is studying proposals for a merged unit. In the meantime, Fordham has a united student government, representing students at both its Bronx and Manhattan campuses.

Major student newspapers—even at private schools like Georgetown, Columbia, Fordham and Harvard—are independent of university control. Some are private corporations, even fiscally independent. But even those receiving university subsidies report they are free of university censorship.

#### CAUGHT IN-BETWEEN

Indications are, however, that most student readers expect their papers to be a sort of buffer between the extreme left, like the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), and the extreme right, like, the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF).

For instance, noting that Harvard's "Crimson" leaned too much to the left during last spring's disturbances, Carl L. Lindhal, a Harvard senior from Glenview, Ill., noted: "Most people are aware that the Crimson is not exactly a responsible paper in reporting the facts."

#### A CREDIBILITY GAP

In this respect, student editors find their readers to be their greatest censors.

Acknowledging that the Crimson "has lost its legitimacy over the years," David Blumenthal, new editorial board chairman of the Crimson, explained that he is "unsure of its influence."

He said the Crimson's "obvious biases" last spring "alienated a lot of faculty and administration."

According to Robert Papper, a Columbia graduate student, the campus newspaper, *The Spectator*, also "lost a lot of respect", during the last two years' disturbances because its "leaning to the left . . . tended to destroy its credibility."

#### COMPETITION, ANYONE?

One safeguard against oneness is that most campus newspapers determine editorial policy on an issue-by-issue basis through editorial board meetings. Other avenues are providing forums for diverse student views, through columnists and letters to the editor.

Another route to campus attention is proposed by the "Harvard Independent," a new paper being produced this year.

Morris B. Abram Jr., a Harvard senior and president of the Independent, said it will specialize in in-depth analysis and coverage of the major issues.

While the campus newspapers are well-read, student government leaders face an uphill fight in gaining campus influence.

Much of its influence comes to bear in joint actions with faculty and administration, and student government remains a key source of moderate communication.

As William H. Guenther, a New York City sophomore and a delegate to Harvard's undergraduate council, explained: "Much of our work is done behind the scenes . . . But you have to prove you are effective to gain student support."

#### CLEARING THE AIR

In a similar vein, Sharon R. Winnett, a Fordham student government vice president, explained that student government's main task is to relate itself "to students in a more meaningful way."

To stimulate discussion, Fordham's student government plans to take periodic computerized surveys of students on key issues and have the results published in the campus newspaper.

Nothing that student government projects involve much planning and work, Miss Winnett added: "It's a long, not very dramatic process."

By themselves, campus newspapers and student governments can't counteract violence. But by keeping the university community informed and suggesting alternative directions, indications are they can join efforts to improve the campus atmosphere.

#### PART XII—SIMPLE AWARENESS IS NOT ENOUGH: STUDENTS WANT THINGS CHANGED

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

NEW YORK, October 15.—For decades, thousands of Americans discovered the college campus provided meteoric challenges to their inbred religious, political and social beliefs.

In the past, these confrontations with conflicting ideas seemed to be resolved generally on an individual, private basis. Today's campus turmoil, however, goes beyond this personal grappling with problems to take on an almost group-like public examination of conscience.

College students before were aware of the inequities of American society—for example, the gaps between rich and poor, ghetto and suburbia. This awareness, however, was coupled with a belief that with orderly development and time the system would gradually improve things.

#### STUDENTS GO DEEPER

Many of today's college students, however, express a desire to go beyond simple awareness of the problems and take up the impatient cry: "We should do something."

The extent of this activism varies, of course, from the radical approach of the New Left to the reforms of the liberals and the subdued concern of the majority.

Many students acknowledge there's "a lot of the follow-the-crowd stuff" about all this questioning. And there is a host of sociological and psychological factors commonly cited as contributing to today's student attitudes.

For instance, this is a generation that does not remember a time without television, a time without space shots, a time without civil rights movements. It's a generation that

does not identify with gradual progress because it is so attuned to speed and quick change.

#### LEARNED MORE ABOUT PEOPLE

All this too has brought a changing definition of education.

As Robert Papper, a Columbia University graduate student, explained: "Education today is not just sitting in a classroom listening to a lecturer and then regurgitating it back on an exam. That's memorization, not learning." During the spring 1968 disruptions at Columbia, he said, he learned "more about people" than he had in the classroom.

There's a general feeling too that raising these questions and calling for actions and solutions are a vital part of education today. This is coupled by a growing belief that you can't separate the classroom and the environment.

As one Fordham student noted: "College prods people to think. So you do. And you make a suggestion. But when you get no answer, where do you go from there?"

#### LITTLE THINGS ACCUMULATE

Today's students are heading in many different directions.

But is there a specific conscious point when a student jumps from a simple awareness of injustice to an active effort to do something about it?

Not generally. This trend of reform and rebellion seems to be more of a metamorphosis than a transformation.

As Sharon R. Winnett, a senior at Fordham's Thomas More College, explained: "It was just a growing accumulation of little points . . . then you start seeing things."

Becoming a reformer is an individual thing and some students do remember a specific experience or set of experiences that set them thinking in a liberal vein.

The example of others has a lot to do with it.

#### START QUESTIONING

As William J. Toppeta, a Fordham College senior from Schenectady, recalled: "When you arrive at college, your mind is opened or expanded. You are hearing things you didn't hear in high school and you start to question things."

What started him asking "who I was and what I was doing here," he said, came when he was a freshman ROTC cadet. During a parade ground inspection, he said, one peace protester with a placard kept following the drilling ROTC contingent to the jeers of all the student onlookers.

The example of one dedicated person set of Bill Toppeta's thinking. He is now student body president at Fordham and the jeering majority of three years ago is now urging that ROTC status at the university be re-examined.

And Charles Haseloff, a 1968 graduate at City College of New York and now a New York University graduate student, recalled an incident in his high school cafeteria when a short teacher stood on a chair to make an announcement and was applauded away by the students.

#### THINGS CAN BE CHANGED

"I was 14 then," he said, "and I remember I thought that something terrible was going to happen. I could not conceive of students taking this attitude . . . of open, mass disrespect. This was just inconceivable to me . . ."

"From then on," he continued, "you suddenly see that you grew up in a certain way and you see that all things aren't created by God, that some things aren't natural law, that they can be different."

For instance, he noted, having grown up thinking Negroes are inferior "and then to be confronted with the fact that they are not, results in questioning. Once you loosen one nail in the structure, the whole thing loosens and begins to shake."

## UNLEARNING PROCESS

Probably a more common experience was that of Terrence L. Chorba, a Columbia College junior from a conservative background in the Bronx, who said he "went through an unlearning process" his freshman year.

Part of what happened, he said, was the realization that absolute truth is an elusive thing and "truth is not what exists in your mind."

In the long run, this meant a willingness to listen to both sides of an issue and make a decision himself.

Another partial explanation of campus unrest, then, is found in this same decision by so many to re-examine and question where they are going each day.

## PART XIII—STUDENTS TOUCHED BY BLEAK VIEW FROM THE COLLEGES' IVORY TOWERS

(By Ronald J. Masekka)

NEW YORK, October 16.—If you want an explanation of student demands for relevance—in their education and from the university—simply:

1—Walk the city streets that intersect the City College of New York on the west side of Harlem.

2—Look down at Harlem from Columbia University's perch on Morningside Heights.

3—Peer through the wrought iron gates on Fordham University's verdant uptown campus at the concrete and asphalt many have charitably called the "changing Bronx."

Then one can sense the motivation behind growing demands for the ivory tower university to extend a hand to the surrounding community.

This need for help is most recognized by minority group students, the blacks and Puerto Ricans who grew up looking at these schools from the outside as their hope for a meaningful future.

Visits to these New York schools show that campus unrest is not racially monolithic.

"There are two very different kinds of movements," explained Charles Haseloff, a graduate student at New York University.

## STILL STRIVING FOR RIGHTS

"There is the white struggle, in essence a sort of frantic kind of reaction to this loss, this destruction of ideals, the disillusionment of the American dream in the face of technical and international conflict.

"And there are the black people," he continued, "still striving for the civil and political rights that white students and their fathers and grandfathers achieved 200 years ago."

Like at most public and private universities, Negroes and Puerto Ricans are a minority at Columbia, Fordham and City College. There are indications here also that minority group students are "doing their own thing" with campus unrest, because of their special concerns.

In past incidents at Fordham, Columbia and City College, black students have been involved in their own protests, sometimes accepting, sometimes rejecting white radical support.

## THE DANGER IN SEPARATISM

Walk into the cafeteria at Fordham's Student Union Building and this separatism is evident. One sees "The Table" at the front of the massive room, populated by eight blacks. Elsewhere are white faces, with an occasional black one.

The danger in this separatism is that it leaves so much room for misunderstanding.

One white Columbia student noted that he sensed, for instance, a growing inability to disagree with his black friends for fear of being branded "anti-Negro."

"The blacks are using a degree of racism against the whites in a reaction to the racism used against them," he said.

The visitor's immediate reaction to "The Table" is that this is a gesture of defiance.

## CITES HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Many studies stress, however, that this tendency is not for the sake of racial separatism or black superiority, but is more of a defense mechanism of a minority seeking cohesiveness and direction.

William J. Wright, a Fordham sophomore from Brooklyn, explains "The Table" as "a social thing because we are such a small part of the population here."

A product of what he calls "the black experience in high school," Mr. Wright notes that blacks who went to parochial high schools had "the white high school experience."

Noting that these blacks tend to be less militant because "they are used to going to school with a lot of whites," Mr. Wright said he and other blacks and Puerto Ricans find college provides their first experience at being a school minority.

## WAS "LOST" AT FORDHAM

He said he "didn't like it" at Fordham during his freshman year because he got lost among the white students, losing his sense of identity and direction.

The table must be understood in this perspective, he explained.

"A black student is interested primarily in bettering his school for the black students," he added, noting the task specifically is "how to make Fordham ready for black students and help them stay."

The issues that concern white protesters are secondary for blacks, he added.

"The army, the draft, ROTC and many of these other things are so far remote from the educational problem. With us, it's simply a different order of importance to the struggle."

## DEBATE WITHIN MINORITIES

Involvement with whites on campus-wide issues, he added, ranges "as far as you are willing to go individually."

There is a debate within the minority communities over whether separatism is good or bad, whether it is better to work within the system or outside it.

Those who, like Fordham's William Wright, think blacks "need to be militant to get what they want." Others believe an integrated effort is best in the long run.

But working through the system takes time and, as in the case of white protesters, impatience is a big factor with black students. They want changes now, not in generations to come.

"Our militancy isn't aimless," Mr. Wright explained. "We know what we want and our task is to get them (the administrators and faculty) to see the reasons why."

## IS THIS THE PROPER WAY?

The demands are focusing on ethnic studies, sometimes called black studies or Afro-American studies, and increasing the number of minority students on campus.

But black studies is a developing notion and a division in the Negro community also exists on whether this is the proper route. Some say it tends too much toward introspection. Others say it is needed to understand the special problems of minorities and their proper place in history.

While many schools have created special Afro-American departments, Columbia is still studying the proposal. Another avenue that receives support is to have black-related courses in every department, rather than combined in one department.

## MORE BLACK RECRUITING

Universities have responded to the demands for greater racial balance, one administrator noted, because of the realization that a main problem of minority students stems from the generally lower quality of precollege education they receive.

Accelerating recruiting of black students, liaison with guidance counselors to help

identify and prepare them early in high school, finding financial aid, providing special orientation programs and continuing tutorial help are part of the university response. Many minority students already on campus return to their high schools and communities to help in this recruitment.

One crucial issue is how the university is going to broaden its access to minority members.

## FAVORS UNIVERSAL ENROLLMENT

Acknowledging that the "United States has very nearly achieved universal access to a college education for its white population . . . and there is a need to extend to blacks and Puerto Ricans a privilege that whites already possess." Political Science Prof. Stanley Feingold of city college believes that the university has to "maintain high quality while allowing opportunity for all."

He, for instance, favors universal enrollment—finding a place in some college for everybody—but opposes open admissions—finding a place in a specific college for anybody.

Instead of having separate admissions standards for whites and minorities, some educators favor a lottery system.

## ASK RESEARCH IN PROBLEMS

While this debate rages, others suggest community efforts at lower levels ranging from converting some high schools into college preparatory institutions to massive preschool education programs.

Many administrators also point to university research—in urban sociology, crime, delinquency, the courts, drug problems—expertise on things like business practices for local merchants and legal advice to ghetto families, plus more diplomatic approaches to university expansion and its effects on area residents as other indications of the urban university's growing awareness of its community attachment.

The special concern of the vocal minority groups is guaranteeing that the university maintains that awareness.

## PART XIV—NEW CAMPUS PHENOMENON: FAITH AND MYSTICISM REPLACE REASON

(By Donald J. Masekka)

NEW YORK, October 17.—It's impossible to gauge its depth but there are indications that years of campus violence are beginning to take their emotional toll of some students.

What becomes perceptible is more a series of different reactions, rather than a pattern, that alone do not warrant a conclusion that the worst is over or that it's all downhill now.

But for some students, it is downhill.

Part of it is the mental scar left by the letdown after weeks of emotional peaking for building takeovers, police busts, mass arrests, endless meeting and talking. Part of it is explainable by the view in retrospect that so much effort accomplished so little.

The war is still there, for instance.

The reaction is most visibly seen in the division of the New Left into radical factions and the growing structure of right-wing groups, like the Young Americans for Freedom.

In between, there are a host of reactions, particularly noticeable at places like Columbia University and City College of New York, which had violence, school shutdowns, changes in presidents within the last two years.

## QUESTION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

"I really have to question what we accomplished," said Terry L. Chorba, a junior at Columbia who was on both sides of the barricades in 1968 and was injured in the police action.

Now, he finds himself in the "political gray area, not politically affiliated but not disinterested either . . . not taking a stand except a stand against radical violence and total apathy."

Looking back, he said, he realized that revolutionary activity is not progress. "We are not stopping the war by shutting down the university," he said.

Robert Papper, a Columbia graduate student, said he too has a feeling that there are many students who feel that "now that this has happened, let's make some progress."

Acknowledging that some activists have "become exhausted, tired, sort of retired," he said: "You see some students who were active but are not now politically interested. They are doing a lot of thinking."

#### TIME TO STOP, ABSORB CHANGES

A similar prognosis was given by I. E. Levine, an assistant to the president at City College:

"I've a feeling that people—students and faculty—are about ready to stop and absorb some of the changes that have taken place. I think there's a feeling of emotional weariness on the part of a lot of people."

A pre-med student at Columbia voiced "plain frustration . . . that with all that and all the talk, nothing was accomplished."

Pointing to the tables set up in the Columbia quadrangle representing spokesmen for various political groups, he said: "They haven't figured out yet that they can't change things . . . The university is not like the rest of the country. The rest of the country voted for Richard Nixon."

#### COUNTER-CULTURE

Besides, he added, the "issues have been around so long they've become clichés, with no emotional connotation any more."

Many administrators hope there is a growing realization, too, that change requires an orderly process and that violence only breeds counter-violence.

But the extreme, apolitical reaction to the turmoil on campus and in society belongs to the counter-culture, the street people, the hippies.

It represents a rejection and a turning inward.

For instance, one student recalled that he was a political activist last year but went to the rock festival at Woodstock last summer and is now content to "develop my own life style."

"You can't solve the world's problems," he said. "You have to solve your own first."

For physics Prof. Arthur Bierman of City College this "current of dissent . . . what seems to represent a reaction of middle-class values, this youth culture or counter-culture, numerically speaking is the important thing, the most significant movement of the youth."

#### DRUGS ARE KEY ELEMENT

Drugs are an important part of this trend.

Many students estimate that a majority of today's collegians have had some experience with marijuana, of varying degrees and duration.

"It's such a common thing, it's not even a topic of conversation any longer," one explained. "But you smoke grass because it's fun. Only the hard users use it to escape, like alcohol."

But drugs are a particularly key element in the life style of the youth culture.

Prof. Bierman said he thinks this counter-culture is a response "to some very serious weaknesses in our society and its structures, a response to the growing inability of our urban society to provide meaningful community . . . one with affection, purpose, meaning, values, love."

Stressing it was "my own personal opinion," the professor said he detects similarities to latter day Rome, "when similarly the old institutions and old religion had lost their legitimacy and people were looking for a new form of community, a new faith."

#### REJECTING MATERIALISM

Part of this turning to a community of peers—the similarities in dress, speech and

behavior—he said, results because "most kids grow up in a world without frames of reference."

The small town; the stable, extended family; stable neighborhoods, and the "church that was credible" are no longer generally available, he added.

Rejecting the materialism of their elders, he added, these young people are turning to other things, like LSD and astrology, because "they want desperately to believe."

Noting that technological changes are speeding up and the rate is getting faster and the impact is greater," Prof. Bierman said today's young people's phenomenon raises questions like:

Is man capable of adjusting to living with these changes? Are they compatible with man's nature? Was man meant to live in a typical American suburb?

#### NOTES LOSS OF OPTIMISM

Noting that the industrial revolution and the rise of modern science lead to reliance on reason rather than faith and intuition—"that man could understand what is important . . . coupled with optimism that man's reason will help make things better"—Prof. Bierman said: "This optimism has been destroyed. Never before have human problems been so acute. This counter-culture then is rejecting reason and turning to mysticism and faith, instead of a world dominated by cold reason."

The significance of this, he said, is that basic tenets are "being questioned intensely inside the system by the young, who were supposed to benefit from it."

How widespread this trend is and where it will go is anybody's guess.

But the fact that it exists raises disturbing questions, and as Prof. Bierman noted: "The genuineness of this alienation should not be ignored."

#### PART XV—SITTING DUCKS IN CAMPUS TURMOIL, COLLEGE HEADS FIND HOW TO COPE

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

MADISON, Wis., October 22.—Imagine a captive tied to 10 horses tugging in 10 directions and one will begin to appreciate the predicament university administrators have faced during campus unrest.

Easily identifiable, university presidents and college deans have been the targets of criticism because of their handling or alleged mishandling of campus turmoil. The accusations range from permissiveness, over-tolerance, over-optimism and over-reaction, to indecision, appeasement, cowardice and ineptness.

The highly emotional subject of student protest has magnified their difficulties with students, faculty and governing boards, alumni, parents and corporate contributors, governments, politicians and the man in the street.

Each of these groups has different demands and a different view of things. The administrator's role confirms the notion that a middleman cannot please everyone.

Much criticism of the university administrator's reaction to campus unrest stems from an erroneous belief that he is some sort of dictator with unlimited power. More accurately, he is a mediator attempting to articulate the university community's consensus. Part of the confused and diverse reaction to disruptions, for example, simply reflected the divisions of opinion and confusion of administrators, faculty, students and governing boards alike.

#### ALIEN TO TRADITIONS

The administrators, however, remain the key popular symbol of university authority and power. Conversations with many of them indicate they are willing to admit they have made some mistakes, and that they are also fast learners.

One key reason for the varied reactions to the student protest movement is that its

violence is so alien to the traditional university climate.

"Universities were places where people came because they wanted to be there," explained Dr. Edwin Young, chancellor of the University of Wisconsin's Madison campus. "Now there are people willing and genuinely interested in trying to destroy the university. We are a voluntary society and we weren't geared up to the idea that anyone would be against the university. It is almost sacrilegious to many of us that anyone would want to destroy the university, which is designed to help them. So, we have had to change our posture to take account of this."

#### ESCALATION OF PROTEST

Noting that he has been confronted repeatedly by alumni, asking: "What's going on here . . . Who's in charge? Arlie M. Mucks Jr., executive director of the Wisconsin Alumni Association, said: "University administrators were not really trained to handle this type of disruptive activity. The university is a slow reacting animal and it is against its nature to mete out swift discipline. Then too, we underestimated the strength of this tiny minority of young people. We underestimated their intent and their capacity for violence."

Other administrators noted that only the escalation of the protest movement—beginning with requests for controversial speakers to peaceful picketing and leading to violent disruption and building take-overs—made it clear that the radicals were not playing the game "by the rules."

As I. E. Levine, an aide to the President of City College in New York, said earlier: "It took time to realize that the old concept of dealing with university problems in a rational way doesn't work with many groups today."

#### NOT POSSIBLE TO PREPARE

The natural tolerance of a university to accommodate dissenting views also worked toward giving radicals more time.

In one interview, Dr. Lyod H. Elliott, president of George Washington University noted that "this university was not ready to cope with violent confrontations."

"I don't believe it's possible to prepare for this sort of thing until you see the nature of its development," he added: Noting that much of this lack of preparation was due to human nature and the feeling "it can't happen here," Dr. Elliott said: "There's always hope that violence will somehow be avoided and until it's confronted. I guess it's kind of hard to accept it as a reality of life."

In the last couple years, however, administrators have received a real crash course in containing student rebellion. And they are fast learners.

#### SHORT RANGE VIEW

There is a definite realization, for example, that they had better deal with outbursts competently or repression, through new laws or financial restraints, will result.

While emphasizing that they are flexible and open to discussion of genuine student concerns, their public and private statements make it clear that flexibility should not be confused with weakness.

The short-range view of containment relies on each university community understanding this policy that violations will be dealt with through judicious calls for outside help—even court injunctions.

Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, University of Maryland President, made this clear when he said: "It is the policy of this university to deal with the disruption, seizures or other illegal action as quickly as possible with whatever legal means are necessary. The university will not negotiate with any individual or group under the threat of force."

#### STUDENTS SUSPENDED

One indication that this firm line is buttressed by detailed planning is an adminis-

tration memorandum at George Washington University that lists the precise procedures and phrases faculty should use when confronted with classroom disruption.

But if universities can do this now, why couldn't they do this before? Why didn't they just kick the violent disrupters out?

To a certain extent they did. Many students have been suspended, put on probation or expelled because of campus disruptions. Others have faced charges in civil courts.

But the unified approach to this violence was lacking, some administrators note, because the rise of the massive multiuniversity and social change affected the university's lines of authority. Like other institutions, it takes time for the university to change.

Most universities "have made the transition from the concept of the old dean, who in this wisdom made the decision that this student was in or out," F. Chandler Young, vice chancellor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison (and no relation to Chancellor Young) noted. He added that a void developed because it "was unclear who was to perform this function."

#### AWARENESS OF DUE PROCESS

"There was confusion in the minds of everybody about who will do what," he added.

The demise of the old dean was partly tied to the student power movement, he continued, the feeling of students "they could have a greater impact on the university as adult citizens, rather than as little children."

Another element is the increased awareness in the last 15 years of the rights of people to due process, accompanied by a shift in thinking of higher education as a privilege to higher education as a right. Compounding the complexity of the task is the difficulty of learning of who did what when large numbers are involved in a protest, of getting witnesses and of collecting evidence.

As one professor explained: "It was easy to kick them out when there were only a few. But today it's mass civil disobedience."

To cope with this, most universities today have devised new disciplinary procedures involving students and faculty and have rules covering types of offenses common today—but unheard of just a decade ago.

#### LEGAL SYSTEM NEEDED

One administrator summed up the intent of the maze of rules—a special booklet in some schools: "This is a liberal place tolerant of dissent but the minute dissenters step on the rights of others, we don't permit it."

George Washington's Dr. Elliott feels that building an adequate legal system "will be one of the chief objectives" on his campus.

"I think most campuses," he said, "recognizing this change of times will be required to have legal advice to instruct staff members and security forces and faculty members in the changes of disciplinary procedure and ways of identifying violators and assembling evidence and the entire due process of law."

Wisconsin's rulebook includes some state laws to "make it clear that the university is not a game refuge or a sanctuary," Vice Chancellor Young said. The key element to the campus disciplinary system will be community support, he added.

"They're still reluctant to stand up as witnesses," he said. "We're making progress but we have a long way to go. I intend to be very optimistic about these things. I think we are going to get a disciplinary system that will be accepted by the community, that as they see these procedures tried they will see that people are being dealt with fairly."

#### MUST DEVELOP TRUST

"I also think there is a greater realization on the part of the students and faculty,"

Vice Chancellor Young said, "that disruptions of a violent kind bring on repressive violence that hurts all of us."

He said the majority of students are beginning to feel the effects of this repression for the first time, in higher tuition costs and in the state's reduced education budget.

But the key to the future is the development of trust between the administrators, students and faculty, a trust that can only be built on mutual respect, not on fear.

As Fordham University president, the Rev. Michael P. Walsh, SJ, put it: "Young people today above all want to be trusted . . . They want freedom but they also want trust and guidance . . . They are looking for a father figure, for loving authority, not paternalism. When one ceases to be authoritarian, there is always the question of where to draw the line on permissiveness, but if you can trust young people, they will help you draw that line."

#### JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ATTORNEYS VIOLATE LEGAL ETHICS

##### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when lawyers paid to represent the U.S. Government donate money to lawyers representing their adversary, at least one of the clients has been unrepresented. And judging from the record, this unrepresented client has been Mr. and Mrs. American citizen.

Small wonder that the courts ignore the Constitution, overlook the law and facts, and decide cases on the basis of consent agreements between purported adversaries. There was no controversy nor diverse interest when both lawyers worked for the same judgment. Sounds more than a split-fee arrangement.

If I hired a lawyer to represent me in a case in court, and then found that he was paying my opposition, I would regard it as highly unethical. In addition to firing the lawyer, I would report it to the bar association for disbarment proceedings.

Mr. Attorney General, the American people have enough unethical conduct with Federal judges. Your staff have no "during good behavior" tenure. If your staff lawyers want to work for the NAACP, give them their liberty—before your Department is faced with demands from the American people for a probe into breach of legal ethics.

I insert a clipping from a local newspaper at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 4, 1969]

#### JUSTICE DEPT. LAWYERS GIVE \$1,100 TO NAACP

The NAACP Defense Fund, an opponent of the Justice Department in recent school desegregation cases, received more than \$1,100 yesterday in 37 checks signed mostly by staff lawyers of the Department's civil rights division.

Fund director-counsel Jack Greenberg said in New York that he had received the checks in the morning mail accompanied by an unsigned letter wishing the fund luck in its money-raising and civil rights pursuits.

In Washington it was learned that many of the contributors considered the donations

a form of continuing protest against the civil rights policies of Attorney General John N. Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Jerris Leonard. Others said their donations were addressed mainly to the fund's most recent fiscal emergency.

Greenberg said the fund, which operates on an annual budget of \$3 million, was running \$200,000 in the red in October and was further behind now. He said fund-raising was becoming increasingly difficult because of reaction to riots and some violent demonstrations and deep division in some communities over Vietnam.

#### MOST MEMBERS WANT TRUE POSTAL REFORM

##### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that most Members of the House want true postal reform, I wish to direct their attention to the following letter from Postmaster General Blount to Senator GALE MCGEE, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The correspondence developed as a result of the six specific objections which Mr. James Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, presented to the Senate committee on behalf of his organization.

The letter follows:

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., December 4, 1969.

HON. GALE MCGEE,  
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The testimony given by Mr. James Rademacher, President of the National Association of Letter Carriers, before your Committee on November 25th seems to show such a thorough misunderstanding of the proposed Postal Service Act of 1969 that I feel obliged to comment and to request that you include this letter in the record of the current hearings of the Committee on postal reform.

Mr. Rademacher's testimony is devoted largely to knocking over a series of straw men. The six "fallacies" with which Mr. Rademacher charges the supporters of postal reform bear little or no relation to what is actually in the bill or to what the proponents of the bill have actually been saying. Let us consider these straw men of Mr. Rademacher's in turn.

1. "A postal corporation and postal reform are synonymous."—I have repeatedly said that the corporate form of organization is no panacea, in and of itself, and I agree completely that it would be fallacious to suppose that adoption of a corporate form of organization for the postal service will automatically assure the improvements in postal efficiency that this country so badly needs. I think it is equally clear, however, that so long as management authority is fragmented and disassociated from managerial responsibility, the quality of postal service will be less than it should be and the cost of such service will be more than it should be. It would be the height of absurdity to deny the Postal Service the tools it needs to do its job simply because of a fear that the tools might not be used to the best possible advantage.

Recognizing this to be so, Mr. Rademacher goes on to suggest that the tools which the Post Office admittedly needs would be provided under H.R. 4, the measure currently

being marked up by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This claim, with all due respect, is simply not borne out by the facts.

In the first place, H.R. 11750 would provide assurance that top management will be responsive to the needs of postal users, and will be assured of continuity so long—and only so long—as it does its job well. H.R. 4, as originally introduced, contains nothing to prevent the repeated interruptions of top management that necessarily go with having the Postmaster General in the cabinet. The House Committee has tentatively decided to amend H.R. 4 to provide a nine-year term for the Postmaster General and six-year terms for the Assistant Postmasters General. While fixed statutory terms of this kind would certainly promote continuity of management, they are hardly calculated to promote either cooperation among the top management team or responsiveness of that team to the nation's postal needs. Such a statute would protect the Postmaster General and his top aides not only from the demands of partisan politics (which is all to the good), but also from the demands of the nation for better postal service (which is precisely the worst kind of protection).

In the second place, H.R. 11750 provides a statutory framework for labor-management relations under which postal employees would have a direct financial stake in the quality of the postal service received by the mail using public. The bill provides for truly meaningful collective bargaining under the Labor-Management Relations Act. In this connection, let me invite your attention to Supplement III of the statement that Mr. Patrick J. Nilan of the United Federation of Postal Clerks submitted to your Committee on November 21. You will recall that Mr. Nilan strongly urged that postal employees be given the same basic benefits and rights as are provided for employees in private industry under the National Labor Relations Act. H.R. 11750 would do just this, except that it would continue the ban on strikes by postal employees and would provide a fair and impartial dispute-resolving mechanism in lieu of resort to strikes. But H.R. 4 (or, for that matter, S. 309, the text of which is incorporated substantially verbatim in H.R. 4) would not provide postal employees with rights equivalent to those enjoyed under the National Labor Relations Act.

Under H.R. 4, wages would continue to be set by Congress. There would be no collective bargaining over "bread-and-butter" issues. Since employees could not bargain for increased wages, they would have no stake in increasing productivity; and since management could not bargain for increased wages, it would have little to offer labor in exchange for labor's agreement on more efficient work practices. Under H.R. 4, moreover, and by way of sharp antithesis to the National Labor Relations Act, the right of employees to organize and elect bargaining representatives of their own choosing would be severely impaired. For instance, H.R. 4 would bar, by statute, the right of employees to organize on an "industrial union" basis, even though every single employee in the Postal Service wanted it. It seems wrong in principle for the Congress to impose upon postal employees a particular kind of labor union structure without leaving the employees any right at all to change that structure if they wish to do so.

In the third place, H.R. 11750 would enable the Postal Service to obtain the capital necessary to acquire the modern buildings and high speed equipment that are essential if the postal system is to be operated on a truly efficient and economical basis. To this end, H.R. 11750 would provide workable bonding authority. For reasons that have been thoroughly discussed in the hearings, it

seems clear that the bonding authority provided in H.R. 4 would not enable the Post Office to raise the capital it needs at interest rates bearing a reasonable relation to those paid by other borrowers.

In the fourth place, H.R. 11750 would provide a rate-making mechanism capable of responding promptly to changing market forces and the needs of postal users. It would do this by establishing a full-time panel of expert rate commissioners who would hold full and impartial hearings on suggested rate changes and would make recommendations which the Postal Service could implement on a timely basis, subject to disapproval by concurrent Congressional resolution. H.R. 4, on the other hand, would place rate-making responsibilities in a separate commission that would be convened every fourth year. A rate review that occurs only once every four years is simply not adequate. One of the major difficulties with postal rates in the past has been that they change too infrequently; when changes do finally come, they are necessarily major changes having a major impact on mail users.

In sum, any fair comparison of H.R. 4 with H.R. 11750 will show that H.R. 4 would come nowhere close to achieving "everything the Postal Corporation Bill would achieve in the way of reform. . . ." But perhaps the most astonishing aspect of this part of Mr. Rademacher's testimony is his insinuation that H.R. 11750 would somehow remove the Postal Service from Congressional surveillance. This suggestion simply is not true. The Postal Service would be required to report annually to the Congress on its operations; its part-time directors would be subject to confirmation by the Senate; its activities would be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office; and its rate changes would be subject to Congressional review before they become effective. But quite apart from these specific provisions for Congressional surveillance, the overriding fact is that the Congress will continue to be present, and since the Postal Service will be as much a part of the Federal Government as it is today—albeit in a different organizational form—postal management will be fully aware of the Congressional presence at all times. Congress can obviously step in whenever it wishes, and the Postal Service Act provides that the Congress will be informed of postal operations sufficiently so that it can see the need to step in if that need arises.

2. "All corporations are inherently more efficient and more desirable than any Government operation."—Here again, Mr. Rademacher does a splendid job of demolishing a proposition that, so far as we are aware, has never been put forward. As indicated above, we have recommended the form of a Government corporation for the Postal Service because it seems to afford the most convenient means of achieving a better fusion of responsibility and authority, a better matching of costs to benefits, and a better marshalling of resources to meet postal needs. All the rhetoric about Edsels and faceless, soulless corporations, inhumane directors and profit-minded management, is—of course—just that: rhetoric. In this connection, although we are mindful that it is possible to overstress the analogy between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the proposed new United States Postal Service, it should be noted that rhetorical imprecations against corporate management are no more appropriate to the new Postal Service than to the TVA—and they are notably lacking in respect to the latter.

3. "A Postal Corporation can operate the postal establishment on a break-even basis within five years."—Mr. Rademacher's assault on this proposition is based on a series of false premises. He apparently assumes that the new Postal Service would undertake to issue \$10 billion worth of bonds all at once

and before any savings could be realized from the first part of a long-term capital investment program. He totally ignores the fact that the Postal Service Act would give the new Postal Service a right to call at any time on the Treasury Department for up to \$2 billion worth of capital, and that private investors would know that this right exists. He projects interest costs of 12% to 15%, although this Committee has received competent testimony from experts in the financial community to the effect that the Postal Service should be able to borrow at rates not substantially higher than those paid by the Treasury itself. He engages in a certain amount of "double-counting," piling an unidentified "contingency fund" on top of an imputed cost of depreciation. Relatively speaking, however, these are all matters of minor detail; the major point that Mr. Rademacher misses is that the management of the Postal Service would be unlikely to float a major bond issue unless a careful economic analysis showed that the costs associated with such borrowing would be clearly outweighed by the savings to be realized through investment of the bond proceeds. In this connection, it is worth recalling that studies performed for the Kappel Commission indicate that capital investments for new postal facilities and equipment should yield cost savings in excess of 20% of the amount invested.

The key to achieving a break-even operation lies in greater productivity—and this is an element that Mr. Rademacher has totally ignored. The fact of enormous productivity increases in the private sector since World War II show what can be done. The record of productivity improvement in the postal service has been poor; but there is no reason why, given the necessary reforms, this record should not greatly improve. Mr. Rademacher seems to assume that improvement is impossible. He states correctly that wages represent over 80% of the Post Office Department costs—but he states it as though this were an ineluctable fact of life which, like death and taxes, must be with us forever. Although we see no real possibility of postal employment diminishing, there is no reason at all why, with mail use continuing to rise sharply, postal wage costs must continue to overshadow the costs of facilities, equipment, and labor-saving devices to the extent that they now do. By investing capital in the buildings and tools that our employees need to do their jobs more efficiently, we can increase productivity, reduce the proportionate cost of wages (although their absolute cost will increase), and go far toward achieving a self-sustaining operation.

This is not to say, of course, that postal rates will necessarily remain constant. On the contrary, we must expect postal rate increases, given the realities of today's economy. We are convinced, however, that these increases will be less frequent and less precipitous than those which would be necessary if the reforms we are recommending are not forthcoming.

4. "The Postal Service is on the brink of catastrophe and only a corporation can save it."—Argument about what did, or did not, cause the breakdown in Chicago in 1966 is not likely to lend much to any serious analysis of what kind of postal reform is needed. I am wholly persuaded that, if basic reforms to the postal system are not forthcoming, we can look forward only to a gradual deterioration in the postal service until it becomes a national disgrace. Whether or not we are in a "race with catastrophe" is largely a matter of semantics. But the fact is that the nation's demands upon our mail system are increasing, and our ability to meet those demands has not been keeping pace. Institutions either change to meet the needs of the times or they die; there is absolutely no reason to suppose that the Post Office is immune from this general rule.

5. "The Postal deficit is inexcusable; the

Post Office should be run on a break-even basis."—Mr. Rademacher's premise here is that: "There is no way to operate the U.S. Postal establishment as a service and still operate it on a break-even basis." There is a tendency in some quarters to equate "public service" to "public deficit"; euphemism doubtless has its place, but this is not it. As I pointed out in my earlier testimony before this Committee, the great bulk of mailing costs have to do with carrying business-related mail and the great bulk of tax revenues come from individual citizens; consequently, postal deficits represent a subsidy largely paid by individuals to businesses. I do not believe that the business community either wishes this subsidy or deserves it.

The real question is not whether the postal deficit is "inexcusable" but whether it should be tolerated in a nation which has such great needs for public revenues as ours does—needs such as health and housing, defense and education, progress against poverty and pollution, against the problems of the city, against crime and injustice. Every dollar of postal deficit is a dollar that could better be used elsewhere.

6. "Postal employees will benefit enormously if a Postal Corporation were to be created."—I have covered this matter in great detail in my earlier testimony and it is unnecessary to reiterate that testimony here. But I cannot let pass unmentioned two statements in Mr. Rademacher's testimony about the Postal Service Act that are gross distortions of the truth. The first is: "We would be deprived of our right to appeal to Congress." Section 209 of H.R. 11750 explicitly states that, among the provisions of law that shall apply to the Postal Service, is chapter 71 of title 5 of the United States Code—and this chapter contains a statutory guarantee of "the right of employees, individually or collectively to petition Congress or a member of Congress. . . ."

The second is: "We would be permitted to bargain collectively—but only by permission of the managers. If an impasse arises, we would be permitted to go to compulsory arbitration only if the managers gave us permission to do so!"

On the heels of that remarkable assertion, Mr. Rademacher adds: "This—I think you will agree—is just a cynical little parody of collective bargaining." So it would be—if Mr. Rademacher's comments were not also a cynical little parody of the truth. The facts are, of course, that H.R. 11750 assures postal employees of a right to bargain collectively, and a refusal by postal management to bargain in good faith over any bargainable issue would be an unfair labor practice. The processes of the National Labor Relations Board and of the court would be available—by law—to require faithful discharge of the duty to bargain; "permission of the managers" has absolutely nothing to do with the case. Nor is the compulsory arbitration provision of H.R. 11750 something to be granted or withheld by "the managers." The fact is—and it is entirely unmistakable if one reads section 808 of H.R. 11750—that neither management nor labor can prevent recourse to compulsory arbitration if the independent postal disputes panel decides that an impasse should be referred to arbitration. The postal disputes panel would be completely impartial; postal management would have no influence whatsoever over the selection of its members of the conduct of their duties.

From time to time, we have been asked why the postal unions are opposed to the Postal Service Act. Mr. Rademacher's reckless misrepresentations suggest a possible answer.

Sincerely,

WINTON M. BLOUNT.

Mr. Blount's letter in effect effectively states the position of the Department and I believe the communication to be of such great significance that it deserve the attention of all Members.

## AIRCRAFT NOISE AND SONIC BOOM

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, when, in July 1968, Congress unanimously passed the Noise Abatement Control Act, the promise was, in the words of the act, "to afford present and future relief to the public from unnecessary aircraft noise."

Now, 17 months after enactment of that act, literally nothing has been done to implement the mandate of the act "to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise and sonic boom." To the contrary, those who live in communities adjacent to airports, who were promised a reduction in noise, have had to endure a continually worsening situation.

As if in response to the escalating decibel rate, the Federal Aviation Agency now has adopted what are, for all intents and purposes, irrelevant standards governing noise levels. Incredible as it may seem, the standards now announced in pursuance of the congressional mandate "to afford present and future relief to the public from unnecessary aircraft noise" apply neither to existing aircraft, nor to the coming generation of jumbo jets, at least not in the foreseeable future. We are told that nothing can be done about the noise levels of the 747 and successor aircraft because aircraft manufacturers have had "inadequate notice."

Inadequate notice, what constitutes adequate notice? Are aircraft manufacturers and airline owners insulated permanently in sound-proof jets where the protests and pleas of everyone else can never penetrate? Maybe we should have expected 5 years of efforts by citizens all over the country to be ignored, but what about the law itself, voted unanimously by the House, overwhelmingly by the Senate, and signed by the President? If the law does not provide "adequate notice," what does? Must people break one law to get another one implemented? How we must pray that it has not come to that in the United States of America.

The simple fact is that an industry that can develop the 747 can develop the technology to control the noise made by the 747. Where there is a will in these matters, there are usually several ways. But all we can get are excuses, evasions, and now deception. Yet no one is fooled that the new noise limits of 108 EPNdB, arrived at without a single session of public hearings, will be responsive to the needs of people living in communities near airports. The 108 limit even rejects in effect the FAA's own carefully considered judgment in 1966 that a ceiling of 106 EPNdB, measured at distances considerably closer than those specified in the new rules, was readily feasible.

Consider what responsible people who have never violated a law must feel in the face of this situation—knowing what is technically feasible, knowing what the law requires, knowing that no relief is even distantly in prospect from the horror of deafening noise ripping communi-

ties apart every 30 seconds or every minute.

Airline companies that have spent \$3.7 billion to date for new 747's, and that anticipate spending a total of \$53 billion for more aircraft and airports between now and 1980, plead that they cannot afford \$500,000 to \$1 million per plane to retrofit existing aircraft; and a Government that is prepared to shell out \$1.2 billion for the SST—against the advice of the administration's own advisory committee—can scrounge together only \$978,000 a year for noise-abatement research.

If airlines are so concerned about cost, they might focus on the \$2.3 billion in lawsuits pending against a single airport—Los Angeles International—because of jet noise. In the long run, I believe the airlines would save themselves a great deal of trouble—and even money—if they would concern themselves now with their impact on the health, spirit, and economic conditions of the communities that they have blighted so cavalierly over the years.

But the FAA is the gravest offender against commonsense and the public good. The people have spoken through their elected Representatives, but this small group of men who are appointed for the purpose of implementing the law apparently cannot hear the voice of the people through the din of the jets.

But if the regulations dealing with new planes are misleading and inadequate, the delay in issuing any regulations at all for existing aircraft is outrageous and incendiary. For even the fairest noise certification standards for new aircraft would produce only belated and marginal relief for the afflicted areas.

In the light of that fact it is incredible that the FAA has yet to take the first tentative steps toward easing the suffering caused by existing aircraft. Seventeen months is a long time in the life of a human being and in the development of a community. It is long enough to schedule and hold hearings and to formulate reasonable regulations. It is too long to allow schools, meetings, and religious services to be disrupted, and far too long to allow the sleep of countless people to be impaired and to allow their health and hearing to be imperiled.

The intent of the Congress could not be more clear. Nor could the duty of the FAA. Areas adjacent to airports must be made habitable now, not when present aircraft have become obsolete and the airlines get around to facing the consequences of their past misbehavior, if they ever do.

The FAA is supposed to be a regulatory agency. People are supposed to be more important than machines. It is past time that this regulatory agency regulated machines in the interest of people, instead of undercutting the will of the people in the interest of a few companies that own machines. The situation is precisely that simple.

The technology is available to correct this intolerable situation, and there are many of us here in the Congress who expect the FAA to see to it that it is corrected forthwith. We invite the help of the President and trust he understands the urgency of this invitation.

## NIXON'S UNION MAN

## HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, last March it was my privilege and pleasure to be present at the swearing-in ceremonies of my old friend W. J. Usery, Jr., as Assistant Secretary of Labor. I felt assured that this most important post was being placed in most capable hands.

Last week, Richard J. Levine, one of the Nation's most able labor editors, wrote a very comprehensive story about Assistant Secretary Usery that appeared in the Wall Street Journal. I felt certain that my colleagues would be interested in learning the background of this new member of the administration's team.

The story follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 2, 1969]  
NIXON'S UNION MAN: USERY MOVES SMOOTHLY FROM MACHINISTS POST TO ROLE AS LABOR AIDE

(By Richard J. Levine)

WASHINGTON.—"What's a trade unionist like you doing working for a Republican Administration?"

Union skeptics still occasionally ask that question of Assistant Secretary of Labor Willie J. Usery Jr., who has emerged as the Government's top troubleshooter on the increasingly turbulent bargaining front. But the former Machinists Union official with the Georgia drawl and disarming country-boy manner hears it far less frequently than when he first arrived in Washington.

Mr. Usery—a Democrat who voted for Hubert Humphrey and the only labor leader in the Nixon Administration—has been able to prosper in an important sub-Cabinet post without compromising his commitment to the goals of organized labor. In the past 10 months, the strapping Assistant Secretary for Labor-Management Relations has become a key member of the Labor Department team, generally impressing Government, union and management officials with his abilities as a bureaucrat, the chief liaison officer with the AFL-CIO and an effective, fair-minded mediator of labor conflicts.

J. P. Hiltz, chief bargainer for the nation's railroads, now dealing with Mr. Usery in a dispute that threatens to result in a strike, credits him with "a very good understanding" of management's position at the bargaining table. "Because he has such a good feel for the union's problems, he can discount that and concentrate on management's."

The only strong criticism of Mr. Usery has come from the fast-growing Federal-employe unions. One, the National Association of Government Employees, has accused him of showing favoritism to an AFL-CIO affiliate in a bitter representation battle at the Norfolk, Va., naval shipyard—a charge he denies.

The 54-year-old Mr. Usery's toughest assignments are on the bargaining front, where, as a mediator, he sees his role as helping the parties focus the issue and fashion new approaches "without trying to dictate" the terms of a settlement.

"It's easy for negotiators and mediators to blunder into a strike," he stresses. "It takes skill to get a settlement."

## NONSTOP NEGOTIATIONS

Earlier this year, President Nixon praised Mr. Usery's "stamina and skill" in helping hammer out a pay-and-benefits agreement that averted a nationwide railroad strike by the Signalmen's Union; in more than 28 hours of unbroken negotiation, he kept the

pressure on both sides without real arm-twisting, until they came to terms on the knotty issue of extra increases for skilled workers. In another weekend of nonstop mediation, he helped bring a quick end to a Teamsters walkout that had crippled Pan American World Airways.

Now the Assistant Secretary is grappling under an approaching deadline with his most difficult dispute to date—a protracted wage battle that pits the nation's railroads against four shopcraft unions, led by Mr. Usery's own International Association of Machinists. If there's no agreement by 12:01 a.m. tomorrow, when a 60-day cooling-off period expires, 48,000 workers will be free to strike; only an act of Congress could order them back to work. The railroads have threatened a lock-out even if only a few of them are struck.

In a last-ditch effort to head off a nationwide rail tieup, Labor Secretary George P. Shultz directed Mr. Usery to move the negotiations from the railroads' bargaining headquarters to the Labor Department and start round-the-clock sessions at 10 a.m. yesterday. Just before the start of the nonstop bargaining, Mr. Usery said he was "optimistic that a settlement can be reached."

In addition to mediating disputes, Mr. Usery has counseled the Administration on labor matters, using his knowledge of union affairs to help shape a new Executive order governing Federal-employe unions and proposals on farm workers' bargaining rights and pension-fund regulation.

As the main day-to-day link between the Administration and the labor movement, the Assistant Secretary is determined to keep lines of communications open and relations civil. Frequently, he is in touch by phone two or three times a day with AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland or James Gildea, George Meany's executive assistant. These conversations have dealt with such matters as the Pittsburgh dispute between white building tradesmen and blacks seeking more construction jobs—which Mr. Usery has been mediating off and on since mid-September—and arrangements for an appearance by Astronaut Edwin Aldrin at the AFL-CIO convention in October.

## "AN ELEMENT OF MISTRUST"

Mr. Usery, who was an obscure union representative when tapped for the sub-Cabinet last January, believes the Nixon Administration has been "fair to labor" so far. Nonetheless, he observes:

"It's very difficult for a labor leader to come into a Republican Administration. There is an element of doubt and mistrust between both factions. In a sense you have to be a mediator between Government and labor."

(Some union men vividly recall how one past experiment in labor-Republican cooperation fizzled. In January 1953, Dwight Eisenhower named Martin Durkin, then head of the Plumbers Union, as his Labor Secretary. Mr. Durkin quit in anger eight months later, feeling the President had violated an understanding that he would propose liberalization of the Taft-Hartley law.)

Critical tests of Mr. Usery's skill as a mediator between "Government and labor," as well as between labor and management, lie ahead.

With the Administration's anti-inflationary policies threatening to push unemployment higher, union chieftains are turning hostile toward the White House. And at the bargaining table, employers concerned about a profit pinch are locking horns more frequently with union negotiators seeking fat wage gains to keep abreast of still-rising prices.

Labor Secretary Shultz and other officials are bracing for a wave of strikes next year, when major contracts expire in the auto, rubber, meat-packaging, trucking and railroad industries. As a result, many observers

expect Mr. Usery will find himself in the midst of more disputes, despite the Administration's pledge to avoid interference. But associates believe he'll be equal to further challenges.

Mr. Shultz describes his colleague as an "immensely talented" individual "who has this knack or ability to get people working together along constructive lines." Though their backgrounds and personalities are very different, Mr. Usery (an ebullient one-time welder) and Mr. Shultz (a soft-spoken former professor) have developed a close relationship.

"Shultz has a way of making up his own mind," says one insider. "But he won't make it up without first having Bill's advice. He has a great deal of respect for his judgment." The Assistant Secretary voices his views either in frequent private meetings with his boss or in the regular Tuesday morning conference of the department's top officials.

## HARSH WORDS

To the delicate task of helping labor and the Administration understand each other, Mr. Usery "brings a pretty highly developed sense of what unions like and don't like," declares an AFL-CIO staffer. "There has to be a person like Usery who is current with the problems of the trade union movement and the Administration whom we can talk to frankly."

But harsh words about Mr. Usery's performance have come from the Federal-employe unions.

Recently the Independent National Association of Government Employees (NAGE) attacked him for allegedly showing favoritism to the AFL-CIO Metal Trades Council, of which the Machinists Union is part. The NAGE is trying to oust the council as representative of 7,800 blue-collar workers at the Norfolk shipyard.

NAGE President Kenneth T. Lyons charges that Mr. Usery, in view of his AFL-CIO background, "is in an obvious conflict-of-interest situation." He says "the unique manner in which this entire matter has been treated . . . raises the strong suspicion in our mind" that the NAGE "has not been treated with impartiality by the AFL-CIO infested Labor Department."

The NAGE is upset at the Navy's indefinite postponement, at Labor Department request, of a union representation election that had been scheduled for Nov. 6. Secretary Shultz has said he asked for the postponement in order to examine a request by an AFL-CIO that an arbitrator be appointed to examine federation charges that the NAGE obtained the election date with "fraudulent and deceitful tactics." The Navy had previously dismissed such charges.

Mr. Usery says the accusations against him are "absolutely false." Though his office has been involved in the matter, he says, "I haven't had anything to do with it. . . . I personally haven't made any recommendation to the Secretary of Labor."

## A COOL RECEPTION

Federal-employe leaders have also given the new Executive order covering their unions—which the Assistant Secretary helped draft—a cool reception. Among other things, the directive establishes a council to oversee the Government's relations with its employees and a special "impasse panel" to help settle disputes.

While the United Federation of Postal Clerks concedes the order may bring "improvement in some areas," it argues that there are "new restrictions" on union activity. For example, the Nixon directive specifically forbids that negotiations be held during normal work hours of employes bargaining for the union.

No such controversy surrounds Mr. Usery's work at the bargaining table, where labor experts agree his impartiality, tenacity and knowledge of labor relations are valuable

assets. "He knows the business," asserts an old Labor Department hand. "He knows how parties feel and react and what instincts motivate them."

All these qualities were on display in the April dispute between the Signalmen and the railroads, and Mr. Usery's performance did much to enhance his prestige.

The Assistant Secretary entered the dispute shortly after the 13,000 member union announced on Tuesday, April 8, its intention to strike the following Monday at 6:01 a.m. One of his first moves was to get the parties to begin talking again. "If you can't agree on anything but the time of day," he says, "you start there and build."

"I started helping them at 10 a.m. Saturday," he has recalled. "At 4:30 a.m. Sunday, everyone was hanging on the ropes and wanted to take a break. In keeping with the Secretary's policy of leaning heavily on the collective bargaining system, I kept the parties negotiating until they finally reached agreement at 2:30 Sunday afternoon."

"I wouldn't say that we did much for regular hours and meals. But there was no nationwide rail shutdown Monday morning. It's amazing that the parties can achieve with some honest-to-goodness hard bargaining."

#### APPEALS TO PATRIOTISM

A lot of that "hard bargaining," insiders say, was due to Mr. Usery's sure touch and refusal to accept defeat. He reminded both sides, with appeals to their patriotism, of the public interest involved in a rail strike, and he constantly cajoled the chief negotiators to try to understand each other's position.

After the accord, Mr. Shultz says, both sides agreed that "it was their settlement," that no arms had been twisted. Railroad bargainer Hiltz said later that Mr. Usery "played it straight down the middle. He's persistent as hell. He just keeps gnawing away at the bone until he gets all the marrow out." Signalmen's President C. J. Chamberlain put it another way: "When Usery zeroes in on you, he has a way of getting things out of you."

Willie J. Usery (known around the Labor Department as Bill or W.J.) has clearly enjoyed his rapid rise from a \$16,000-a-year union job to a \$38,000-a-year sub-Cabinet position. Declares retired Machinists Union President Roy Siemiller: "Bill likes the prestige and recognition given a little country boy from Georgia."

Mr. Usery grew up in Milledgeville, Ga., and went to work as a welder in 1941 after two years at Georgia Military College. He joined the Machinists Union in 1949 at Armstrong Cork Co. in Macon. Seven years later the Machinists assigned him to coordinate union activities at Cape Kennedy, then Cape Canaveral, in Florida.

When he arrived at the cape, where he became an avid rocket and space buff, the union had 17 members there; when he left to come to Washington, it had 4,600. As the top Machinists official at the cape, Mr. Usery participated in most of the national aerospace labor negotiations, coming in contact with former Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Vice President James Hodgson. When Mr. Hodgson was chosen as Under Secretary of Labor, he recommended Mr. Usery to Mr. Shultz "as the smartest and ablest union official I had dealt with at any level."

#### A SHOWER IN THE OFFICE

Though now ensconced in one of the Labor Department's plus third-floor executive suites, Mr. Usery hasn't lost his informal charm. One evening he wandered into the Secretary's outer office, his broad face split by a grin, and drawled: "Not so many years ago I didn't even have a shower in my house, and I just now took one in my office." And, after a typical 12-hour day, he is given to announcing, "I'm plumb wore out."

Still, some department associates suspect the mood-gated Georgian of putting on an act. "If he wants to, he can speak with very

little Southern accent and few errors," says one official. "I accused him of being a phony one day after I heard him tell a phone caller who asked for Mr. Usery—'This is he.'"

Put on or not, his casual manner, which helps him get to know people on a first-name basis, is undoubtedly useful in his role as a mediator. He says: "I have found that a good personal relationship with a man will make him a lot less likely to turn down my proposal out of hand."

The Assistant Secretary has been accepting two or three speaking engagements a week (at the AFL-CIO convention he gave four), addressing such groups as the Amalgamated Transit Union, the American Society of Hospital Personnel Administrators and the Painters Union. He reads a prepared text poorly and is at his best in off-the-cuff remarks or in later conversation over a dry Beefeaters martini.

Apart from his peacemaking successes, Mr. Usery is winning considerable influence on policy within the Republican-ruled Labor Department.

Secretary Shultz says the mechanism to provide farm workers with a limited right to strike—which is part of the Administration's proposal to give bargaining rights to agricultural employees—was "more Usery's idea than anyone else's."

His thinking is also reflected in a bill drafted by the Labor Department, but not yet proposed by the Administration, to tighten regulation of welfare and pension funds. He has grown concerned about the tempting target that \$115 billion in retirement fund assets makes for organized crime. One feature of the bill would bar persons convicted of such crimes as robbery and extortion from serving as pension-plan administrators.

Mr. Usery says his Washington experience has been broadening in many ways, and he recently mused:

"As a union official, I was representing skilled workers with high school educations in relatively high-paying jobs. Now when I look across my office, I see 81 million people in the work force—black, white, yellow, the physically handicapped, the illiterate. In this job, you have to be concerned about the welfare of all the people."

#### THE UNSUNG SAILOR OF SCIENCE

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes our attention is not brought to historical figures and their accomplishments. One such figure in our naval history was Rear Adm. Charles Henry Davis.

Admiral Davis was not only an outstanding naval officer, but he was also a man of science. His effort helped make the Navy a service associated with science and scientific accomplishment.

A very interesting and informative article relating the many accomplishments of Admiral Davis was written by Mr. Don Groves. I commend the article, "The Unsung Sailor of Science," to the attention of our colleagues:

#### THE UNSUNG SAILOR OF SCIENCE

(By Don Groves)

(The author is a Naval Reserve Officer currently attached to a unit (5-8) of the Navy's Research Program (ONR). He has had a wide range of experience in the Navy both while on active duty during World War II and Korea, as well as in the Reserve Program. His civilian experience has included electrical

and mechanical design, systems engineering and advanced engineering in Naval Warfare as well as Materials Science. Groves is a member of the ASNE, The Marine Technology Society and a Fellow of The Washington Academy of Science plus several other scientific and engineering societies.)

"Our government does not spend nearly fifteen percent of its budget in the research and development business because science has a powerful lobby; in fact, scientists are still rather untutored at the game; nor because the United States is hungry for a better understanding of nature, or what lies on the other side of the moon; nor—finally—as a contingency investment against the risk that some other nation will surpass us. Each of these factors certainly plays a part, but basically the investment is made because our society has understood the dependence of its future on science and technology." (Hon. Paul H. Nitze, former Secretary of the Navy.)

The people of this country have always been interested in science, and our society has always "understood the dependence of its future on science and technology." Even in the earliest days, an unexplored continent provided a powerful stimulus to the curiosity of our ancestral pioneers. In this rugged environment, they realized that even their survival and that of their families depended upon a better understanding of nature.

As that understanding increased and our nation began to develop, the sea represented to many colonial Americans and later to great numbers of early nineteenth century Americans as much of a frontier as did the prairies and mountains in the West. For rather practical reasons, American merchantmen and whalers traveled to little known seas and lands. Fur sealers even ventured to the Antarctic for what they then allowed was a source of promising wealth to the country.

But . . . scientific curiosity itself and the desire for national prestige provided the prime motivation to the majority of our forefathers. And it was this that made the Navy the service that has historically been associated with science and scientific accomplishment in this country. In 1825, President John Quincy Adams requested Congress to establish a Naval Academy "for the formation of scientific and accomplished officers." Five years later the Naval Observatory and the Hydrographic Office were founded jointly as the Depot of Charts and Instruments which, under Commander Matthew Fontaine Maury compiled and published the first hydrographic charts ("Wind and Current Charts" and "Sailing Directions") and helped found the science of oceanography. In 1838, a University of Pennsylvania Professor of Chemistry and Physics became the Navy Department's first scientist. And in 1842, a Naval officer, Lt. Charles Wilkes, headed the first great American scientific venture overseas. This particular expedition and Wilkes' view, as expressed in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy prior to the expedition, to the effect that the Navy should provide the scientists and "not act simply as the hewers of wood and drawers of water" set an example which stimulated subsequent U.S. scientific expeditions.

These and many other noteworthy events in history directly established the Navy's foundations in the scientific work of our nation. However, various activities of the Navy have also, over the years, helped to shape a more meaningful relationship of not only the Navy's but of our entire government with science. Such a significant role is often overlooked. Moreover, perhaps the most unsung hero in all Naval history is this remarkable man who played the key part in this same role. His name is Rear Admiral Charles H. Davis, USN.

Davis, as fine a professionally qualified officer as the Navy had in a time when it ships were built of wood and men were of steel, was also a recognized scientist—recognized,

that is, by some of the great men of science on whose shoulders our own scientists now stand.

Charles Henry Davis was born in Boston in 1807 and died at the Naval Observatory in Washington in 1877. He was educated at the Boston Latin School and entered Harvard in 1821. He left college in 1823 to enter the Navy but subsequently completed work for his degree, and his name is listed with the Class of 1825.

Seventeen years of his early life were spent almost constantly at sea in the Navy. He served on board such ships as the frigate, *United States*; the schooner, *Dolphin*; and the sloops, *Vincennes*, *Erie*, and the *Ontario*. The famous naval heroes Dahlgren, Maury and Dupont were among his first shipmates. In this fast company, one of his skippers, Capt. Gordon, on the *Ontario*, reporting on the qualifications of his officers to Commodore James Biddle who commanded the squadron stated that:

"Lieutenant C. H. Davis is devoted to the improvement of his mind; his country may expect much from him."

This succinct fitness report on Davis was both accurate and prophetic. He was indeed a man interested in probing into the "whys" of everything around him. During all these years at sea, he devoted himself at every opportunity to studies of astronomy and hydrography. Such study, coupled with his experience and knowledge of navigation, brought him into a billet in 1842 with the Coast Survey that exactly suited his attitudes, objectives and abilities.

In 1842 the Coast Survey—recognized then as the one great scientific institution in the U.S. under government control—was involved in a preliminary but ambitious hydrostatic survey of the entire East Coast. Moreover, at that time there was much to be done by the Coast Survey in the examination of harbors and plans for harbor improvements.

Davis spent six years with the Survey under the superintendency of a most remarkable man, Professor Alexander Dallas Bache, the great grandson of Benjamin Franklin. Bache was an eminent scientist, the first President of the National Academy of Sciences, in 1863, a man whose scholarship was without a flaw, an effective administrator, and a natural leader of men. He made a profound and lasting impression on Davis.

Working under Professor Bache, Davis spent an effective tour of six years with the Coast Survey. He discovered the "Davis' New South Shoal" (20 miles south of Nantucket shoals) and became an acknowledged U.S. authority on tides and currents, and especially their effects on the formation of coastlines and reefs. He published several papers on the subject and his scientific work, "The Law of Deposit of the Flood Tide" won wide acclaim.

In 1849, the Navy in recognition of his talents placed Lt. Davis in charge of publishing an American Ephemeris and National Almanac. At the time our navigators and astronomers were still dependent on the British Nautical Almanac, a disadvantage which had long been apparent to Davis. His Coast Survey work had strengthened his conviction of the necessity of a National Ephemeris and he looked forward to the assignment.

Harvard University and the Cambridge Observatory were established as the headquarters for the work on the Almanac. Here in the congenial and intellectually stimulating society of such men as zoologist Louis Agassiz, mathematician Benjamin Pierce, the Director of the Observatory, George Bond, and many other established scientists of the day, Davis effectively established the foundation of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac.

While still engaged in work on the Ephemeris, Davis read a paper on the Solar Eclipse of 1851 before the Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advance-

ment of Sciences. Here, at this Albany, N.Y. meeting he listened with avid interest to an address by his friend, Professor Alexander Dallas Bache.

Bache, in his address as retiring President of the AAAS, dwelt on the need for a national scientific organization:

"I would throw out for your consideration some reasons which induce me to believe that an institution of science, supplementary to existing ones, is much needed in our country, to guide public action in reference to scientific matters. . . .

"It is, I believe, a common mistake to associate the idea of academical institutions with monarchical institutions. We show in this, as in many other things, the prejudice of our descent. We have among us the two extremes of exaggerated nationality and of excessive imitation; let us modify each by the other, and be wise. A national institute is not necessary to Great Britain, with her rich and powerful universities. Republican France has cherished her Institute, seeking rather to extend than to curtail its proportions. . . . Nor does the idea of a necessary connexion between centralization and an institution strike me as a valid one. Suppose an institute of which the members belong in turn to each of our widely scattered states, working at their places of residence and reporting their results; meeting only at particular times, and for special purposes; engaged in researches, self-directed, or desired by the body, called for by the Congress or by the Executive, who furnish the means for the inquiries. The detail of such an organization could be marked out so as to secure efficiency without centralization, and constant labor with its appropriate results. The public treasury would be saved many times the support of such a council, by the sound advice which it would give in regard to the various projects which are constantly forced upon their notice, and in regard to which they are now compelled to decide without the knowledge which alone can ensure a wise conclusion. The men of science who are at the seat of government either constantly or temporarily, are too much occupied in the special work which belongs to their official occupations to answer such a purpose; besides, the additional responsibility which, if they were called together, they must necessarily bear, would prove too great a burden, considering the fervid zeal, and I might almost say fierceness, with which questions of interest are pursued and the very extraordinary means resorted to to bring about a successful conclusion. . . .

"Our country is making such rapid progress in material improvements, that it is impossible for either the legislative or executive departments of our Government to avoid incidentally, if not directly, being involved in the decision of such questions. Without specification, it is easy to see that there are few applications of science which do not bear on the interests of commerce and navigation, naval or military concerns, the customs, the lighthouses, the public lands, post-offices and post-roads, either directly or remotely. If all examination is refused, the good is confounded with the bad, and the Government may lose a most important advantage. If a decision is left to influence, or to imperfect knowledge, the worst consequences follow.

"Such a body would supply a place not occupied by existing institutions, and which our own is, from its temporary and voluntary character, not able to supply."

Such an idea for an organization of this type that would be of use to the country as a whole in matters relating to science and technology was certainly not new. Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, John Adams, had, although in rather vague terms, proposed a permanent national scientific association designed to further science in the national

interest. By far, the most aggressive group of advocates of the overall Academy idea before the Civil War were called the "Scientific Lazzaroni" (scientific Beggars). This brotherhood of American scientists was headed by Professor Bache and Joseph Henry, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The Bache-Henry circle included Louis Agassiz, Wolcott Gibbs, Benjamin Pierce, and Charles H. Davis.

Several attempts by this group and others to found a National Scientific Association or Academy were made in the 1850's but they encountered very great opposition from the States Rights' Groups in Congress who, at the time, questioned the appropriateness of any centrally oriented Federal Institution. In fact, the 1846 legislation that created the Smithsonian Institution had passed only by a very narrow margin against opposition, most prominently from the States Rights' Groups. Only the fact that over \$500,000 in private money was available for financing kept the Smithsonian idea from being dropped completely. Nevertheless, Davis retained his deep interest in the Academy movement, and because of this he was destined to eventually evolve a practical plan for its establishment.

Davis had been promoted to Commander in 1856 (after 31 years of service) and he spent the next three years in command of the sloop, *St. Marys*. This was a busy command. He cruised in the Pacific visiting several of the ports on the West Coast of South America, the Marquesas and Sandwich Islands, and surveyed some of the uninhabited islands in the South Pacific. Incidentally, the principal purpose of such surveys at the time was to determine the value of the guano deposits of these islands. Several months were spent refitting the *St. Marys* at the newly established Mare Island Navy Yard commanded by Farragut who Davis recognized in his 1857 letters as one who possessed the qualities of a great Naval Commander."

In 1857, Davis was sent to Nicaragua to monitor the dramatic events then taking place in that country. At this time the power of William Walker, the American adventurer, who had in two short years' (1855-1857) time become Generalissimo then President and Dictator of Nicaragua, had crumbled. Davis' part in handling the Walker episode (he was instrumental in securing the surrender of Walker and he carried him and 16 of his principal officers out of the country aboard the *St. Marys*) brought out conspicuously the leading traits of his professional character—fearlessness of responsibility, independence and soundness of judgment, and strong self reliance. While not every one in the U.S. politically agreed at the time with Davis' conduct in the affair, the event served to mark him as an officer who was to be reckoned with and depended upon in matters of action as well as matters of science.

Davis was relieved of command of the *St. Marys* in 1859 and he returned to Harvard again as head of the Nautical Almanac work. During his absence his English translation of Gauss' "Theoria Matus Corporum Coelestium" had been published and he had the honor of giving the mathematical world the first English version of the Method of Least Squares. During his cruise on the *St. Marys*, he had translated Kerhallet's "General Examination of the Pacific Ocean" and written several papers on astronomy and hydrography.

When the Civil War started, Commander Davis was summoned to Washington where he spent some time first in bureau work as a member of what was known as the Construction Board\*. This Board had under con-

\*In this job, Davis took a rather dim view of the design of the *Monitor*. He felt it worthless as a seaworthy ship and endorsed the design only on the premise that

sideration the plans of ships to be built and added to the Navy. Later he served as Fleet Captain in the expedition against Port Royal\*\* and as Flag Officer in command of the Mississippi flotilla. By virtue of this command he was made a Commodore in July 1862, and for his gallant conduct in the victories of Fort Pillow and Memphis\*\*\* he was made a Rear Admiral on 7 February 1863. (The list of Rear Admirals at this time included Farragut, Goldsborough, Dupont, Foote, Davis, and Dahlgren. Each had been promoted for cause.)

Only a few months before had the Navy Bureau of Navigation been established as the Navy's main scientific organization with Commodore Davis as its first Chief. In addition to being the time of his promotion, February of that year proved to be an eventful period both for Admiral Davis and the country.

In February of 1863 the Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, also appointed a "Permanent Commission" to advise the government on inventions and other scientific proposals with which the government at Washington was flooded. The letter of appointment to this Commission is as follows:

"NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
"February 11, 1863.

"Sir: The Department proposes to organize upon the following programme a permanent commission to which all subjects of a scientific character on which the Government may require information may be referred.

"Propositions relative to a permanent scientific commission:

"1st. There shall be constituted a permanent commission consisting of, for the present, Commodore Davis, Professor Henry, and Professor Bache, to which shall be referred questions of science and art upon which the Department may require information.

"2nd. This commission shall have authority to call in associates to aid in their investigations and inquiries.

"3rd. The members and associates of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services.

"You are directed to act as a member of the Commission in conjunction with Professor Henry and Professor Bache.

"Such matters as are presented to the Department will be referred to you for examination and report by the Commission.

"I am respectfully,

"GIDEON WELLES,  
Secretary of Navy.

"CHARLES H. DAVIS,  
Commodore, Chief of Bureau of

Navigation."

"This Commission which was originated by Davis is interesting because it led directly to the establishment of the National Academy of Sciences. Or, as Admiral Davis himself wrote that month in letters to his family in Boston:

"February 2, 1863. How much have I told you, if anything, about a Permanent Com-

mission or Academy? Bache, Henry, and myself are very busy on this topic, and have made a move which will no doubt result in the Permanent Commission. The Academy is more doubtful."

"February 20. Inclosed is a copy of the order creating the Permanent Commission. But the Academy is to be introduced into Congress by Mr. Wilson (Senator from Massachusetts). The whole plan of it was arranged last night between Mr. Wilson, Agassiz, Bache and Ben (Professor Pierce). It was my plan amplified and improved."

"February 24. I told you a word about the Academy in one of my notes, but only a word, being in a hurry. The appointment of a Permanent Commission was suggested to me by one of my letters, which quoted a passage from the British War Office which spoke of a Select Commission; and when I mentioned it to Bache and Henry they acquiesced, and the latter presented the plan to the department. You saw, by the copy of the Secretary's letter to me, that our plan was accepted without any change whatever. We had hardly got through this thing before the idea flashed upon my mind that the whole plan, so long entertained, of the Academy could be successfully carried out if an act of incorporation were boldly asked for in the name of some of the leading men of science from different parts of the country. This I submitted to Bache and Henry with details, but the view was not immediately adopted. The next step was Agassiz coming to Washington as one of the regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Then followed a visit to Agassiz by Senator Wilson, who had nominated him to the regency. At this meeting, which took place at Bache's, Ben, Bache, and Dr. Gould were present; and it was there that the mode of proceeding was devised. Mr. Wilson introduced the bill last Saturday."

In summary, these letters, coupled with other evidence, indicate that immediately upon returning to Washington for duty Davis participated in various discussions among his scientific associates on the important question of how to best aid the Union. The value of such discussions again clearly illustrated to Davis the need for a formal national scientific organization. Having served as a member of various advisory boards, the idea occurred to him not long before February 2, 1863, that this organization might take the form of a Permanent Commission. He at once discussed this idea with Bache and Henry, who agreed that the plan was meritorious, while at the same time clinging to the idea of founding an academy. Henry was so favorably impressed with the commission plan that he immediately presented it to the Navy Department. This plan received the prompt attention of the Secretary of the Navy, who issued an order on February 11, creating the Permanent Commission.

While still awaiting the outcome of his plan to establish this scientific commission, the idea occurred to Admiral Davis that the academy, so long coveted, might be organized by the simple process of asking Congress for its incorporation "in the name of some of the leading men of science from different parts of the country." This idea was also presented to Blache and Henry, who, however, were not immediately convinced of its merits. About this time the great Harvard zoologist, Louis Agassiz, having been nominated by Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, a regent of the Smithsonian Institution, came to Washington and met him on February 19, at the house of Professor Bache. Also at this same meeting were Professor Pierce, Dr. B. A. Gould, and Admiral Davis. Davis' plan of incorporating an academy was discussed by all present, and it was eventually decided that Senator Wilson should introduce a bill of incorporation, which he did on Saturday, February 21. As his letters indicate, Admiral Davis asserts that the plan

of action adopted on this occasion was his own, "amplified and improved."

The bill passed both the Senate and the House on 3 March 1863 and was signed by President Lincoln on the same day. Thus, was created a unique national institution—a private organization with a federal charter. Made up of distinguished scientists and engineers, the Academy had two chief purposes: to foster the orderly development of science and its use for human welfare, and to advise the Federal Government on request and without fee, on matters relating to science and engineering.

It has long been well recognized that this Academy has proved of inestimable value to this nation. The unique mechanism of the Academy of Sciences and its sister Academy of Engineering by which the country's scientists, physicians, and engineers can contribute their knowledge as individuals to the solution of various pressing national problems works just as effectively today as it did over 106 years ago. Such effectiveness of operation and flexibility of charter are high tributes to Davis and the early planners of the Academy.

Navy support was vital in the initial stages of the Academy's work. Such support has always been important to the success of the endeavor. The Academy's first report, incidentally, was on a Navy subject. It dealt with the very practical and important problems of calibrating compasses aboard ships equipped with iron smoke-stacks. The Secretary of the Navy requested such an investigation. And, although documented history is vague on this point, we may presume that Admiral Davis requested the Secretary to make such a request, as well as a good many of the others that were made by the Navy during Davis' lifetime.

Indeed, Admiral Davis was very active in the affairs of the Academy in 1863 and 1864 and remained as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation until 1865. He relinquished this post to assume the Superintendency of the Naval Observatory. Here, he established its operations so efficiently that the French copied our system and placed their National Observatory under the administration of a Naval officer of eminent scientific attainments.

But Admiral Davis was still considered a flag officer of the line and, after two years at the Observatory, he was called once more to sea duty. In 1867 he assumed command of the Brazilian squadron. In 1869, upon his return to the U.S., he was made a member of the Light-House Board in Washington. During his absence in Brazil, Harvard conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws, at this time, the first such honor in the history of the University ever paid to a Naval Commander. From 1870-1874 he commanded the Norfolk Naval Station and from 1874 to the time of his death in 1877 (February) he again had charge of the Naval Observatory.

In a word, Charles Henry Davis was indeed in all ways a very remarkable man. And in the early days of our country he combined his very unusual and remarkable talents in science, administration, and Naval warfare to applications directed solely to his country's welfare. His contributions were many, varied, and important. In the biographical memoirs of the august Academy of Sciences he helped to found, some insight to the man himself can be gained by these words which were written 20 years after his death:

"... He entered the field of science when the gate stood wide open to him, and although not a man of genius, he went as far as a deep love of knowledge and truth and the talents which God had bestowed would carry him. Whatever he had to do he did with all his might; and so when the test came which sorted men according to the merit that was in them, the scientific officer went easily to the front and the idler dropped into

\*\* An interesting account of this battle is contained in the article, "The Great Stone Fleet Calculated Catastrophe," by Cdr. Arthur Gordon, U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Dec. 1968.

\*\*\* Regarding the battle of Memphis, Admiral Porter stated: "For the second time RADM Davis was a strictly Naval victory and won it without a single mistake."

oblivion. He passed the alembic of trying times . . ."

But in the 1899 book, "The Life of Charles Henry Davis, Rear Admiral 1807-1877" by his son, Capt. Charles H. Davis, USN, it was said this way:

"In his official character, Admiral Davis was, first and foremost, a naval officer. He belonged to that class which it is the honor of the regular services of the army and navy to produce, and whose reward is generally only the fulfillment of a high ideal all its own; which it is often the privilege of vulgar malice to flout and condemn, but which is truly the safeguard and bulwark of the republic. He was incidentally a student, but he was neither a pedant nor a dreamer. He could borrow from the past elucidation and example, but he brought the labors of the study to aid, not to impede, the demands of stirring action in the present. He lived intensely and earnestly in the times in which his life was cast.

Since the close of his active career, the service which he loved has passed through a long and almost hopeless period of decadence and neglect, until it has, by a sudden transition, again attained to a position of respectable importance. A sharp line of demarcation has been drawn in men's minds between its former state and its present,—between, in the cant phrase of the day, the old navy and the new. The service has forgotten its past, or at the best remembers it only as a subject for curiosity, bearing a very trifling relation to the present. Tradition and the trace of continuity are lost. Nor is this unnatural. It is due in some measure, perhaps, to a shallow and illiberal scheme at Annapolis, but mainly to the vigor and energy with which the whole navy has arisen, from the enforced lethargy of years, to adapt itself to new conditions and the engrossing pursuits which they demand. But if successive phases of studied neglect and contempt and spasmodic popularity have left the service untainted, it is because the men who compose it to-day, whether they will it so and realize it or not, are, in standard and ideal, the logical heirs and successors of a preceding generation.

It would be false to the teachings of his life to close a review of Admiral Davis' career in any other spirit than that of hopeful expectation and encouragement. Unless the signs of the times are wholly illusory the navy, released from a degrading struggle, against bigotry and caprice, for a mere continued existence, will find its acknowledged place as a factor in the march of the nation as a world-power, even towards a realization of the dream of universal peace. In the even and progressive current of usefulness, succeeding not only because it is skillful with its tools, but because a heritage of earnestness, self-sacrifice, and devotion is its own, it may learn to recognize its own past, and the lives of the men who made it, not as "a series of pictures which please us more or less according to the attitudes of the principal figures and the beauty of the coloring, but as the records of living, acting men, governed by exactly the same passions and motives as ourselves, and therefore always affording us, if we choose to analyze their conduct, the surest and safest rules for our own government; for the interval which divides us from any period of history is really nothing in this respect."

#### ACT OF INCORPORATION

An act to incorporate the National Academy of Sciences

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Louis Agassiz, Massachusetts; J. H. Alexander, Maryland; S. Alexander, New Jersey; A. D. Bache, at large; F. B. Barnard, at large; J. C. Barnard, United States Army, Massachusetts; W. H. C. Bartlett, United States Military Academy, Missouri; U. A. Boyden, Massachusetts; Alexis Caswell, Rhode Island;

William Chauvenet, Missouri; J. H. C. Coffin, United States Naval Academy, Maine; J. A. Dahlgren, United States Navy, Pennsylvania; J. D. Dana, Connecticut; Charles H. Davis, United States Navy, Massachusetts; George Englemann, Saint Louis, Missouri; J. F. Frazer, Pennsylvania; Wolcott Gibbs, New York; J. M. Giles, United States Navy, District of Columbia; A. A. Gould, Massachusetts; B. A. Gould, Massachusetts; Asa Gray, Massachusetts; A. Guyot, New Jersey; James Hall, New York; Joseph Henry, at large; J. E. Hilgard, at large, Illinois; Edward Hitchcock, Massachusetts; J. S. Hubbard, United States Naval Observatory, Connecticut; A. A. Humphreys, United States Army, Pennsylvania; J. L. Le Conte, United States Army, Pennsylvania; J. Leidy, Pennsylvania; J. P. Lesley, Pennsylvania; M. F. Longstreth, Pennsylvania; D. H. Mahan, United States Military Academy, Virginia; J. S. Newberry, Ohio; H. A. Newton, Connecticut; Benjamin Peirce, Massachusetts; John Rodgers, United States Navy, Indiana; Fairman Rogers, Pennsylvania; R. E. Rogers, Pennsylvania; W. B. Rogers, Massachusetts; L. M. Rutherford, New York; Joseph Saxton, at large; Benjamin Silliman, Connecticut; Benjamin Silliman, Junior, Connecticut; Theodore Strong, New Jersey; John Torrey, New York; J. G. Totten, United States Army, Connecticut; Joseph Winlock, United States Nautical Almanac, Kentucky; Jeffries Wyman, Massachusetts; J. D. Whitney, California; their associates and successors duly chosen, are hereby incorporated, constituted, and declared to be a body corporate, by the name of the National Academy of Sciences.

SEC. 2 *And be it further enacted, That the National Academy of Sciences shall consist of not more than fifty ordinary members, and the said corporation hereby constituted shall have power to make its own organization, including its constitution, bylaws, and rules and regulations; to fill all vacancies created by death, resignation, or otherwise; to provide for the election of foreign and domestic members, the division into classes, and all other matters needful or usual in such institution, and to report the same to Congress.*

SEC. 3 *And be it further enacted, That the National Academy of Sciences shall hold an annual meeting at such place in the United States as may be designated, and the Academy shall, whenever called upon by any department of the Government, investigate, examine, experiment, and report upon any subject of science or art, the actual expense of such investigations, examinations, experiments, and reports to be paid from appropriations which may be made for the purpose, but the Academy shall receive no compensation whatever for any services to the Government of the United States.*

GALUSHA A. GROW,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SOLOMON FOOTE,

President of the Senate pro tempore.

Approved, March 3, 1863.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, President.

#### PITTSBURGH'S LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM—SAVINGS THROUGH NOMINAL BONDS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on October 27 and again on November 24, for the RECORD, I expressed my support for the legal services program conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and my intention to oppose the "Murphy amendment" giving Gov-

ernors an ultimate veto authority over these programs—should it be offered on the House floor.

I reiterate my opposition to this amendment and in support of my position, include at this point in the RECORD an article describing Pittsburgh's nominal bond program appearing in November's OEO newsletter.

I am very proud of our local program in Pittsburgh, and of the services being performed for some of our less affluent citizens by Mr. Stanton Wettick and his team of dedicated attorneys.

When we debate H.R. 12321 in the House, I urge my colleagues to consider the accomplishment of many programs such as Pittsburgh's, and vote down any damaging amendments that would give undue power to the State capitals. The article follows:

#### A LEGAL SERVICES PROJECT: SAVINGS THROUGH NOMINAL BOND

PITTSBURGH.—Neighborhood Legal Services here has developed a bail bond project which is saving about \$1,200 a month in investigators' salaries, is paid by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The savings, estimated at \$10,000 to \$20,000 a month in jail detention costs—not to mention other social service costs—are realized by local jurisdictions. The program serves Allegheny County, the City of Pittsburgh and several local jurisdictions in the county.

Called the Nominal Bond Program, it processes some 150 cases a month, with three NLS investigators responding around the clock to the needs of people being jailed who cannot raise bail and some of whom have no friends or contacts whom they can phone for help. Usually within 24 hours the NLS team can round up enough supporting data on the jailed person's employment, family responsibilities or past record of lawful behavior to back up an appeal for release. The decision, however, rests with the judge.

In about 100 cases per month, or two out of three handled by NLS, the local magistrate or Justice of the Peace finds the evidence adequate and sets bail at the nominal rate, or \$1.

Without NLS help the accused would have to await trial proceedings in jail until the case comes up on the court docket, with the local jurisdiction meanwhile bearing the costs of detention. This can run up to \$500 a month, but averages out at about \$100 per person, according to Stanton Wettick, originator of the program and director of NLS since June.

He is even more concerned about the human savings, which also represent real savings in social service and welfare costs. If a person lands in jail without someone to support him, he stands a greater chance of losing his job. For heads of families this means putting the entire family on welfare. There are also the losses in terms of purchasing power and taxes.

The investigation is carried out by non-lawyers, most of whose work can be done by telephone. They spend about two or three hours per case. Wettick feels that the success of the program is due as much to the fact that someone is taking an interest in the accused as the facts themselves. So far the courts and other contracts have been cooperative, and the only losers appear to be the firms which formerly wrote those bonds at an average cost of \$50 each.

"This month we're writing more bail than the professional bondsmen," Wettick adds with a grin.

Pittsburgh's four-year-old NLS program got what his staff calls "a shot in the arm" when Wettick took over as director. A veteran of the Legal Services Program in

Charleston, West Virginia, he also teaches poverty law at the University of Pittsburgh, where he is in a prime position to recruit the top graduates. His staff of 16 presently includes four Reginald Hebersmith Fellowship students from Pitt and two VISTA lawyers, all OEO-funded.

The staff is divided between a central office core of specialists and roving neighborhood teams of two who staff NLS offices from two to five days a week, depending upon the neighborhood served. There are eight offices in Pittsburgh and five in rural Allegheny County communities.

The entire program is funded by OEO for approximately \$420,000.

#### THOMAS VAIL: A BLEND OF BROTHERHOOD AND LEADERSHIP

### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the December newsletter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews includes a front page article concerning one of Cleveland's most outstanding citizens, Tom Vail, editor and publisher of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The National Human Relations Award by the National Council of Christians and Jews is a fitting testimonial to this dedicated man. I believe this article is worthy of the attention of my colleagues:

THOMAS VAIL—A BLEND OF BROTHERHOOD AND LEADERSHIP

In a time when leadership and dynamic forthrightness are at a premium it is reassuring to focus on the career of the young publisher-editor of the Plain Dealer, Tom Vail. A newspaperman's newspaperman, Tom Vail set out to make his mark in the field of journalism and at the same time see to it that the tremendous influence and power of his newspaper and his pen be used for the good of all men, everywhere.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews in their selection of Mr. Vail to be the recipient of the National Human Relations Award recognizes that Tom Vail has blended his qualities of leadership, his successful journalistic career and his essential belief in human dignity and the Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God into a personal way of life that has become a powerful force for good. When Mr. Vail receives the highest honor of the Conference on Sunday night, February 8, 1969 at a civic dinner in Cleveland it will be because of "his leadership as National Brotherhood Week Chairman in 1969; the tremendous amount of time, energy, resources and the influence and prestige of his newspaper he has devoted to the righting of intergroup wrongs in the areas of race, religion and community."

The Awards Committee pointed out that under his direction his newspaper, the Plain Dealer, has supported every campaign and every cause that seeks to better relationships between the races and other minority groups in this country. He has put himself and his newspaper in the forefront of the struggle for racial equality, fair housing and equal employment opportunity.

He is a young energetic, brilliant American leader who has picked up the banner of the essential dignity of the individual and is helping to build a better and new society for all men.

Mr. Vail is a Co-Chairman of the Northern Ohio Chapter of the NCCJ and has been a Board member of this organization for the

past six years. In 1967 his newspaper support of Carl B. Stokes in his campaign for Mayor in the Primary Election was a giant stride in breaking down of racial barriers in contemporary American politics.

He became publisher and editor of the Plain Dealer at the age of 36. He has spent 20 years as a newspaper reporter and publisher.

Mr. Vail comes from a famous family of great prominence in the business, civic and social affairs of Cleveland. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfathers were founders and contributors to many of the most important businesses and civic institutions in the Cleveland area. He was born in Cleveland, June 23, 1926, the son of Herman L. Vail and the late Delia White Vail. He is a great-grandson of the late Liberty E. Holden, founder of The Plain Dealer. His grandfather, the late Windsor T. White, was a founder of the White Motor Co., world's largest manufacturer of trucks.

He has served on the boards of many highly important local and national organizations. He served on the President's Health Manpower Commission in 1967. He is on the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. He is president of the Cleveland Convention and Visitors Bureau and a director of the Greater Cleveland Growth Assn. He is a trustee of the Washington Journalism Center and the Cleveland Council on World Affairs, and an executive board member of the Greater Cleveland Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

Mr. Vail is a director of the Forest City Publishing Co.; director of the Art Gravure Corp.; member of the board of the Associated Press; recently completed six years on the board of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Assn.; secretary and Executive Committee member of Newspaper 1, an association of some 30 leading newspapers of the country. He is a member of the American Newspaper Publishers Assn. and of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

#### VITA-U.S.A.

### HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of President Nixon's recent announcement of the creation of a National Center for Voluntary Action to help motivate and mobilize citizen-volunteers to "master common needs and problems," I think it is timely and appropriate to inform the Congress of a volunteer program in my home district which has already achieved outstanding success in mobilizing large numbers of volunteers to help solve the problems of poverty in the United States. I am speaking of the new U.S.A. Division of Volunteers for International Technical Assistance.

On past occasions I have commented on VITA's more than 9 years' experience in successfully providing technical consultation through its volunteers in helping to improve conditions in the developing world. Working with private citizens, missionaries, Peace Corps volunteers, and AID personnel, VITA's international operation continues with that important task. Recently, VITA counterpart organizations were established in the Philippines and Ceylon, and more are planned in the coming months.

Now I am happy to report that VITA, through its new USA program, is calling on its roster of over 6,000 volunteers to provide technical and professional assistance to both public and private anti-poverty efforts. At a time when we are reviewing the authorization for the Office of Economic Opportunity, I think it significant to point out that VITA-U.S.A. was created with a grant from OEO last January. As an example of cooperation between a Government agency and the private sector in helping to seek solutions to some of America's critical problems, the VITA-U.S.A. program is very much in keeping with the President's recent remarks on voluntarism and the innovative thrust of OEO under Mr. Rumsfeld.

In a November 4 statement on voluntarism the President said:

From the beginning of our country, Americans have worked together voluntarily to help master the common needs and problems. A major goal of this administration is to recognize and enlist the energies and resources of the people themselves, as well as government, in a renewal of this historic American approach.

A recent review of the first 9 months of VITA-U.S.A.'s operation indicates solid success in enlisting the energies and resources the President spoke of. Under unanimous consent I insert excerpts from that review and from a recent program description prepared by VITA:

#### VITA-USA: A PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The USA Division of Volunteers for International Technical Assistance (VITA) came into being with the signing of an OEO contract in January 1969. This was the culmination of discussions which OEO initiated in the summer of 1968 and reflected the reputation VITA had acquired in providing volunteer technical assistance to the developing nations since 1960.

VITA-USA shares an expanding roster of over 6,000 Volunteers with the organization's International Division. In the first nine months of operation, VITA-USA received more than 300 inquiries from all parts of the United States and its territories.

VITA-USA accepts requests for technical assistance from any organization, group, or individual—public or private—engaged in domestic anti-poverty work. The single criterion applied is that the recipient of VITA consultation not be able to afford normal fees for such services.

Requests are sometimes answered by mail but more frequently involve face-to-face contact. This is accomplished in one of two ways. In the first method, a volunteer living near the requester visits the client and often accomplishes the assignment in his spare time. Presently there are two field offices with small staffs who support the community service activities of VITA's Boston and Washington, D.C. Chapters.

Second method: the volunteer spends a block of time on "short term assignment". In such cases volunteers are usually required to travel to another area and must take leave from their jobs. Travel expenses are paid by VITA. The volunteer's employer makes a vital contribution by continuing his salary during the leave period. Duration of the assignments vary from one day to several weeks.

VITA Volunteers represent a wide range of skills from architecture and engineering to business management, systems analysis, education, and psychology. In the USA program they have assisted self-help housing groups, trained hotel employees, done marketing surveys, developed a volunteer manpower management system, and designed simple, easy to build playground equipment.

To date, new volunteers have been recruited on the basis of need in specific skills categories. On-board Volunteers are frequently used to recruit or refer others and even help in the selection and screening process when assignments are made. Many volunteers, particularly in the national headquarters area, give administrative assistance to staff members by working in the inquiry service, serving on research committees, and by representing VITA at meetings and conferences.

Once a request is received, the Inquiry Service staff check the roster to locate one or more volunteers with the skills required. They use a telephone interview guide to determine the person's willingness, availability, and suitability in terms of experience and attitude. The client himself usually participates in the selection process by also speaking with the candidate to make a final suitability determination. The volunteer's effectiveness is measured following receipt of reports submitted by him and by the client with whom he has dealt.

Although VITA-USA is still a new program, the response by those who have been assisted indicates that it has been very successful. Acceptance by community people being helped is based on two factors: *responsiveness*—we assist only those who request help, and *performance*—the volunteers have consistently provided competent professional assistance.

Basic elements of our plan for the second and third years of operation are the considerable expansion of local staff supported chapters in a number of American cities to better serve concentrated urban areas and an enlarged National Consulting Service to handle requests from smaller towns and rural areas.

#### VITA-USA: A SUMMARY REVIEW OF THE FIRST 9 MONTHS

**General Conclusions:** Based on the success of the program it may be said that the major hypothesis of the demonstration has been proven: "VITA's volunteer force, which has been utilized effectively in aiding developing countries, can be applied to help solve problems of poverty in the USA."

The USA program is unique in its ability to mobilize and apply volunteers for use in urban and rural poverty settings and on a national scale. The basic principles that have led to acceptance by community people needing help are:

1. **Responsiveness:** assistance is given only to those who request help and only in the form that it is requested.

2. **Performance:** the staff has shown an ability to handle volunteer selection, logistics of volunteer assignments, and follow-up. Volunteers have consistently demonstrated their ability to provide competent, professional assistance.

The first two chapter projects established in Boston and Washington demonstrate the need for additional ones in metropolitan areas where manpower resources covering a broad skills spectrum can be mobilized.

The National Consulting Service is mostly needed by small cities and rural areas.

**Quantity of Effort:** During the nine months covered by the review, 316 requests were received by the program. Responding to them, over 500 volunteers contributed 7000 hours.

The program start-up was smooth, with top-notch staff being recruited within targeted dates. (Interestingly, six of the staff are ex-Peace Corps volunteers.) Methods and procedures have been developed, and an ongoing evaluation permits continual improvement of these procedures.

Voluntary technical assistance is extremely economical since the consulting time is free.

**Quality of Effort:** Evaluations of the Boston Project and the National Consulting Service include the following conclusions on

operating procedures: (1) the requesters give VITA-USA high marks on volunteer selection and speed of response. (2) VITA-USA cases involve mostly "soft technology" and are much more complex than previous international requests. They require more in-depth, on-site help, and follow-up. (3) the volunteer's interest in providing repeated or long term assistance to our requests is increased when the staff provide him with up-to-date feedback on the results of his efforts. (4) there are still many potential users of VITA's services who do not clearly understand how to take advantage of the program or who have as yet not even heard of it.

**Unique Characteristics:** (1) **Flexibility and Concern:** there is frequent intermittent involvement, thanks to VITA's flexibility and lack of "red tape", (2) VITA-USA often serves as a bridge to other private or governmental resources, in many cases bringing together for the first time those in need with those in the best position to provide assistance, (3) **Availability:** for the first time in many communities VITA represents a source of free technical assistance. Too often in the past community projects needing such assistance have gone without and failed; (4) **Objectivity:** volunteers serve as objective outsiders; their advice can be used publicly or privately to help the requester achieve his goals. Examples illustrating these points:

A California Community Action Agency director reports valuable assistance in changing organization structure and personnel methods as a result of management analysis by a VITA Volunteer.

An Urban League housing project in Omaha is being considered for a \$160,000 grant and is using a report by two qualified volunteers to back up its case.

Quote from a crafts project in Harlan, Kentucky: "VITA provided the assistance needed to this small agency which had neither funds nor confidence to seek elsewhere. In areas where volunteers were not available, excellent referrals were made, quite unlike others I have dealt with." As a result of VITA's help in costing and market sources, a grant providing initial capital has been obtained and a market established in Washington, D.C. Sixty people are involved.

Quote from Wyoming Community Health Council, New Richmond, Virginia: "I had contacted OEO in Washington and was told that the chances of getting a consulting firm were very dim. I contacted VITA but did not expect any results . . . VITA provided the assistance asked for and more . . . provided a stimulus to the project when many were discouraged and about to give up hope. Dr. Starkweather has shown the way. We have hired a health specialist and are preparing the proposal for funding."

**Areas of Greatest Contribution:** Based on experience to date, VITA's staff has been able to define areas where the program seems to be able to have its greatest impact. One of the areas is the field of *business development in rural areas and small cities*. Three ventures off to a successful start, due heavily to VITA volunteer assistance, are:

1. "Jack of All Trades Service Corporation", a maintenance business formed by the Bennington-Rutland Opportunity Council, Inc., received help from volunteer Richard Bowen on systems of floor maintenance, equipment procurement, job bidding. "Mr. Bowen brought over a floor machine and worked day and night to train the men. He visited our customers and set up a program of cleaning for each. Also helped with calls on new customers, increasing business."

2. A quilting group in North Carolina received information on production, marketing, and design. The co-op has been formed, and the first quilt samples are in production.

Other areas of special competence include *Management Methods and Systems Analysis, Fund Raising Assistance, Engineering—par-*

*ticularly rural water systems and sanitation, Education of the Disadvantaged, Recreation and Playgrounds, and Business Development.*

VITA-USA has developed a model for establishing a nationwide network of effective urban chapter programs. Whereas one chapter program was the goal for the first year, two staffed projects have been stated. The Boston Project is already up to over 500 volunteer man hours per month being devoted to projects with high success potential. The District of Columbia Project is well under way.

#### NIXON THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Washington often gets referred to as a "wonderland," and these days certainly are no exception.

And if there were ever an issue that seemed to place everyone within a veritable caucus race, it is that of the Vietnam war; the more we race, the more we pout, the more we seem to be still in the same tragic position.

These thoughts come to my mind after reading the following poem by Miss Carol Stevens, managing editor of the Eastside Sun in Los Angeles. Miss Stevens reacted to current antics here in the Capital by deftly parodying Lewis Carroll in a manner I found both amusing and telling.

So as to share this bit of verse with my colleagues, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Eastern Sun, Nov. 13, 1969]

NIXON THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS

(By Carol Stevens)

"The time has come," the Walrus said,  
"To talk of many things;  
Of budget cuts and Vietnam  
Of presidents—and flings—  
And why the sea is full of oil—  
And whether liberty rings."

"But wait a bit," Dick Nixon cried,  
"Before we have our chat;  
It isn't fair to talk of peace  
Or dangerous things like that."  
"That's very true," said the Agnew,  
"Off with their heads if they do!"

"A space of peace," the Walrus said,  
"Is what we chiefly need,  
And some cash for education  
Would be very good indeed—  
And solutions to pollution  
Before our dissolutions."

"But not from us," Dick Nixon cried,  
Turning a little blue.  
"Military and industry agree,  
Too dismal a thing to do."  
"That's fine for them," the Walrus said,  
"We're the ones in the stew!"

The President said nothing but,  
"Just keep as quiet as mice."  
The Majority took their cue,  
And they were very nice.  
Their wires and letters agreed with Dick  
The Way they're told to do.

"It seems a shame," the Walrus said,  
"To play them such a trick."  
"In Vietnam we've gone so far  
We can't turn back," says Dick.  
"We have to stop," the Walrus said,  
"While Vietnam exists!"

"I weep for you," the Walrus said;  
I deeply sympathize.  
The Great White Father has it hard,  
But I'm the one who dies."  
Holding his "Peace Now" sign up high;  
"End the war now!" he cries.

"O Nixon," said the Vocal Few,  
"You've had a pleasant run.  
How about tackling our problems now?"  
But answer came there none,  
And this was scarcely odd, because  
He'd gone to get his gun.

#### MORE EFFECTIVE BUDGET PROCEDURES ARE NECESSARY TO STRENGTHEN THE U.N.

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), recently spoke perceptively on how the United Nations should deal with its formidable array of problems. As a congressional representative to the General Assembly, Mr. FASCELL is particularly well equipped to assess the major obstacles confronting the world body. His speech should be read by all those who wish an insight into how the U.N., so vital to the cause of world peace, can be made more effective.

THE UNITED NATIONS BUDGET FOR 1970  
(Statement by Congressman DANTE B. FASCELL, U.S. Representative to the General Assembly<sup>1</sup>)

Before commenting on the budget estimates for 1970 and several other important issues which will be before our committee, I should like to say a few words about a somewhat larger but also a relevant, issue.

Since I have been attending this session, I have listened carefully to statements presented both in this committee and in the plenary session, and I have been struck by a theme which appeared to recur in many of them—a theme reflecting certain uneasiness, even certain profound concern, about the direction in which this organization is moving and its capacity for effective action.

I would like to stress, Mr. Chairman, that this theme, this concern, was not particular to any one delegation nor to the delegates from any one geographical area. It was expressed by representatives of small states and of large ones, of those which are advancing along the ladder of development as well as by more developed countries.

Viewing its present, and looking back at the development of this organization during the past 24 years, I find this concern to be fully warranted. For nearly two and a half decades, the United Nations and its affiliated organs and agencies have grown considerably in response to the wishes of their member states and the needs of the moment. This growth has been necessary and beneficial to the world community, but we would be less than frank with each other if we were to claim that it has proceeded at all times along clearly defined, rational, and systematic lines. As a result, many thoughtful people, looking at the complex proliferating machinery of the United Nations system, conscious of its financial and other problems, have wondered aloud about this organiza-

tion's ability to respond effectively during the next 10 or 25 years to both the legitimate desires of its membership and the immensely challenging tasks which lie ahead of us.

All of us are agreed, I am certain, that the United Nations is a vitally important organization which should, and indeed must, continue to respond to the needs of its members. At the same time, is it not for us who have some responsibility for the future of mankind to take the necessary steps to assure that our cumulative efforts may actively promote the cause of peace and development for all people?

These are, admittedly, large issues, and some may say that they do not belong in the Fifth Committee. I feel otherwise. I believe that this committee has a legitimate and vital concern for the effectiveness of this organization, its management, and wise use of the resources entrusted to it by the world community.

For example, we ought to devote attention and comprehensive consideration to the relationships—financial, budgetary, administrative, and other—between the United Nations, its voluntary programs and the entire family of U.N. specialized agencies.

Several items on the agenda of the Fifth Committee relate to this subject. Therefore, this committee is competent to act in this field with a view to proposing changes and improvements which will assure a more systematic, coordinated, and efficient utilization of scarce resources—manpower as well as financial. The methods and procedures which we have followed during the past 24 years are not necessarily suitable to the tasks which will confront the United Nations family of organizations during the next quarter of a century. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, as necessary, to devise new, effective methods of coping with future challenges.

Accordingly, I would suggest that in approaching the agenda items before us, and in our corridor conversations, we begin to focus on ways and means to make this organization as effective an instrument as possible. And in doing so, I would hope that we could keep certain basic concepts in mind. They are:

First, that we recognize that the task before us is a collective effort in which we are all vitally interested and that, while there are and will always be differences of opinion on various items, there is no rational basis for confrontation. This is an organization to which we have all contributed and which is of major importance to all of us. Accordingly, we must listen to each other and realize that none of us is the exclusive repository of wisdom.

Secondly, we should recognize that, in order to carry out the purposes and principles of the charter and to be a vital force in international life, the United Nations must develop its capacity to meet the needs of its members. As we take on new activities we must constantly reassess our priorities to see whether they are still valid. None of us, I am certain, is willing to abandon his early dreams and hopes for the United Nations, and none of us wants to place what has sometimes been called a "ceiling" on its essential activities. But at the same time, all of us should agree that the organization's growth should follow a rational pattern related to the increasingly challenging and complex tasks which will confront our world during the next 25 years.

#### BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1970

Because we feel as we do about this matter, Mr. Chairman, we are pleased that the Secretary General has taken the lead in dealing with the problems which have troubled us and that in this he has the support of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. We believe that the Secretary General has been wise to consider that the present is a period in which to assess the existing resources, capacity, and methods of work of the United Nations—that

it is a period of consolidation. We consider that his budget estimates for 1970<sup>2</sup> on the whole reflect this view and that he should be commended for them. We consider them to be a considerable improvement, particularly at this stage in the life of the organization, over the estimates which were presented last year. I should add, Mr. Chairman, that we consider that the Advisory Committee has done its usual excellent job in making its recommendations with respect to the estimates.

It is, of course, true, as many representatives have pointed out, that we have no clear picture as yet as to what the final budget level will be, and so it is premature to take a position with respect to it. We, like other delegations, will carefully scrutinize the additional estimates which will come before us.

Before going further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize one point to which sufficient attention is seldom given. The United States does not mean to speak as if the major administrative and budgetary problems about which we are concerned can be solved by the Secretary General alone. We recognize that these problems have been created, to a very large extent, by the demands of member governments themselves; that we all share the responsibility for the existence of these problems. We must realize that greater discipline and restraint on our part is required if the development of this organization in the administrative and budgetary area is to be orderly and rational.

#### PROVISIONAL POSTS

A number of delegations have questioned the credit sought by the Secretary General to provide for 234 provisional posts in 1970. It can, of course, be questioned whether the request of the Secretary General for this credit is wise, in view of the manpower survey being undertaken and in view of the fact that a number of existing posts have not yet been filled. Further, one can question the provisional-post approach—which was tried and discarded some years ago—and we do not favor it as a normal method of budgeting. However, we recognize that the Advisory Committee has scrutinized this credit very carefully and has decided to accept it for 1970, with some reduction and some question as to the total, in the light of the limitations the Secretary General has imposed upon himself with respect to its use. Further, we can understand why the Secretary General has chosen to call for posts on a provisional basis during the period in which the manpower survey is underway. While sharing the misgivings of the Advisory Committee on the numbers involved, we believe that this limited approach can be accepted as an exceptional measure to deal with an unusual situation.

There is another area to which many delegations have referred as one in which savings can be made; that is, conference and documentation costs. We strongly share this view. The problems which exist in this area arise almost entirely from the demands of member states, and there is only a minimal amount which the Secretary General can do on his own to solve them. We are convinced that the best way in which to deal with this matter is for this committee to approve the recommendations of the Committee of Seven, which are before us.<sup>3</sup>

The Secretary General is making an effort to deal with that part of the problem which is his responsibility. Recognizing the interest of this committee in the matter, he designated the Office of Conference Services as the first area to be the subject of the survey being undertaken by the new Administrative Management Service. The survey is now underway and is expected to be completed by the end of the year. In this connection, we

<sup>1</sup> Made in Committee V (Administrative and Budgetary) on Oct. 21 (U.S./U.N. press release 128).

<sup>2</sup> U.N. doc. A/7606.

<sup>3</sup> U.N. doc. A/7359.

would like to congratulate the Secretary General for the manner in which he has responded to this committee's request for a study of the utilization and deployment of the entire Secretariat.

#### PLANNING ESTIMATES, 1971

One of the most important items which will come before us is the planning estimates for 1971. We can say little on this subject at the present time, since the Secretary General's proposals are not yet before us. We assume that, in preparing the 1971 planning estimates, the Secretary General will be guided by the same philosophy which he has sought to reflect in the 1970 estimates; namely, that no significant increase in existing staff resources will be sought until the results of the manpower survey become reasonably clear.

#### UNFORESEEN EXPENSES

Let me now turn to another matter, the report of the Advisory Committee on procedures for dealing with unforeseen expenses and their financing.<sup>4</sup> This report was held over from last year because of an understandable desire on the part of many delegations for additional information and clarification. We believe that this committee should at this session adopt the Advisory Committee's recommendations. As we have pointed out on an earlier occasion, the size of the supplemental appropriations for 1969—of which only a part qualified under the present resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses—makes clear that additional discipline is needed in incurring obligations during a financial year and approving proposed expenditures which were not foreseen at the time annual appropriations for that year were made.

#### SUBSIDIARY ADMINISTRATIVE BODIES

We share the concern expressed by the Secretary General, by the chairman of the Advisory Committee, and by a number of delegations to the effect that the activities of subsidiary bodies, established to help bring about efficiency and economy, may not be properly interrelated. Perhaps the problem results from the fact that this committee was not sufficiently careful when it established the terms of reference of these bodies. We consider it essential that the activities of the various subsidiary organs which are now dealing with administrative, budgetary, and management problems be carefully aligned and that their responsibilities and relationships be clearly delineated. To accomplish this, we believe that the Advisory Committee should examine this problem in depth during the coming year, in consultation with the other bodies involved, and should present this committee with specific recommendations next year as to how we should deal with it.

#### STRENGTHENING THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

For many years now, we have been calling upon the Advisory Committee to study more and more problems, and obviously we will have to rely increasingly on this committee as United Nations operations expand and grow more complex. It seems to us that the time has come to recognize that we have overloaded the Advisory Committee in relation to its existing program and method of work. We believe that it is, in part, because the Advisory Committee is so overloaded that we have tended in recent years to create new bodies to perform tasks in the administrative, budgetary, and management field. It occurs to us that what is needed for the future is to ensure that members elected to the Advisory Committee are able to devote more time, perhaps substantially full time, to this important committee. This will, in turn, enable it to give greater attention to its program of work, including providing broader services to the committee, by being

in session during a substantial part of the year. It also occurs to us that it may very well be necessary for the future to make arrangements to enable the chairman of the Advisory Committee to serve on a full-time, year-round basis. We recommend that the Advisory Committee be asked to look into this matter seriously during the coming year and report its conclusions to us at the next session of the Assembly.

#### SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS

In response to the General Assembly's request of last year, the Committee on Contributions has made a report to us of the results of its review of the criteria and terms of reference used in establishing the scale of assessments. We are impressed with the general conclusions of the committee, contained in paragraphs 47 through 50 of its report.<sup>5</sup> In particular, we agree that the various guidelines laid down for the committee by the General Assembly have withstood the test of time and permit the establishment of a balanced and equitable scale based primarily on the principle of capacity to pay. Accordingly, we believe that no new guidelines are required for the Committee on Contributions in connection with its establishment of a new scale of assessments next year.

#### FINANCIAL SOLVENCY

Speaking earlier before this committee, the Secretary General reported to us on the financial position of the organization. If we believe that there is a vital necessity for the survival and continued development of this organization to carry out the purposes of the charter, we cannot permit the existing financial situation to continue. All our other efforts will be in vain unless we can solve the financial problem. Our own views concerning the responsibility for this problem are well known and need not to be repeated here. We believe, that, as part of the overall effort to put this organization on a sound basis by its 25th anniversary, a most serious effort must be made during the coming year to find a solution. We suggest that this committee request the Secretary General to devote his own efforts and those of appropriate senior staff members during the coming year to an attempt to negotiate the *modus vivendi*, of which he spoke at our first meeting.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding this, my first intervention in the deliberations of this committee, I want to return briefly to my earlier remarks concerning the need for a meaningful reappraisal of the operations of this organization and its affiliated agencies in order to find out where we are, where we wish to go, and how we hope to get there. It is an obvious fact, not requiring any lengthy elaboration, that a sound financial basis and effective management are essential if this organization is to enjoy significant growth and live up to the expectations which millions of peoples throughout the world have placed in it.

The financial resources required to sustain the organization's growth will not be forthcoming if the member states lose faith in the organization's ability to use them wisely and effectively. Already, a number of governments have questioned the wisdom of providing the United Nations with significantly increased support unless and until our organizational structures, methods of work, and guidelines for future development are changed so as to alleviate the concern which has been expressed in this forum. In my view, the United Nations must respond to this situation. Then and only then will most of our members be willing to give proper attention to considering the inputs of resources which may be required to make the engine go.

It is for this reason that I have suggested that the United Nations use the next year

wisely. It is for this reason that I have urged that this committee take the necessary action to set in motion the several suggestions set forth above. If we can find solutions to these problems alone, it will, I believe, set the pact for the rest of the organization. If we catch the beat here, this very rhythm may well pulsate throughout the entire organization in time to give us all the basis for celebrating a truly glorious 25th anniversary.

#### FINLAND'S 52D ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1969, the Finnish nation celebrated her 52d anniversary of independence. Although young as an independent and sovereign state, Finland is a country with old and strong traditions of the same democratic ideals and democratic system of government as those we Americans cherish.

Finland is a border land. Its geopolitical position has shaped its history and made it a bridge and a meeting ground between East and West. This fact has in recent days and weeks been clearly demonstrated by the decision of the United States and the Soviet Union to start the so-called SALT talks on the limitations of strategic armaments in Helsinki, Finland. The starting of these talks marks a historical occasion of the utmost importance and urgency for mankind as a whole.

We can only be grateful to Finland, a country which maintains friendly relations with all nations across the dividing lines of military blocks and ideological alignments, for offering a neutral ground for these talks and for making every effort to create a favorable atmosphere for the success of the talks. This is a laudable policy and effort in serving the cause of peace.

For most Americans Finland is a country of honesty, a country that meets her obligations and has a strong spirit of righteousness and freedom. It is a country which has been internationally recognized as one of the leading nations in modern architecture, city planning, and modern design. We Americans can be proud of the friendship and mutual understanding that have always characterized the relations between our two countries.

This friendship began with the adventurous Finnish immigrants who came to this country in past centuries and helped to build our great Nation. This friendship has been reinforced by the Finnish nation's abiding example of valor and industry.

On this occasion, I think we should remember Finland's struggle for freedom. We can congratulate the Finnish people for having been able to remain a free country in conditions which have not always been easy. I hope that they will count among their nation's resources the enduring friendship of the American people.

<sup>4</sup> U.N. doc. A/7336.

<sup>5</sup> U.N. doc. A/7611.

VIETNAM: 111 B.C.—1969 A.D.—BRIEF HISTORY PREPARED BY UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH STUDENT

## HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a day or two after the Vietnam moratorium of October 15, I received a copy of a history-in brief of Vietnam, "111 B.C.—A.D. 1969, written by sophomore Bill Gormley of the University of Pittsburgh, which appeared in the Pitt News of October 13.

This article was written to help convey to the leadership of our country some of the reasons why so many of the young people are opposed to the war.

In preparing this narrative, I think Mr. Gormley has done a very able job of expressing the mixture of curses and blessings which has befallen this small and unfortunate nation, during its long history. Accordingly, I am pleased to include his article in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

VIETNAM: 111 B.C.—A.D. 1969

(By Bill Gormley)

Vietnam's strategic location, fertile territory, and mineral resources have been curses as well as blessings. Richly endowed by nature and nestled conveniently between the sea and the Asian mainland, Vietnam has inevitably been eyed lustfully by mightier nations and has found freedom an elusive ideal.

In 111 B.C., Vietnam was annexed by China, her powerful northern neighbor. Submitting for a millennium, the Vietnamese finally rebelled against their masters, bringing Chinese hegemony to an end in 939 A.D. Except for a brief period during which the Chinese resumed control, Vietnam remained independent for over 900 years.

During the latter half of the 19th century, however, western nations proceeded to bear their share of "the white man's burden." France, with little difficulty, colonized Vietnam. Although some Vietnamese physically resisted the French and later harassed French soldiers and officials, most Vietnamese felt impotent before the European giant.

### RISE OF NATIONALISM

Conditions changed, though, as the 20th century ushered in a new era. Contagious nationalist fervor spread quickly. Resentment against colonial rulers became pronounced. Those Vietnamese who journeyed to Europe to be educated or to fight the Kaiser's troops could hardly fail to be impressed by the gap between democratic theory and colonial practice.

One such Vietnamese, a young nationalist who would later be known as Ho Chi Minh, appeared at the Versailles Peace Talks in 1919, begging the great powers to grant his people their independence. Ho's plea fell on deaf ears. Turning to another source for help, Ho became a member of the French Communist Party, which sympathized with his cause.

Quickly acquiring a reputation, Ho was sent to the Soviet Union and China where he worked as a political organizer. In 1930, he established the Vietnamese Communist Party dedicated to the eviction of the French colonialists. Before long, Ho's organization emerged as the strongest anti-French group in Vietnam, attracting support from communist and non-communist sources.

### ORGANIZATION OF VIETMINH

Late in the 1930's, the Japanese invaded Indochina, ousted the French, and imposed a new dictatorship on the people of Vietnam. In response to this different threat, Ho Chi Minh organized a broader independence movement, the Vietminh, which soon encompassed Vietnamese nationalists of various political affiliations.

In the vanguard of the Japanese resistance movement, Ho Chi Minh and the Vietminh won the informal recognition of the Allies and the special appreciation of the United States. In addition to supplying the U.S. with vital intelligence information, Vietminh soldiers helped rescue American pilots shot down over Indochina.

President Roosevelt, grateful for the assistance of the Vietminh and committed to the principle of self-determination for all peoples, vowed to press for a free Vietnam after the war. Although President Roosevelt didn't live to witness the event, his hope was realized on September 2, 1945, when Ho proclaimed Vietnam's independence.

### ESTABLISHMENT OF FREE STATE

Ousting the Japanese puppet, Bao Dai, the Vietminh established a government which France recognized as "a free state" in March, 1946. In November however, convinced that they could reimpose colonial control over Vietnam, the French bombed the port of Haiphong, killing 6,000 Vietnamese civilians and beginning a long and bloody war.

President Truman, afraid of alienating the French and jeopardizing the future of Atlantic defense alliance proposals, refused to back Vietnam's freedom fighters, despite the commitments of his predecessor. Vietnamese nationalists concluded that the Allies had double crossed them.

Boldly, the French sought American support for their campaign against the Vietminh, soft-pedaling the nationalistic nature of the independence movement. At first, the United States shrank scrupulously from involvement and actually urged the French to meet the Vietminh's demand for an end to colonial rule.

### CHANGE IN SYMPATHIES

Two events, however, changed America's attitude toward the Vietnamese conflict. First, China went communist. Second, the Korean War broke out. As a result of the two developments, the United States stopped viewing the struggle in Vietnam as a struggle for freedom. Suddenly, it was part of a devilish communist attempt to take over the world.

The United States decided to side with the French against the Vietminh. By 1954, America was supplying 80 per cent of France's war material. In the end, however, the overwhelming desire of the Vietnamese people for independence proved decisive. Assisting the guerrillas, Vietnamese peasants helped bring about France's humiliating defeat at Dien-bienphu.

The Geneva Accords of 1954 ended the conflict, providing for a temporary division of Vietnam in order to separate the hostile sides and make a cease-fire effective. French forces were to assemble south of the 17th parallel. Vietminh troops were to gather north. Most importantly, nationwide elections were to be held in 1956.

### RESULTS OF DIVISION

France, anxious to leave Vietnam and little concerned about the country's future, departed unceremoniously, allowing the United States to fill the power vacuum. Backed by American dollars, Ngo Dinh Diem, a Catholic aristocrat who had not opposed the French, emerged as the most important leader in the southern zone.

Ho Chi Minh, a national hero as a result of his primary role in the war for independence, basked in the warmth of his

countrymen's esteem and confidently looked forward to the elections he almost certainly would win. According to the late President Eisenhower, Ho was so popular at the time of the fighting that he could have garnered as much as 80 percent of the national vote.

Diem, gazing into his crystal ball, reached the same conclusion and recognized that if the elections were held, he would lose his post. Despite the specific language of the Geneva Accords, Diem announced in July, 1955 that he would not permit the promised elections to occur.

The thought of a communist electoral victory in Vietnam alarmed the United States little less than it disturbed Diem. Dreading the probable consequences of the implementation of the treaty, American unabashedly applauded Diem's decision, arguing that elections in the northern zone of Vietnam would not be free.

In response to charges that the Geneva Accords had been violated Diem correctly pointed out that he had not signed the agreements. However, the Geneva Accords specifically provided that any administration which accepted rule of the south after the French would be responsible for carrying out the 1954 electoral arrangements.

American spokesmen also aptly argued that the United States had not signed the Geneva Accords. However, in a unilateral declaration issued June 29, 1954, the U.S. government had solemnly pledged to support the principle of "unity through free elections" with reference to Vietnam and had promised not to contravene the Geneva Agreement.

### INTERNAL CONFLICT

Outraged by Diem's refusal to allow the promised elections to take place, the Ho Chi Minh government repeatedly called upon Diem to alter his decision and pleaded with the French to see that the Geneva Accords were carried out. Their efforts were to no avail. Embittered, the Vietminh felt betrayed.

Weighing his alternatives, Ho decided against declaring war on Diem. Weary of strife, Ho's supporters needed a respite after 15 years of exhausting conflict. Recognizing that his followers could endure only so much, Ho chose to build up the northern half of his country before challenging the man who had seized control of the southern half.

Diem, in the meantime, attempted to strengthen his position by abolishing village election in the south, replacing elected leaders with his own appointees. Labeling Vietminh and community sympathizers ipso facto enemies of the state, he rounded up dissenters of various sorts, imprisoning some and executing others.

Displaying little tact, Diem limited the autonomy of the Montagnards and persecuted the powerful Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sects. Forcing the peasants to pay rents to absentee landlords, he alienated the bulk of the population steadfastly refusing to initiate a significant land reform program. Resentment against the southern leader mounted quickly.

The northern government made a similar mistake. Confiscating private property and redistributing the land to the peasants, overzealous officials executed and imprisoned landlords with little finesse. Opposition to the brutal excesses of agrarian reform was widespread and one village finally rose in revolt.

Unlike Diem, however, Ho Chi Minh opted to admit his errors. The northern government engaged in an exercise of self-criticism, apologizing to the people for its mistakes. The two men responsible for the persecution of the landlord class resigned from their posts and a more popular agrarian reform program was inaugurated.

Meanwhile, a number of powerful southern

groups became increasingly upset with the repressive tactics of the Diem regime and began to retaliate vigorously. In the spring of 1960, a group of prominent southerners issued a declaration of grievances and were subsequently arrested. In November, military forces launched an abortive coup.

Although southern communists and former Vietminh, Diem's prime targets, were perhaps more disturbed than anyone else by Diem's actions, they had refrained, by and large, from fighting back, because Ho Chi Minh had counseled otherwise. Convinced that Diem's unpopularity made his downfall imminent, Ho argued that there was no need for vigorous guerrilla activity.

Conditions in the south, however, became so intolerable for some that native communists decided to move, with or without Ho's support. On December 20, 1960 the National Liberation Front (NLF) was established by southern Vietminh veterans. Ho, realizing that conflict could no longer be postponed, formally recognized the NLF early in 1961.

The southern insurgents mounted an intense guerrilla campaign and achieved a considerable degree of success. Native southerners who had gone north in 1954, expecting to stay only two years, returned home after a long absence to fight against Diem. Later, native northerners joined them.

#### AMERICAN INTERVENTION

From America's point of view, the "infiltration" represented an act of aggression. The Geneva Accords had labeled the 17th parallel a "provisional military demarcation line . . . not in any way (to) be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." However, the United States had come to regard the line as a permanent border and Vietnam's southern zone as a separate state.

Unable to cope with his opponents, Diem pleaded with the United States for more military aid, asking for both weapons and advisors. President Kennedy viewing the prospect of a communist victory in Vietnam with dismay, complied with the request.

As American aid to Diem and northern support of the NLF increased, the fighting in the south grew bloodier and more intense. Religious friction complicated the picture. Arresting Buddhists protesting against the disproportionate number of Catholics holding high posts, Diem incurred the wrath of an extremely powerful group.

On November 1, 1963 a military junta gunned down Diem and seized the reins of power in the southern part of Vietnam. On November 22, John Kennedy was assassinated and Lyndon Johnson became President of the United States. With new leadership in two quarters, it seemed possible that the war in Vietnam would take a new direction or that a settlement would be reached.

However, President Johnson continued to send men and material to Vietnam because of his belief in the "domino theory." And Diem's successors were no more anxious than their predecessor had been to relinquish their power to another group.

Although the war dragged on, its nature changed significantly as a result of several developments. Late in July, 1964, southern vessels, "covered" by American destroyers, bombarded some northern islands and attacked a group of fishing boats in the Gulf of Tonkin. In retaliation, northern torpedo vessels attacked two American destroyers.

#### ESCALATION

Calling the action unprovoked, President Johnson asked for the power to "take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." Without full knowledge of the facts and not realizing the implications of such a blank check, the Senate complied with the President's request.

On February 7, 1965 NLF forces launched a surprise raid on an American barracks in Pleiku. Deeming a reprisal necessary, President Johnson ordered U.S. planes to bomb the north. Shoving into the background his campaign references to the undesirability of a "wider war," the President continued the bombing raids after the initial retaliation.

Escalation proceeded at a rapid pace. In June, President Johnson authorized the use of American troops in combat, and America's involvement in the war changed dramatically. The other side's forces swelled too and China and the Soviet Union began to pump more and more equipment into Vietnam.

#### APPEASEMENT

Dissent within the United States became pronounced and assumed a critical form. Stunned by the showing of peace candidate Eugene McCarthy in New Hampshire and challenged by Robert Kennedy as well, President Johnson decided not to seek re-election and proceeded to de-escalate the war within the framework of his political philosophy.

Former Vice-President Richard Nixon emerged victorious in November, promising to end the war and labeling peace his prime objective. Hoping to avoid fury of both hawks and doves, President Nixon too de-escalated the war but refused to end it dramatically. Nine months after Nixon's inauguration, death still stalks the people of Vietnam.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Aggression From the North." State Department White Paper, 1965.

Eisenhower, Dwight. Mandate for Change. Honey, P.J. Communism in North Vietnam.

Kahin, George and Lewis, John. The United States in Vietnam.

McGovern, George. "The Lessons of Vietnam." Congressional Record, April 25, 1967. North Vietnam Today. Edited by P.J. Honey.

Salisbury, Harrison. Behind the Lines. Schlesinger, Arthur J. The Bitter Heritage.

#### MIRACLE OF EVANGELINE

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, great fanfare is currently given to culture and cultural appreciation, but little note is taken of traditional American values.

From the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., we have a story of community action in the traditional American spirit by free men who are dedicated to perpetuate their American heritage.

The "Miracle of Evangeline" is a short editorial relating how parents in a small Louisiana community have struggled to retain their God-given rights of authority and decision concerning their children. Now that the bureaucrats in Government have federalized the once public schools, this community has converted a cattle auction barn into an independent center of education boasting an enrollment of some 2,500 ambitious and earnest young people—the type who seek and will suffer to attain an education.

Perhaps this story of ingenuity, and community spirit has not been reported by the biased and prejudiced national press because they fear the example might serve as an inspiration to others.

Citizens banding together to gain freedom at considerable personal sacrifice, should be news—but it is censored.

Every American who appreciates the struggle of our forefathers against tyranny will join in complimenting the Honorable Mayner Fontenot and his fellow Evangelinians of Ville Platte, La., for their display of true American perseverance and courage. We wish them well, and commend them for keeping alive this flame of liberty, no matter how small, for thier posterity, knowing that it will blaze again across our land.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the editorial from the News and Courier be made a part of my remarks so that all our colleagues may be reminded that people who are determined to be free and to plan their own destiny will do so, not because of Federal programs, Federal aid or someone else's ideas—but in spite of them.

The editorial follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 2, 1969]

#### MIRACLE OF EVANGELINE

From a roundabout source we have obtained an account of a private school system established by citizens of Evangeline Parish in Louisiana. The system, including a high school housed in an abandoned cattle auction barn, is serving 2,500 pupils. The elementary department, housed in various buildings throughout the parish, has an enrollment of more than 1,800, and more than 600 are in the high school.

Mayner Fontenot of Ville Platte, La., has said in a letter, which was passed on to us, that little publicity has been given to this effort by citizens of a rural region. In a two-week period they contributed more than \$300,000 to set up an alternative school system to the public schools, which had been forced by court order to comply with federal guidelines.

"It is my opinion," Mr. Fontenot wrote, "that something has transpired to prevent the television stations and larger newspapers from publicizing our efforts to retain our God-given right of choosing how to educate our children. Having only a small weekly newspaper in our area, I am reluctant to believe that these larger newspapers will be generous enough to print our efforts . . . We have set the pace for our state, and for myself, I wouldn't trade places with any other citizen of this nation."

A summary of the campaign to establish this "instant" school system—accomplished in about six weeks—is entitled "The Miracle of Evangeline—Fruit from Our Labor." It tells about volunteer work by carpenters, truck drivers, painters, plumbers, laborers, poor and wealthy, parents and children, who worked and planned.

"Dedicated teachers who had come forth to join us worked 18 hours per day," the document reports, "put their skills and experience in high gear to recruit teachers and to plan a system of education second to none. Realizing that they would have shortages of both equipment and facilities, they achieved magnitude with what they had . . . Our giant had then fed its appetite for learning . . . We will have unsurpassed school spirit in our academy and will be demanding of our teachers. And they will send out into our society true Americans dedicated to the survival of their country."

We pass along this story, which was news to us, for the information of readers and the inspiration of the public. Evangeline Parish is not a rich territory in money. Obviously it is populated by people who care, a force greater than money.

## THE OMBUDSMAN IN NEW ZEALAND

## HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Kent M. Weeks, the College of Wooster, titled "Public Servants in the New Zealand Ombudsman System" appeared in the November-December issue of *Public Administration Review*.

The article brings up points favorable to an ombudsman system that could be adopted by the United States:

PUBLIC SERVANTS IN THE NEW ZEALAND  
OMBUDSMAN SYSTEM  
(By Kent M. Weeks)

(NOTE.—An investigation of the effects of the New Zealand Ombudsman's Office on department heads and public servants was carried out by interviews, a mailed questionnaire, and an inspection of the Ombudsman's complaint files. It was found that the apprehensions expressed by public servants when the Ombudsman was first proposed in 1961 have not materialized. There has been a change in attitude among public servants themselves who acknowledge that the Ombudsman has not impaired staff efficiency or candor. The support for the institution expressed by public servants is due to the impartiality of the Ombudsman himself; the small proportion of the complaints investigated by the Ombudsman that are found to be valid; the fact that his investigations have not impaired efficiency; and the fact that public servants themselves are using the Ombudsman Office to appeal their own personal grievances.)

Concern about the increasing influence of government over the life of a citizen has prompted a quest for protective devices to insure that the citizen receives fair treatment from administrative authorities. The Scandinavian institution, Ombudsman, adopted by New Zealand in 1962, has caught the imagination of administrators, legislators, political scientists, and lawyers.<sup>1</sup> The Ombudsman is an impartial government officer who reviews complaints from citizens against administrative decisions. With access to departmental files, he has the power to criticize and to make recommendations to the departments; he has no powers of enforcement. Proponents of the system see the Ombudsman as a nonpolitical and easily accessible channel to be used by the citizens in challenging the fairness—not merely the legality—of an administrative ruling.

The functioning of the Ombudsman Office in New Zealand affords some interesting data regarding two areas of inquiry.<sup>2</sup> First, have the investigations and findings of the Ombudsman impaired the efficiency of the public service? And second, how do the public servants themselves view the Ombudsman system?

In the United States the response to the Ombudsman proposals has been glacial.<sup>3</sup> It appears that some legislators and public servants approve what they see on the surface, but, as in the case of the iceberg, are fearful of what lurks below. Legislators are apprehensive lest the Ombudsman undermine their own casework function that provides a vital link to their constituencies. Civil servants see the Ombudsman as detrimental to staff efficiency and as an antibureaucratic office undercutting their authority. And there is a general apprehension about adding another layer of bureaucracy to governments already overburdened by what some critics think is excessive bureaucracy.

However, none of these apprehensions are substantiated by the New Zealand experience.<sup>4</sup> A questionnaire designed to elicit opinion regarding structural and functional aspects of the Ombudsman system was sent to each of the 42 heads of departments under the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman Office and to a random sample of 45 public servants in these departments. Thirty-three (79 per cent) of the department heads and 29 (64 per cent) of the randomly selected public servants returned completed questionnaires. Certain heads of departments and public servants, some of whom had responded and some of whom had not, were interviewed in New Zealand.

There has been a remarkable change in attitude among public servants in New Zealand. The initial opposition of the public servants to the Ombudsman proposal has been supplanted by support for the institution by all but a few public servants for several reasons: the skillful drafting of the legislation, in which certain public servants played an important role; the impartiality of the Ombudsman himself; the small proportion of complaints investigated by the Ombudsman that are found to be valid;<sup>5</sup> the fact that his investigations have not impaired efficiency; and the fact that the public servants themselves are using the Ombudsman Office to appeal their own grievances pertinent to personnel matters.

EFFECT OF THE OMBUDSMAN ON  
ADMINISTRATION

The effect of the Ombudsman system on the efficiency of the administration, on the relationship between departments and their cabinet overseers, and on the public image of the administration has been the subject of some debate. In New Zealand, where the government is the largest single employer,<sup>6</sup> the department head wields considerable power. The permanent head provides continuity when governments change; and as advisor to his political mentor, the minister in charge of his department, he aids in preparing legislation, offering proposals for new legislation, and speech writing. Not only must he be a capable administrator, but he is expected to draw attention to the political implications of his recommendations. There is a shared interest. Minister and department head have a stake in the output and image of the department. Although decisions of ministers are not subject to review by the Ombudsman, the recommendations made to a minister by a department may be reviewed.<sup>7</sup>

When reviewing a complaint, the Ombudsman<sup>8</sup> deals directly with the department head, who assigns the complaint to a top-level officer. The complaint is then shot out to a field officer who writes a summary of the facts and his analysis of the case. The field report, and in some cases the original file, is then reviewed by the Officer assigned to the case who then recasts the answer to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman functions as mediator between complainant and department head. If the Ombudsman finds that a complaint is justified, he then negotiates with the department head in an attempt to find a solution acceptable to both department head and complainant. Three-quarters of the justified complaints are reconciled in this manner prior to a formal recommendation being issued by the Ombudsman.

There is evidence to suggest that the very existence of the Ombudsman has had an indirect effect upon complaint review within the departments. The Ombudsman himself once advised: "The decisions of the Ombudsman Office has encouraged departmental officers to take great care in the exercise of discretionary powers which were final and not open to challenge before the establishment of the Office."<sup>9</sup> Seventy-three per cent of the permanent heads and 79 per cent of the public servants supported his statement.<sup>10</sup> One department head noted that the Ombuds-

man "is an influence on judgments—his existence makes officials more cautious in reaching decisions which can have a serious effect on the rights and liberties of individuals." A labour MP observed that the mere existence of the Office "is an indication to public servants that they must be rather more cautious in the exercise of discretion than they would be if they did not know there was someone who could query the exercise of their discretion."<sup>11</sup> Indeed, the question of the exercise of discretion is crucial. When given six choices, department heads, public servants and MP's ranked lack of flexibility in applying legislation and government regulations to particular situations, inadequate reasons given for decisions, delay in reaching a decision and unfairness as the four most important causes of complaints against administrative decisions. Not one respondent listed corruption as a source of complaints. The data suggests that the largest portion of complaints arise, not because the citizen feels that a public servant has abridged the law, but because the law has been applied unfairly or unwisely in a particular situation.

Certain departments may now be spending more time in keeping records in anticipation of review by the Ombudsman. In the United States records made in anticipation of review are known as "Pearl Harbor Files." One department head noted that his field offices are spending more time on cases, because they are attempting to keep a complete record, including notations of telephone conversations. Another department head suggests that the Ombudsman system is not inexpensive, for one of his assistants spends a large portion of his time following up each complaint submitted to the department. But the general view of department heads and public servants is that the Ombudsman system has not resulted in increased record keeping for them. Only four departments are spending more time keeping records, and all but three of these note that the added record keeping is a worthwhile expenditure of time. Although the public servants have not been consumed with additional record-keeping duties, departmental officers at the top level are probably spending more time in reviewing the complaints than they would if the citizen himself had submitted the complaint directly to the department.

The effect of the Ombudsman upon the complaint review workload borne by the departments has been negligible. The number of complaints addressed directly to public servants has not decreased since the advent of the Ombudsman. By their own admission, very few department heads or public servants has ever suggested to a complainant that he see the Ombudsman.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, none of the department heads or public servants have selected as a reason for having an Ombudsman Office: "to relieve members of the public service of processing some citizen complaints." However, one department head has noted that the Ombudsman might have discouraged certain perennial complainers: "Some real old troubleshooters have resigned."

It has been suggested that the Ombudsman's access to all records kept by departments, including internal departmental comments, might impair the staff efficiency and candor of public servants. Documents might have to be cleaned up prior to being placed in the files, and public servants might be restrained in expressing themselves frankly out of concern that some day the Ombudsman might review the file. Yet this suggestion is rejected by department heads and public servants.

It appears that department heads and public servants themselves do not think that the Ombudsman has affected efficiency. When asked what effect the Ombudsman has had upon efficiency, none of the respondents indicate that the public service has become less

Footnotes at end of article.

efficient. When asked their attitude about the Ombudsman Office, respondents rank "interferes with the efficiency of the public service," sixth of seven choices. The charge heard during the debate on the legislation, that an Ombudsman is antiadministration, is supported by only two department heads and no public servants. The Ombudsman has explained his own intent: "The Ombudsman is not concerned to try to find fault if no fault exists; and it has proved necessary to advise a few complainants, in quite forceful terms, that they should cease groundless attacks on Departments or officials."<sup>12</sup>

The New Zealand experience suggests that an Ombudsman need not impair efficiency and that he may enhance the image of the public service. His investigations reveal that only a small percentage of complaints are justified. The Ombudsman has publicly praised the public service and exonerated particular public servants who have been the object of unsubstantiated charges by citizens. The Ombudsman suggests that because "thorough and independent investigation of allegations of malpractice establishes that those allegations are unfounded, the Office act as a valuable shield to the administration. . . ."<sup>14</sup>

The establishment of the Ombudsman Office may have contributed to the improved public service image.<sup>15</sup> There may be other explanations, but in 1965 the State Services Commission acknowledged that the "reports of the Ombudsman have also shown, and done much to bring home to the general public, that a sense of responsibility and fair play exists among public servants."<sup>16</sup> The Swedish Ombudsman has suggested that at the least, the dissatisfaction of a disgruntled citizen is shifted from the department to the Ombudsman.<sup>17</sup>

The Public Service Association, once bitterly opposed to the Office, has not failed to use the Ombudsman's findings in its public relations efforts. The Association proudly points to the small proportion of complaints found to be justified and to the fact that no complaint where personal charges have been made against a public servant has been supported by the Ombudsman. The foregoing discussion bears directly upon the remarkable change in attitude of the public servants toward the Ombudsman system.

#### ATTITUDE OF PUBLIC SERVANTS TOWARD THE OMBUDSMAN SYSTEM

The Public Service Association, pressure group for the 46,000 permanent staff members of the public service, set the tone for the debate on the Ombudsman legislation in its editorial in the *Public Service Journal* in August 1961:

"The Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) for Investigations Bill, now before Parliament is sheer humbug. It is half baked. It panders to sectional prejudice—those directed against officialdom. If it works at all it will cause confusion and disgruntlement. . . . It is a hoary institution introduced in primitive Sweden a century and a half ago."<sup>18</sup>

The Association raised several objections when the legislation was first introduced and again in testimony to the parliamentary committee which reviewed the legislation in August 1962. The Association opposed the exclusion of ministers' devisions from the Ombudsman's review, for it was feared that a department "could find itself in an embarrassing position in having to defend a decision which was not its own while, apparently, being at the same time precluded from making the full facts known without the consent of its Minister."<sup>19</sup> It was argued that the bill appeared to be aimed at individual acts of public servants, which properly should be dealt with within the departments. The Association was concerned about the limited protections granted to public servants who were involved in the Ombudsman's investigations. A public servant was entitled to a hearing before the Ombudsman only if he was to be criticized; yet it was argued that

"circumstances could arise in which an officer's reputation could be affected by the Commissioner's reports whether he was specifically mentioned in it or not."<sup>20</sup> Finally, the Association argued that the bill should be expanded to cover decisions of local government bodies—where the need for review was greater—that were financed by the national government.<sup>21</sup>

But the tune has changed. The Public Service Association acknowledged as early as 1965: "It is becoming increasingly clear that the office of Ombudsman is not necessarily the trap for public servants which many of us feared when it was first established."<sup>22</sup> The change in opinion about the Ombudsman is most notable among the department heads. If they had been asked to vote on the Ombudsman legislation in 1962, ten permanent heads and five public servants say they would have voted against the act. Yet, by 1967, only two permanent heads and four public servants indicate they would oppose a proposal for an Ombudsman. All members of both groups indicate they are satisfied with the way the Ombudsman Office is operating, with the exception of one permanent head who has consistently noted his dissatisfaction with the Office.

There is some division of opinion regarding the need for the Office. It has been argued that the house-review procedures already operating in many departments provide adequate channels for complaint review. However, the Ombudsman and many MP's suggest that once decisions are made, impartial review at higher levels within the department is difficult to achieve.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, where an administrative official is given discretionary authority to make decisions regarding the interpretation and implementation of legislation, supervision by a minister is exceedingly difficult. Thirty-nine per cent of the department heads and 24 per cent of the public servants indicate that an appeal to an administrative official is the most effective method for influencing an administrative decision, whereas 39 per cent of the department heads and 48 per cent of the public servants indicate an appeal to the Ombudsman is most effective. In any event, it appears that impartial review by the Ombudsman does facilitate a final disposition of complaints. Rarely do complainants whose complaints have been found unjustified by the Ombudsman turn to other grievance channels. Only one public servant indicates that a complainant turned down by the Ombudsman has appealed to him for redress of the same complaint. Nonetheless, 39 per cent of the permanent heads and 17 per cent of the public servants say that continuation of the office is unimportant; 9 per cent of the permanent heads and 13 per cent of the public servants say that the Office should be abolished.

Among department heads, attitudes toward the Ombudsman Office fall into one of three dimensions. Most department heads, who say that investigations by the Ombudsman "permit better understanding of official action," are supportive of the Office. In effect, the goals of the department and the Ombudsman, namely sound administration, are congruent. Repeatedly the word "safety valve" is mentioned; the Ombudsman is an alternative outlet for the "aggrieved person who cannot see that the department's decision is fair and in accord with the law." There are a few permanent heads who are moderately supportive of the Ombudsman because of what he has not found. He has largely dispelled notions about graft and corruption in the public service and he has "proved in practice to be no friend of the snipers." There are a few department heads, not supportive, who simply tolerate the Office—described once as "an experiment in progressive political science"—and try to stay as far away as possible.

One final point deserves attention. The change in attitude of public servants toward the Ombudsman is partly attributable to the fact that they are using the Ombudsman system to appeal grievances about working

conditions, promotions, and transfers. In fact public servants represent the second largest group of complainants. And the percentage of complaints investigated found to be justified is somewhat higher than the overall percentage.<sup>24</sup> The Public Service Association has endorsed repeatedly the Ombudsman's review of personnel complaints from public servants, and its general secretary distributes annually to its field staff a memorandum reviewing cases in which the Ombudsman has set forth guidelines for dealing with personnel problems of public servants. Although the State Services Commission is opposed to Ombudsmanic review of complaints from public servants—on grounds that the Ombudsman is provided to enable citizens to complain about administrative decisions, not to serve as an additional appeal authority between public servants and their government employers—the department heads and public servants are opposed to excluding their complaints from review by the Ombudsman.

In New Zealand public servants have benefited from the Ombudsman system. Even though the chief value of the institution is in its service to the citizen complainant, the effect of the system's operation on the public servants has been far from onerous. The findings of the Ombudsman have enhanced the image of the public service. Even if that feature of the system which allows for review of complaints submitted by public servants were deleted from proposals in this country, it would be in the interests of public servants to support the transference of the system. The introduction of an Ombudsman system to facilitate increased responsiveness by administrators to the needs of the citizen need not diminish efficiency. For the citizen and for the public servant, the Ombudsman may prove to be a significant institutional innovation for affording both political responsiveness and administrative efficiency.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> For a review of some of the literature on the Ombudsman, see the *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW*, Charles S. Ascher, "The Grievance Man or Ombudsmania," Vol. XXVII (June 1967), pp. 174-178. Two other comprehensive works have been published: Stanley V. Anderson (ed.), *Ombudsman for American Government?* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968), and Roy V. Pell (ed.), "The Ombudsman or Citizen's Defender: A Modern Institution," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (May 1968).

<sup>2</sup> The research for this study, part of a larger study on the New Zealand Ombudsman System, was conducted during the summer of 1967 in New Zealand. The financial support of the National Science Foundation through Grant No. GS-1527 for improving doctoral dissertation research in political science is gratefully acknowledged by the author.

<sup>3</sup> According to Walter Gellhorn, in the last five years, some 47 state legislatures have had Ombudsman proposals before them. See "The Ombudsman's Relevance to American Municipal Affairs," *American Bar Association Journal*, Vol. 54 (February 1968), p. 134. In only one state, Hawaii, has a proposal been enacted, and there the office has remained unfunded and understaffed for over a year. There has been Ombudsman legislation pending in Congress since 1965.

<sup>4</sup> Members of the New Zealand Parliament responding to a questionnaire indicated that their caseload has not been diminished since the advent of the Ombudsman and that they are processing complaints as before.

<sup>5</sup> For the period October 1, 1962, to March 31, 1967, of the complaints fully investigated, 18 per cent were catalogued as justified. However, 54 per cent of the complaints submitted to the Office were not investigated for lack of jurisdiction or other reasons; hence, of the total complaints submitted to the Ombudsman, only 8 per cent were catalogued

as justified. In other countries, about 10 to 20 per cent of complaints fully investigated are found to be valid. For comparative data see Kent M. Weeks, *A Comparative Analysis of the Civil Ombudsman Offices in Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden* (Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, January 1967).

<sup>6</sup> The State Services Commission, formerly called the Public Service Commission, employed 68,842 persons in 1967, about 2.5 per cent of the total population, as compared with about 1.5 per cent employed by the federal government in the United States. There are additional state employees not under the State Services Commission.

<sup>7</sup> This compromise was obtained so that the "constitutional" principle of ministerial responsibility to Parliament would not be violated by the interposition of the Ombudsman.

<sup>8</sup> The New Zealand Ombudsman, Sir Guy Powles, is an attorney (although the Ombudsman legislation does not require that the appointee be an attorney) who had had military experience and experience in government most recently as High Commissioner to Western Samoa and to India. His staff consists of an administration assistant, formerly with the New Zealand Army; a legal officer, who is an attorney and who had served as legal officer to the State Services Commission; an investigator, formerly a British citizen employed in the colonial office; and two clerk-typists.

<sup>9</sup> G. Powles, "The Citizen's Rights Against the Modern State, and Its Responsibilities to Him," *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, Vol. 13 (1964), p. 785.

<sup>10</sup> When data from the questionnaire is cited, the term "public servants" is used to refer to the group of randomly chosen public servants.

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Finlay, New Zealand Parliament, *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, May 18, 1967, p. 648.

<sup>12</sup> For a two-year period ending June 30, 1967, only six permanent heads and nine public servants recalled referring complaints to the Ombudsman; they made such a suggestion a total of 35 times.

<sup>13</sup> *Report of the Ombudsman for the year ended 31 March 1964* (Wellington, N.Z.: Government Printer, 1964), p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> In any event, 45 per cent of the permanent heads and 50 per cent of the public servants indicated that since the establishment of the Ombudsman Office, the attitude of the public toward the public service was more favorable. None thought the public attitude was less favorable.

<sup>16</sup> *Report of the State Services Commission for the year ended 31 March 1965* (Wellington, N.Z.: Government Printer, 1965), p. 5.

<sup>17</sup> See the remarks of Alfred Bexelius in U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *Ombudsman, Hearings*, before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, 1966, p. 19.

<sup>18</sup> "Ombudsman" Bill Sheer Humbug," *Public Service Journal*, Vol. 48 (August 1961), p. 2.

<sup>19</sup> New Zealand Public Service Association, "Submissions of the New Zealand Public Service Association, to the Chairman and Members of the Statutes Revision Committee of the House of Representatives," unpublished mimeo., August 8, 1962.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> The legislation excludes from the Ombudsman's review decisions of local government agencies, most complaints from military personnel, the decisions of judicial officers, and decisions of certain other departments. Eighty-eight per cent of the department heads and 93 per cent of public servants indicate that the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman Office should be extended to local government agencies that are fi-

nanced by the national government. An amendment to the Ombudsman Act was adopted in December 1968, giving the Ombudsman Office limited jurisdiction over education boards and hospital boards based on the rationale that these local agencies receive the bulk of their financing from the national government.

<sup>22</sup> *Public Service Journal*, Vol. 52 (July 1965), p. 1.

<sup>23</sup> Of the 56 complaints classified as justified by the Ombudsman during the year ending March 31, 1967, 12 complainants had contacted a departmental officer and had failed to obtain redress prior to submitting their complaints to the Ombudsman.

<sup>24</sup> Of the 77 complaints against the State Services Commission during the period October 1, 1962, to March 31, 1967, and fully investigated, 22, or 29 per cent, have been classified as justified, as compared to 18 per cent for all of the Ombudsman's investigations.

#### THE MAKING OF A JUSTICE

### HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, of all the editorial comment concerning the Haynsworth rejection by the Senate, I believe that Owen Hansen of the Lebanon, Ind., reporter, has come up with the most pertinent observation.

In a satirical approach to a serious subject, Owen gets to the heart of the matter.

As the Indiana writer suggests, the Senate is looking for someone who can walk on water.

The article follows:

#### THE MAKING OF A JUSTICE

(By Owen Hansen)

Much has been said about the defeat of Clement Haynsworth as a justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Senate says it will suggest that more stringent rules be mandatory in the nomination of future judges. This would insure that the background of the nominee is perfectly clean.

I suggest that the candidate be nominated at birth. This method would permit the mother and father to stop the future jurist from engaging in such nefarious activities as playing marbles as a kid, buying up any properties when at the Monopoly table at home and dating until he is 27.

Should any free soap samples be sent to the nominee's home by mail, a watchful mother can immediately report same to the postal authorities to assure there will be no later accusations of payola.

Should the infant be brought up knowing that someday he will be called on to appear before the Senate for advice and consent, he can pave his path ahead of time by never visiting the South, by working his way through the ranks of organized labor and serving then for a tenure on the NAACP's policy committee.

The Supreme Court justice of the future should be made to be born in a manger and wear a halo over his head.

He should spend his years from 16 to 35 in a monastery of the Redemptionist Order and be vaccinated daily against the disease of temptation.

And then the final day comes when the future jurist takes his test before Congress to see whether he is fit to serve on the nation's highest court. If he can walk on water, he's in. If he sinks, he can then join the renown law firm of Fortas and Haynsworth.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES AND SOCIAL PROGRAMS

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased to learn that the House Ways and Means Committee had approved a 15-percent rise in social security payments as provided in a bill I introduced some time ago.

This bill should give some much needed relief to social security recipients but, of course, it is far from being adequate, when one considers that the minimum payments are \$55 per month.

However, I feel that under all the circumstances, much higher increases are warranted, but was of the opinion that the 15-percent increase would probably be signed by the President, whereas a higher increase, such as I was prepared to support, might not be.

In any event, I think we are moving in the right direction, but much remains to be done before we have a social security payment scale that will do justice to many covered by the Social Security System.

I believe that our House Ways and Means Committee, at a very early date, should inaugurate full hearings to overhaul the social security and medicare laws to provide better coordination and more realistic benefits that will reflect the sharp increases in our price levels and cost of living. All social security programs should be bracketed under one statutory roof.

I again urge our appropriate House committees to give painstaking consideration to the very serious problems stemming from increased needs throughout the Nation of modern, hospital accommodations at reasonable rates, since the current situation affecting hospitals, rates, health plans, and the capacity of many people to afford and pay escalated hospital and related costs gives rise to some of the most challenging problems we face.

I believe that the Congress must make a broadside attack upon these problems, and come up with suitable legislation that will effectively solve them on a long-run basis that will coordinate various social programs.

Further delay in this field will lead not only to hopeless confusion, but to intolerable aggravation of the problems arising from lack of modernized, hospital accommodations, care and treatment, and the rapid, sharp increases in costs in these areas.

I hope the leaders of the Congress and the committees concerned in these areas will take early action to come up with a broad, comprehensive revision and consolidation of current laws to provide the authority and the funds needed to put these great social programs in proper perspective and provide suitable, effective relief, and insure the best modern care and the means to pay for it, to those who are currently finding it increasingly impossible to do so under present conditions. This is a subject of primary priority that cannot be deferred and face further deterioration.