

Committee on Film Classification; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Res. 747. Resolution amending the rules of the House to prohibit a single appropriation bill from carrying appropriations for more than one executive department; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 748. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the House of Representatives on general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. BRADEMAs):

H. Res. 749. Resolution authorizing travel

for certain members of the committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 750. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 105; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 15218. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tu-

ran Argun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 15219. A bill for the relief of Maj. Michael M. Mills, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 15220. A bill for the relief of Mrs. In-Soon Lee Castronova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 15221. A bill for the relief of Maria Gagliardi Paladino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 15222. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Keefe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### MEDICAL RESEARCH AND THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

#### HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the recent past there have been statements in the record by members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning new clinical treatments with L-dopa for several neurological diseases. The Honorable CRAIG HOSMER of California pointed to the outstanding medical efforts being supported by the Atomic Energy Commission and particularly to the work of Dr. George C. Cotzias and his colleagues at Brookhaven National Laboratory with L-dopa. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON made two statements, one concerning the use of L-dopa for Parkinson's disease and the other concerning L-dopa and dystonia musculorum deformans, a neurological disease which affects young people.

Recently Dr. Cotzias was awarded the Albert Lasker Award for his brilliant clinical work with L-dopa. Since the Joint Committee has for a long time been interested in the team efforts at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, I wrote to Dr. Cotzias and congratulated him on behalf of myself and the other members of the Joint Committee. I received a reply from this great, but humble man. This is a real man and a real scientist and a real doctor who puts his faith in the data he records. His great efforts resulted in a true reward for all mankind. He did not sit in his laboratory scanning data others had collected, shaking his head over past failures and then doing nothing. He decided something needed to be done, and did it.

L-Dopa is a newly developed drug which has been developed and used in many clinical cases. It has given miraculous relief to persons suffering from Parkinson's disease.

Dr. Cotzias is not like the pseudoscientists and nonscientists—or to use a descriptive terminology from Orwell's book "1984"—the "unscientists" who run all over the country making strident, sensational charges about the dire results that will befall mankind because of nuclear power reactors and the Plowshare programs. It would certainly be helpful and eliminate the arousing of

unnecessary fears if the unlearned would try to establish facts by performing research instead of regurgitating computer runs made on a third party's data.

I would like to place Dr. Cotzias's letter in the RECORD to indicate other areas of Atomic Energy Commission sponsored medical research from which we can expect significant benefits for all mankind. The letter follows:

BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY,  
ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES, INC.  
Upton, L.I., N.Y., November 24, 1969.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,  
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,  
Congress of the United States, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLIFIELD: My colleagues and I are deeply touched by the warm accolade in your letter of November 17. We thank both you and the members of your Committee.

The results to which you refer constitute the fruition of team work that was continued over many years. Sustaining such labor outside the complex climate provided at Brookhaven by the AEC, would have been impossible.

The main lesson from this is the following: if one wants progress with debilitating diseases, one must couple long-term, in-patient investigations with highly sophisticated laboratory research on animals, their tissues, their cells and even fragments of their cells. Such tedious and frustrating enterprise is never immediately rewarding. If the Brookhaven environment can flourish we cannot help but remain productive. The work that led to tritiated thymidine; studies of the genetic control of hypertension; of extracorporeal irradiation; of the remarkable progress toward a cure of hoof and mouth disease; of the synthesis of the first human protein (insulin), were bought at bargain prices by a small group of incredibly dedicated people here at the Medical Department at Brookhaven.

We are of course elated that our results have been confirmed and that from this thousands of patients have derived, or will derive, benefit and hope. We do not intend, however, to rest on these perishable laurels. As scientists, we accept this success as a mandate to pursue novel investigations in animals and man with increased urgency.

Our collective experience and sophistication combined with, hopefully, increased financial support should further increase our effectiveness. Presently, for instance, we appear to have hit on even more fundamental processes which we are elucidating in animals before we apply them to the therapy of man. Given credits of time and money, we believe that other diseases of the brain will be ameliorated at Brookhaven. I hope you will agree that at this juncture, besides misleading you, false modesty or humility would be inexcusable.

Again, many cordial thanks for your generous letter.

Very sincerely yours,  
GEORGE C. COTZIAS, M.D.

### SANDS POINT NAVAL TRAINING DEVICES CENTER

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as you know, many local communities are faced with overcrowded schools—the result of growing populations coupled with the all too frequent problem of lack of available land on which to build schools.

In Port Washington, which is part of the Third Congressional District, which I am proud to represent in Congress, this problem has developed. Recently, however, the General Services Administration announced that a 161-acre tract of Federal property, the former site of the Sands Point Training Devices Center will be available to bidders with the greatest need.

I am concerned with the fact that Port Washington's school system's needs are both immediate and acute.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I received a unanimous resolution that had been passed by the residents of the affected area regarding this issue. Since I firmly feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility to meet the needs of local communities, especially in the important area of education, I would like to take this opportunity to include this resolution in the RECORD:

Whereas the Port Washington Board of Education last month released a comprehensive public school building program geared to meet the needs of an expanding school population for the next ten years; and

Whereas the key to this plan is the acquisition of 50 acres of free land from the Federal Government, part of the former site of the Sands Point Naval Training Devices Center, declared surplus by the General Services Administration last week; and

Whereas two additional parties, Nassau County and the Sands Point Country Day School, have made known their interest in the entire 161 acre tract, to the exclusion of the requirements of the Port Washington School District; and

Whereas the Port Washington School District is the only applicant combining both public and educational use, and requires only

a small portion of the over-all tract, not to the exclusion of the other claimants; and

Whereas petitions bearing the names of over 3,100 Port Washington residents, backing the claim of the School District to 50 acres of this site were presented to all relevant government agencies and officials in Washington, D.C., last week.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Port Washington Democratic Club express its support for the Port Washington School District's claim for this land, and

Be it further resolved that the Club call upon:

1. Nassau County to relinquish their claim to the entire tract in favor of a joint application for shared usage with the Port Washington School District and one another, and

2. Senators Javits and Goodell, Congressman Wolf, Supervisor Meade, and County Executive Nickerson to support the application of the Port Washington School District, and

3. all civic, fraternal, political, and educational organizations in Port Washington to support the application of the Port Washington School District; and

4. the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare and the General Services Administration to act favorably upon the application of the P.W. School District.

#### VIEWS OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LEADERS

### HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the rural electric systems of region V of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held their annual meeting at Springfield, Ill., on October 1, 2, and 3, 1969.

The regional meeting was attended by over 500 farm and rural leaders. They represented 116 cooperatives, serving some 386,121 consumers in the States of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD the resolutions adopted during the 3-day meetings. These resolutions reaffirm past views of the rural electrification leaders and reflect their expression of opinion on issues of current concern. It is a pleasure for me to call these significant resolutions to the attention of my colleagues and to commend region V and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association for the vital role they are playing in our country today.

The resolutions follow:

#### 5-1. REAFFIRMING PAST ACTIONS

Resolved, that we reaffirm our support of those resolutions contained in the document "Continuing Resolutions," distributed to the delegates at this meeting, subject to the following amendments:

Be it further resolved that we amend Continuing resolution No. 7 by substituting therefor the following:

We urge Congress to pass legislation which would prohibit the Atomic Energy Commission from issuing any license for the construction and operation of a nuclear generating station until the applicant therefor has granted to all interested parties, including other electric systems, an opportunity to participate on fair and reasonable terms in the ownership of such station, and has agreed to make the output of electricity from such station available for sale on non-discriminatory terms to all entities engaged in the dis-

tribution, transmission or sale of electric energy. We further recommend that REA take cognizance of the increasing role of nuclear generation and be prepared to approve loans for nuclear generating units where they are required to provide lowest-cost wholesale energy.

Be it further resolved, that Region V of the NRECA recommend that the Atomic Energy Commission continue to regulate, supervise and license nuclear generating stations as a nation-wide expert on behalf of all the citizens of the United States and that the several states refrain from attempting to impose duplicating regulation without the benefit of the expert experience of the Atomic Energy Commission.

#### 5-2. LOAN FUNDS AND THE ECONOMY

Resolved, that we, the delegates of Region V:

1. Commend the President for his concern and efforts to control inflation.

2. Respectfully urge the Administration and the Congress to be cognizant of the continuing urgent needs of the rural electrification program.

3. Recognize the need for restraint in spending, but we believe it is self-evident that it is not in the national interest to financially starve the rural electric co-ops and jeopardize their ability to meet the growing demands of their member-consumers.

4. Urge the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of REA, and other officials to not impose additional cuts on an REA loan program that is already inadequate to meet the need for capital funds; and we further urge support for a supplemental appropriation to meet loan fund needs of the rural electrics and lower the record-high backlog of loan applications.

5. Urge the Bureau of Budget to promptly release REA loan funds appropriated by the Congress.

Be it further resolved, that we urge all possible action by the Administration and the Congress to lower the record-high level of interest rates, which add fuel to the inflationary spiral and cause financial hardship to farmers, the aged, and others, and severely restrict the construction of badly needed housing.

#### 5-3. CFC MEMBERSHIP

Whereas, the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation was established as a self-help financing institution to provide funds to supplement the annual Congressional appropriation for the REA two percent interest loan program; and

Whereas, more than 500 rural electric systems have shown their support of the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation by qualifying as Founding Members; and

Whereas, eighty-five rural electrics in Region V have so qualified:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that all rural electric systems in Region V are urged to apply for membership in CFC.

#### 5-4. CO-OP PROVISION IN TAX BILL

Whereas, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress has passed tax legislation (H.R. 13270, Tax Reform Act of 1969) which contains provisions of a punitive nature against our fellow cooperatives; and

Whereas, this provision would not result in increased tax revenues for the federal government, but would hamper cooperatives in their efforts to maintain adequate capital for necessary improvements; and

Whereas, this provision would have a detrimental effect on our efforts to establish a cooperative financing institution to provide badly needed supplemental capital:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that we oppose this portion of the pending tax legislation (Section 531).

#### 5-5. INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Whereas, we recognize there is a basic difference in the need for continuation of

the investment tax credit as between farmers and rural small business on the one hand and on the other the regulated utilities whose rates are established to cover costs:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that we urge the Senate to reinsert into the tax bill the investment tax credit provision as applicable to farmers and rural businesses.

#### 5-6. FARM INCOME AND UNITY

Whereas, the prices received by farmers for their products have for a number of years failed to keep pace with the prices of goods and services which farmers must buy; and

Whereas, the number of farms and the farm population continue to decline, bringing about an inevitable decrease in farmer-oriented representation in the U.S. Congress and increased difficulty in securing Congressional understanding and passage of legislation of benefit to farmers and our present system of family-type agriculture; and

Whereas, during the past few years, a number of general farm organizations and commodity groups have been meeting in an effort to achieve a degree of unity on agricultural policy; and

Whereas, the present situation of low farm income and decreasing number of farm families is eroding the rural economy, thus affecting the operations of the rural electric systems; and

Whereas, rural electric systems and their national association, NRECA, having no vested interest in any of the general farm organizations or commodity groups and their policy positions, have a great potential for providing leadership in efforts to achieve unity in agriculture:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that NRECA encourage, support, participate in and, where appropriate, initiate efforts to find common ground of agreement among the membership of the various organizations in American agriculture for the purpose of developing national farm and rural policy which will benefit family-type farmers and strengthen rural communities, and which will be practical, politically realistic and generally agreed upon among farmers and their friends; and

Be it further resolved, that where possible and appropriate, we help to present the position of the farmer to the consuming public in order to achieve a greater understanding among urban consumers of their stake in national farm policy which will permit our present system of family-farm agriculture to prosper and continue to serve the good of the entire nation.

#### 5-7. RURAL URBAN BALANCE

Whereas, the future health and prosperity of the Nation depends upon the solution of the imbalance between rural and urban America. There can be no lasting solution unless social and economic opportunities in rural America are sufficient to stop and reverse the outmigration to the cities; and

Whereas, America's rural electric systems are prepared to contribute to the maximum extent possible manpower, know-how, and leadership in correcting the critical rural-urban imbalance:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Administration and the Congress give the solution to this grave domestic problem the highest priority; and

Be it further resolved, that we actively and aggressively support legislative and administrative rural development efforts, including:

1. Programs designed to provide new job opportunities including incentives for rural industrial development; vitally needed community facilities of all kinds; modern housing, and technical assistance.

2. Appointment by the President of a coordinator for rural community development on the White House staff to be charged with developing maximum cooperation and coordination among the several government

Departments and Agencies which now administer the multiplicity of programs that affect rural development.

3. Restructuring of the Federal machinery which has responsibilities for developing programs to insure maximum coordination within Departments and between Departments.

4. Continued efforts to develop and foster a national housing campaign as previously approved by the membership.

5. Removal of present restrictions and limitations which prevent the Farmers Home Administration from providing a level of home financing that realistically meets the needs of rural people.

6. Adequate funds in the form of loans and grants to enable public water supply districts and municipalities in rural areas to construct and extend water systems so that rural communities and farm areas may have services comparable to those available to urban residents.

#### 5-8. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Whereas, population growth and increasing industrialization are placing, with every passing year, a heavier demand on our nation's natural resources, including land, water and the air we breathe; and

Whereas, public attention is being increasingly focused on the resulting problems of water and air pollution, the overcrowding of existing recreational areas and the disappearance of open land suitable for developing additional recreational areas, especially in the vicinity of our large metropolitan centers; and

Whereas, there is great need for a balanced and practical national policy in regard to environmental protection which gives due consideration to economic as well as environmental factors; and

Whereas, it is the responsibility of rural electric systems and the other segments of the electric utility industry to participate in the development and promotion of a balanced national policy in this important area;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that we endorse the establishment, as directed by the NRECA Board, of a Subcommittee of the NRECA Standing Committee on Power and Water Resources to study the various aspects of the environmental control problem, and we pledge our assistance to that Subcommittee in the execution of this important assignment; and

Be it further resolved, that we commend the NRECA Board for authorizing the NRECA General Manager to work with other electric industry leaders as appropriate in developing effective solutions to the problems of environmental control and in other areas of mutual concern; and

Be it further resolved, that we urge Congress and the Administration to institute appropriate research and action programs to deal effectively with the growing problems of pollution and environmental control, including specifically programs to reclaim and reuse the waste products of our society.

#### 5-9. MOBILE AND PREFABRICATED HOMES

Whereas, there is a strong trend to increasing use of mobile and prefabricated homes for year-round living, providing additional opportunities for electric service; and

Whereas, many problems are arising both for the home-owner and for NRECA member systems in the areas of safety, economics, standards and financing;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that NRECA in cooperation with statewides and manufacturers develop a proposal which the member systems might consider for dealing with the mobile and prefabricated home problems and opportunities.

#### 5-10. YANKEE-DIXIE

Resolved, that we reaffirm our support of the Yankee-Dixie project and urge all systems to support this endeavor.

#### 5-12. CO-OP MUNICIPAL COOPERATION

Whereas, rural electric cooperatives and municipal electric systems have numerous common characteristics and share many common problems;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that rural electric cooperatives be urged to explore the possibilities of gaining strength in the wholesale power area by working together with municipal electric systems.

#### 5-13. ACTION COMMITTEE FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION (ACRE)

Whereas, the rural electrification program is dependent upon public acceptance and legislative support; and

Whereas, the rural areas have experienced a decline in the number and strength of elected officials interested in rural-oriented legislation;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that we support the Action Committee for Rural Electrification (ACRE) as a voluntary vehicle through which we as individuals can promote the interest of the rural electrification program by helping our friends in state and national office;

Be it further resolved that we urge all directors, employees and members of rural electrics to participate as individuals in our political processes.

#### 5-14. NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FOOD, NUTRITION AND HEALTH

Whereas, we believe that in a country with such resources as ours, every citizen should be assured an adequate, nutritious diet; that we should, indeed, be a "well-fed" nation; and

Whereas, President Nixon is planning a national Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health for the purpose of producing a national commitment to a nutritional policy which will be applicable to every economic level, with particular cognizance of the food and nutrition problems of the poor; and

Whereas, NRECA, because of the social concern of its members, has been asked to participate in the planning of this conference and in the formulating of voluntary action programs;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the managers, directors and members of Region V be urged to participate in the national campaign to give community visibility to, and to generate electorate awareness of, the Conference recommendations during 1970.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Dr. Jean Mayer, Special Consultant to the President.

### ABORTION AND POPULATION CONTROL

#### HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I gave the following speech before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare's Subcommittee on Health as part of their hearings on population control.

I am including these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to serve as a reference for any of the Members or private citizens who might be interested in the issue:

#### STATEMENT BY MRS. CHISHOLM

For quite some time now I have been an ardent advocate of family planning. It seems to me quite obvious that whenever it is possible to do so, the limitation of the number of births should be accomplished by the utilization of contraceptive devices as a desirable method.

However, it is apparent that based on population growth statistics and the writings of many eminent demographers and scientists that the issue of overpopulation has become a most pressing one. A number of writers predict that as early as 1990 we will witness world famines whose primary cause will be linked directly to population growth.

Lawrence Lader, now executive director of the national association to repeal abortion laws has written that "Beyond the problem of economics and food supply, the brutal reality is that the world will eventually run out of space to hold a population that keeps doubling at the present rate. General Eisenhower, an opponent of family planning aid during his Presidency, has this to say today: '... since the Earth is finite in area and physical resources, it is clear that unless something is done to bring an essential equilibrium between human requirements and available supply, there is going to be in some regions not only a series of explosions but a lowering of standards for all people, including our own.'"

I am equally aware that there are many political, legal, social, moral and economic issues involved in Government-sponsored birth control programs and policies and that there have and will appear before this committee eminently more qualified and adept people than I to discuss those issues.

Therefore, I will address myself solely to some of those issues that surround the most widely used method of birth control in the world today—abortion.

Alice S. Rossi, in an excellent article in the July-August 1969 issue of *Dissent* made this most cogent comment about the word "abortion":

"Free associations to the word 'abortion' would probably yield a fantastic array of emotional responses: pain, relief, murder, crime, fear, freedom, genocide, guilt, sin. Which of these associations people have no doubt reflects their age, marital status, religion or nationality. To a forty-four-year-old Japanese or Hungarian woman, the primary response might be 'freedom' and 'relief'; to an unmarried American college girl, 'fear' and 'pain'; to a Catholic priest, 'murder' and 'sin'; to some black militants, 'genocide'.

There are many ways to avoid the negative associations and connotations that surround the word. We could, for example, borrow the term advanced by the British when they recently rewrote their laws—"pregnancy termination".

I believe that that would get us closer to the heart of the issue but it would still not be close enough.

Not close enough because the basic issue—and the only real alternatives for the pregnant woman who does not want the child—is abortion or compulsory pregnancy. If we view the issue in this perspective we are at what one might call "ground zero".

Does our Government or any other government have the right by which to force a woman to have a child that she does not want? In Hungary, Gyorgy Peters, the chief government statistician, has answered (presumably with backing from higher officials) with an emphatic "no!" He reportedly has said "the introduction of regulations with which the state would interfere with the freedom of the parents contradicts our political and moral concepts." What then must we, as representatives of a democracy, answer to the question?

The majority of family planning advocates would be aghast if our Government were to suggest laws requiring the use of any contraceptive, or, as in a recent case in California, legal sterilization.

Yet it has been Government policy in this country that compels pregnant women to carry a full-term pregnancy, often against the wishes of both parents.

Dr. Garrett Hardin has, perhaps rightly, equated this situation with compulsory servitude and has said "when we recognize that

these (abortion or compulsory pregnancy) are the real operational alternatives (for the pregnant woman), the false problems created by the pseudo-alternatives disappear."

Gentlemen, if I may, I would like to now discuss some of the statistics that are pertinent to this number one method of birth control.

One: The safest method of contraception now known, if one excepts total abstinence, is supposedly the pill. But certain statistics show that even when the pill is used properly there is a failure rate of approximately one percent. Consequently, if all fertile women in the United States were using this method of contraception properly there would still be some 250,000 unwanted births.

Two: At present there are approximately 245,000 babies born illegitimately in the United States each year.

We cannot say definitely that all of the illegitimate children born each year are either unplanned or unwanted but what is clear from a comparison with the first statistic is that the same number of births, patently unwanted, would be with us each year even if information and dispensing services about the pill (or any other method) were working at the optimum level.

It is further clear that with the present laws and policies in effect, at that point we would indeed be compelling pregnancy even though the woman had attempted everything within her power, except total abstinence to prevent the pregnancy.

Shall we take another look at the illegitimacy statistic? About 41 percent of the illegitimate births are to young girls under 19 years of age. What happens to these young ladies and their children?

Society's attitude seems to be "you've had your pleasure now pay the price!" which is more immoral, granting an individual, basic right or forcing a young girl—some as young as 14 or 15—to assume the responsibilities of an adult without the privileges, rights and the opportunities? What are we doing to the mother? What are we doing to the unborn child?

There is also the fact that if a white girl gives up her child for adoption there is a good possibility that the child will be adopted. This is not the case for black and other minority-group children. When they are given up they spend most of their childhood in orphanages, public institutions and foster homes. This is, I believe, one of the prime reasons that so many black girls choose to keep their babies.

That is only a small part of the moral cost that we pay for maintaining our present attitudes. There is another reason that might appeal to you gentlemen more.

Compulsory pregnancy costs money. For a moment I would like to continue to concentrate on the illegitimacy statistic.

The number of illegitimate children on AFDC has been rising steadily. As of 1967 there were 1,100,000 on AFDC. That was 28 percent of all children on the rolls. About 1/4 to 1/3 of all illegitimate children under 18 (and in 1967 there were 4.5 million) are on the AFDC rolls. There are at present over 70,000 unwed mothers receiving aid for dependent children.

The AFDC payments range from \$10.55 per recipient in Mississippi to \$64.65 in New Jersey. The national average per recipient is \$44.30, for the District of Columbia it is \$42.40. Think about it, gentlemen, the total amount paid out for these children is about \$48,730,000 a year and unmarried mothers are the ones who find it most difficult to get off the Public Assistance rolls.

I have talked a great deal about illegitimacy today. I have done it purposefully because people tend to be squeamish and don't want to generally discuss the matter. I think we must discuss it and many more of the subjects that surround the abortion issue and come to grips with them. I do not

believe in either sugarcoating or hiding the issues.

I would like to make one final point about illegitimacy for those of you who might be thinking about the immorality of women receiving AFDC. As I understand it, the largest increase in the AFDC rolls is coming not from those women who are now receiving public assistance but from those women who find that AFDC is the only answer to the problem of compulsory pregnancy that they face.

Before you condemn their immorality consider that there is two sides to the coin and that the government policy that we as elected officials represent is the other side of it.

Three: one can hardly discuss the issue of abortion by pointing out the inadequacy of the pill or the number of illegitimate births while ignoring legitimate but unwanted births.

A recent survey by Dr. Charles Westoff of Princeton University's office of population research reveals that 22 percent of all legitimate births in the United States are unwanted by either the husband or the wife. This in-depth study also revealed that of all economic groups the poor were most anxious about this issue. Among the poor (as classified by the social security standards) 42 percent of all legitimate births were unwanted. The principal reason seems to be either financial or financially related e.g., crowded housing.

The plethora of studies, committees and commissions on poverty and its causes have shown beyond a doubt that there is a very high correlation between family size and the ability of the family to break the poverty cycle. The risk of poverty increases rapidly from 9% for one-child families to 42% for families with six or more children. Nearly half of the children growing up in poverty in 1966 were members of families with five children or more under 18; more than 1/4 of all families with four or more children live in poverty; the risk of poverty is two and one half times that for families with three children or less.

I do not want you to think however that I am asking you to consider this aspect of family planning solely as an element of what was known as the "war on poverty". If this were the sole reason, we would indeed be waging a full scale war on the poor themselves.

No, I am suggesting that we move away from the concept of a class-oriented family planning policy. I am asking that all of those family planning services available to the middle-class, rich and white be made available and accessible to the poor, black and brown. The primary one which is not available at present, under safe and sanitary conditions, is pregnancy termination; and abortion is, as I noted, the number one method of birth control.

Why do I say that this service is not equally available, under safe and sanitary conditions, for at least minority-group poor women? In New York City, for example, well over 90% of all therapeutic abortions are performed on white women, according to the association for the study of abortion.

In January of this year an article in the *Scientific American* estimated that the ratio of therapeutic abortions per 1000 deliveries in this country was 2.6 for white women, .5 for black women and .1 for Puerto-Rican women.

One must also note that in New York City from 1960-1962 the abortion ratio in municipal hospitals was only .1 per 1000 live births. Plainly and simply, this shows that legal abortions are not readily available to the minority-group poor, in New York City at least.

There is also the financial burden that even legal abortion can and does impose. The cost of a legal abortion, mainly because the uneven laws that now govern, may cost from \$500 to \$1,000. The fees vary from doc-

tor to doctor, and from State to State, but average cost with hospital expenses could well be somewhere between \$500 and \$700. It is obvious that none of the poor can afford this luxurious method of birth control.

But nevertheless they are the ones who most often find themselves in crucial need of it. They, of course, seek out the illegal abortionist or attempt to do it themselves. The financial cost may be as low as \$30, or the average cost of a year's supply of the pill.

But it is the other cost, the human cost, that is horrifying to contemplate. Edwin Gold's study estimates that of the deaths of women related to maternity in New York City, abortion was the cause of death for only 25% of the white women while it caused 49% of the deaths of non-white women and 56% of the deaths of Puerto-Rican women.

This is at least a part of my answer to those who say that family planning is a form of genocide. What could be more like genocide than what a comparison of these statistics I just gave you portray?

Further, in 1966, Dr. Carl Goldmark, Jr., president of the New York County Medical Society, estimated that about 80% of all maternal deaths were the result of criminal abortions.

But gentlemen, let us come a bit closer to home, to Washington, that showplace of the Nation. What is the situation here?

Well, Dr. Milan Vuitch, who was the central figure in Judge Gessell's recent ruling on the District's compulsory pregnancy law, estimates that more than 20,000 abortions a year are performed in the greater Washington area. He further estimates that only 25% of them are performed in hospitals. That means that there are more than 15,000 illegal abortions performed in or near Washington.

The municipal hospitals in the District have the same anti-black, anti-poor policies in effect that I find in the New York City hospitals. D.C. General, for instance, reports 80 therapeutic abortions for last year. That is roughly .016% for the legal abortions in the greater Washington area. That figure has even more impact, I believe, when one realizes that it is only .004% of the total abortions performed, both legally and illegally, in this area.

The impact multiplies dramatically when we consider that D.C. General also reports between 800 and 1,000 incomplete abortions. Incomplete means that the abortion was induced, either by drugs, instrument or naturally, but that it did not complete naturally . . . therefore it must be completed by a physician.

In short, they expended 10 to 12 times more effort on repairing botched, non-professional surgery than they did on performing medically safe, professional surgery. That is nothing short of complete absurdity. Botched abortions are the single largest cause of maternal deaths in the United States and it is evidently going to be Government policy to keep it that way.

There are no clear statistics on exactly how many illegal abortions there are each year in this country. Estimates range from as low as 200,000 to 1.5 million. One thing that is clear however is that if we repealed our compulsory pregnancy laws the incidents would be reduced.

There are many statistics from other countries that support my contention. But in the interest of saving time let me quote instead from an article about the new British law that appeared in the *Washington Post* in June of last year.

"Some doctors contend the only value of the bill is to prevent the harm done by secret abortionists. They say Hungary allows abortions for anyone who wants one, and illegal operations have reportedly faded away. Czechoslovakia has a 'social clause' similar to Britain and clandestine abortions have dropped to 4,000 a year instead of 100,000."

May I point out that if there are now 1,500,000 illegal abortions in this country, a drop of the same percentage would reduce the number of illegal operations performed to about 30,000; that is only about twice as many as are now performed in the District of Columbia alone.

Gentlemen, let us look briefly at some of the countries where the compulsory pregnancy laws have been weakened or, if you prefer, where abortion laws have been liberalized:

Experience in Sweden and Denmark have shown that as legal abortions increased the death rate associated with it decreased.

In 1967 in Hungary there were 187,000 legal abortions as against 148,900 live births. Similarly Czechoslovakia's birthrate has been reduced but not as drastically as Hungary's.

Romania, after substituting a more restrictive law in 1966, discovered that their birth rate almost tripled in one year, the previous rate being 13.7 per 1,000.

It would seem that the absence of compulsory pregnancy laws alone can contribute a great deal to the control of the population growth, especially when one considers that at least the eastern bloc countries mentioned do not widely practice the more modern methods of contraception.

Of course no discussion of abortion would be complete without discussing the politically volatile issue of religious and moral concepts.

Since we are already outside of the country, let's stay there momentarily to quickly inspect the abortion rates of a few countries with large Catholic populations:

The illegal abortion rate in Uruguay is almost two and one-half times the number of annual live births.

In Roman Catholic Chile, 27 percent of the women reported that they had had abortions at one time or another.

In Roman Catholic France, the annual number of abortions equals the annual number of live births.

Coming back to this country we find that in a poll conducted in 1967, no less than 72 percent of the Catholics polled favored abortion reform, as did 83 percent of the Protestants and 98 percent of the Jewish.

No lesser a Catholic luminary than Cardinal Cushing of Boston was quoted as having said "It does not seem reasonable to me to forbid in civil law a practice that can be considered a matter of private morality."

He was of course speaking of the less traditional methods of birth control, contraceptives, but it is my belief that logical extension to abortion is now in order. That is especially true if he did, in fact, mean "A practice that can be considered a matter of private morality."

Outlawing compulsory pregnancy laws, which some of you might still prefer to call legalizing abortion, would not be forcing any doctor or hospital to perform abortions against their beliefs. By outlawing these laws we would instead be honoring the basic and individual right of a woman to terminate an unwanted pregnancy.

There are literally reams of other statistics that I might present to you gentlemen today in support of the repeal of the present compulsory pregnancy laws. However, time will not allow me to nor am I sure that it would accomplish more than muddying up the waters.

The basic underlying question in any discussion of compulsory pregnancy laws (which I choose to use rather than the term abortion laws) is what should a woman who is pregnant against her will do and what should the professional and public response toward her be if she chooses to terminate the pregnancy?

If the underlying thesis of family plan-

ning is to reduce even the number of wanted pregnancies, is it not illogical then to continue to force women with unwanted pregnancies to have the child? I think that it is!

#### FEAR OF A BLOODBATH

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in his November 3 speech, President Nixon said:

For the South Vietnamese, our precipitate withdrawal would inevitably allow the Communists to repeat the massacres which followed their takeover in the North 15 years before.

Douglas Pike is quoted in the Washington Post of December 7 in support of the President's view.

I include in the RECORD three other articles which consider the likelihood of a bloodbath in postwar South Vietnam. The Tran Van Dinh article especially indicates that new policies can lessen the possibility of a postwar massacre by either side.

Mr. Speaker, there is today a bloodbath in Vietnam. Our aim should be to bring it to an end by effective negotiation, by broadening the base of the South Vietnamese Government, through a creative aid program for postwar Vietnam, and if necessary, by providing asylum for those who want to leave Vietnam.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 7, 1969]  
HUE SLAYINGS SEEN PATTERN IF FOE WINS

HONG KONG.—The massacre in Hue during the 24 days Communist troops occupied the city in February, 1968, was a three-phase operation, according to a U.S. authority on the Vietcong.

Douglas Pike, a Foreign Service officer whose book, "Vietcong," is generally regarded as the definitive text on the "guerillas" organization, spent a week in Hue last month researching the mass slayings and concluded that as many as 5,800 Hue citizens may have been executed.

Pike, now stationed with the U.S. Information Service in Tokyo, is preparing a report on his findings. During a visit here, he said the massacre in Vietnam's old imperial capital "was quite impersonal."

#### AGAINST GROUPS

"It was not a blacklist of individuals but a blacklist of titles and positions in the old society," he said. "It was directed not against people, but against 'social units'—religious organizations, political parties and social movements like women's and youth associations."

Pike said that Phase I of the Communist campaign against Hue's civilians occurred during the first few days of the occupation, when the Vietcong did not expect to stay but wished to make an example and "break the enemy's administrative structure."

"Civilian cadres," Pike said, "accompanied by firing squads, executed key individuals to weaken governmental administration following Communist withdrawal. This was the blacklist period, the time of the drum-head court."

"Cadres with clipboards bearing lists of names and addresses summoned various 'enemies of the revolution' to kangaroo courts. Public trials usually lasted about 10 minutes, and there were no known not-

guilty verdicts. Punishment, invariably execution, was meted out immediately."

#### "RECONSTRUCTION"

Phase II was the period of "social reconstruction." It occurred during the few days the Communist cadres believed they were permanently in Hue.

In order to "build a new social order, it was necessary to purge the old order." The "social negatives" were eliminated. Anyone who might stand in the way of the Communists' consolidating their hold and imposing their own rules was killed.

Phase III, however, was the worst. During the last week of their stay, the Communists knew they would be forced to withdraw. They were determined to leave no witnesses who might testify against them or identify the 150 clandestine Communist cadres who had "surfaced" to rule Hue.

"Most victims were killed in batches during this period. At the sand dune grave they were tied together in groups of 10 and cut down with submachine guns," Pike said.

By Pike's count, 5,800 of Hue's civilians are dead or missing, while 1,800 were hospitalized. Of approximately 75,000 persons in the city during the Communists' rule, 7,600 became casualties. Allowing wide latitude for casualties in the battle for the city, at least 5 per cent and possibly closer to 10 cent of the population were deliberately slain, he estimates.

He believes the Hue massacres were different from other Vietcong terrorism, "not only in degree but in kind." It was not the quick terror used to build Vietcong morale or to frighten the populace but the slow, intensifying terror intended to create the basis of a new government.

To Pike the lesson of Hue is clear: "If the Communists win decisively, all foreigners would be expelled from the South, particularly hundreds of newsmen. A curtain of ignorance would descend. Then the night of the long knives would begin."

[From the New Republic, Dec. 6, 1969]

THE FATE OF "OUR" VIETNAMESE AFTER WITHDRAWAL—FEAR OF A BLOODBATH

(By Tran Van Dinh)

The possibility of a "bloodbath" in South Vietnam if US troops were to swiftly withdraw has been worrying both "hawks" and "doves." But the Vietnamese likely to be the most affected by a change of regime in Saigon, or by a Communist take-over—the wealthy and powerful—do not talk much about it: they have been getting ready ever since the Tet offensive of 1968, which brought the war into their cities and their air-conditioned living rooms. A quiet exodus began, mostly to France. The price of exodus is not cheap. An exit visa costs as much as \$5000; a "certificate of French citizenship" costs about \$2000; illegal border crossings into Cambodia cost anywhere from \$800 to \$4000.

Money has been deposited in European banks. According to Alessandro Cassella of Die Weltwoche of Zurich a total of between \$1.5 and \$2 billion has left Vietnam in this way. According to the same journalist, President Nguyen Van Thieu has found a home for his children in Rome (where his brother is ambassador), and his wife has just purchased a house in Europe. He estimates that of 1600 Vietnamese who are legally leaving this country each month, half do not return, which means that approximately 10,000 have emigrated since the negotiations started in Paris. My own estimates are a bit higher. Those who cannot afford or who do not wish to leave, have gone through a well-planned process of accommodation with the "other side," an accommodation that reaches the highest echelons of the government. Huynh Van Trong, special assistant to President

Thieu, was arrested in July this year with 42 others on charges of having contacts with the Vietcong. They were scheduled for trial November 28. On the provincial level, as Henry A. Kissinger has noted, "tacit accommodations are not unusual in many areas such as the Mekong Delta" (Foreign Affairs, January 1969). One wonders who will be left among the prospective victims.

The here-and-now bloodbath is real, however. For the majority of Vietnamese, poor peasants in the defoliated countryside and destitute workers in the city slums, it is what they have been witnessing a long time: the search and destroy missions; the "free zone" strikes; the B52 saturation bombings; the Phoenix operation (which from December 1967 to December 1968 killed 18,393 civilian Vietcong cadres); the Song My ("Pinkville") type of breakfast massacre in which an American infantry unit allegedly shot down some hundreds of men, women and children in a captured village in the early morning of March 16, 1968; the atrocities regularly described in national magazines (Esquire, Look, The New Yorker). To talk about a future massacre against this present background is ironic, to say the least.

For me, a Vietnamese, to discuss this problem is to admit the US has a role to play in the internal affairs of Vietnam after the war. I ask myself if earlier Americans would have been impressed by the reprisal argument, if it had been raised by the British before they left American shores after the War of Independence? Would it have carried much weight if, during the Civil War, a European country had intervened on behalf of either the North or the South, and then refused to leave on the grounds that withdrawal would leave the people of the North (or the South) at the mercy of aggressors?

Nonetheless, the question needs to be discussed, if only because it is raised by many Americans whose compassion for the Vietnamese people and whose opposition to the war I do not doubt. But in doing so, we must examine two underlying myths: the first is that the "Orientals put little value on life and take killing very lightly"; the second is that reprisals are the monopoly of the Communists, whereas anti-Communists are less vengeful. The first is easily dispelled by a reading of Western history: the religious wars, the Inquisition, the lynchings, the World Wars, the American Indian and Civil Wars, Hitler's "final settlement." Anyone who has spent time in Vietnam realizes that the peasant esteems life very highly. The Oriental is no more brutal, no more casual about death than is the Occidental, irrespective of politics. Since 1945, Vietnam has gone through a revolution and revolutions are always bloody, but the blood is on all hands. Mr. Kissinger recognized this when he wrote: "It is beyond imagination that parties that have been murdering and betraying each other for 25 years could work together as a team giving joint instructions to the entire country." The French, whom the U.S. helped to fight against the Viet Minh during the first Indochinese War, murdered a large number of Vietnamese nationalists and Communists alike, in both the North and the South. In November, 1945, French artillery fire and air bombardment killed 6000 fleeing Vietnamese civilians at Haiphong. The brief Japanese occupation of Vietnam was also bloody.

Many Americans believe that the Vietnamese Catholics will be the sure victims of future reprisals. Thus, President Nixon in his address on November 3 mentioned the "million-and-a-half Catholic refugees who fled to South Vietnam when the Communists took over the North." The President's statistics were inflated. According to *Vietnam Past and Present* published in Saigon in 1956 under the patronage of the South Vietnam Department of Education and the National Commission for UNESCO (p. 374)

and written by Mr. Thai Van Kiem, a Vietnamese diplomat and scholar, the total number of refugees was: 887,895 of whom 85 percent or 754,710 were Catholics.

Also, some 100,000 Vietnamese left the South for the North in 1954, several thousands of whom were Catholic. There are now about 800,000 Catholics in North Vietnam. There are Catholics in the leadership of the National Liberation Front. Those who predict the wholesale murder of Catholics by Communists sound more Catholic (and more anti-Communist) than the most anti-Communist Catholic leader in South Vietnam, Father Hoang Quynh. During the First Indochinese War, Father Hoang Quynh led a guerrilla army against the Viet Minh, and in 1954 he moved south with his faithful. Recently, he said: "If the Communists come, we will try and live and adapt here." (*Newsweek* November 24, 1969). In the last three years, he has worked out a close relationship with Venerable Tich Tri Quang, the militant Buddhist leader whom some in the US consider pro-Communist. Father Hoang Quynh knows very well that security lies in close association with your own people, not with a foreign army. In a communique on January 8, 1968, the Conference of Bishops in Vietnam appealed to "the goodwill of the government of both South and North Vietnam to build peace together: in the name of the Lord, we cry Stop." In early November this year, 93 prominent Vietnamese Catholics from France, West Germany, Canada and in Vietnam called for the immediate withdrawal of US troops. Among the signers of this appeal was Colonel Nguyen Van Chau, for several years (1957-1962) Director of Psychological Warfare of the ARVN (Army of the Republic of South Vietnam). (The colonel recently sent a letter supporting the October and November Moratoriums in the US.)

In recent months Saigon has given wide publicity to "mass executions and mass graves" in Hue, digging up bodies for the press and photographers. Yet, Colonel Ton That Khien, chief of Quang Ngai province ("Pinkville"), where the March 16, 1968 massacre of Vietnamese women and children took place, refused to dig up the bodies of the victims, saying that "they are old bodies" (*Evening Star*, November 17, 1969).

Why are the Hue bodies new and the Quang Ngai old, when they were buried at the same time? President Nixon said: "We saw the prelude of what would happen in South Vietnam when the Communists entered the city of Hue last year. During their brief rule there, there was a bloody reign of terror in which 3000 civilians were clubbed, shot to death and buried in mass graves." I was touched by the President's mention of Hue, my home town. The 1968 Tet offensive took two victims in my own family: my younger brother, a noncommissioned officer in the ARVN and a published poet, and my nephew. They were both killed not by the Vietcong but by American bombings. They were buried in a temporary grave for the reason that Hue was under siege; nobody could get out of the area to buy a coffin for decent burial. The first news I received from an official Saigon source was that my relatives were killed by the Vietcong. Only much later, when I got word from my own family, did I learn that they had been killed by the bombings. What happened in Hue is told in an account that appeared in *The Christian Century* of November 5, 1969. The author, Len E. Ackland, now a graduate student at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, worked and lived in Hue in 1967. He returned there after the Tet offensive of 1968 to interview the people (he speaks Vietnamese). He wrote: "When on the first day of the attack, about 20 Vietcong entered Gia Hoi (a precinct of 25,000 residents in Hue) in order to secure the area, they carried with them a list of those who were to be killed immediately as 'enemies of

the people.' According to Le Ngan, director of Hue's special police, the list consisted of five names, all those of officers of special police." The Catholic priest in Gia Hoi told him that "none of his clergy or parishioners were harmed by the NLF."

When the 1968 Tet offensive started, I suggested to an acquaintance of mine whom I thought was close to the Saigon policy makers, that Hue should be declared an open city as was Rome during the Second World War, and for the same reasons. Had that been done, the loss in lives, the damage to historical sites and treasures would have been minimized. Instead of which, the ARVN (which disappeared at the first Vietcong shot) returned in force with the US Marines and planes to "destroy the city in order to save it." Hue authorities never explained why they failed to protect the people. Nor did they reveal the number of people killed by American bombings and artillery.

Few know the Vietcong better than Tran Van Duc, a Vietcong colonel who defected last year. In an interview published by the Joint US Public Affairs Office in Saigon, Tran Van Duc said: "If the Vietcong took over, they would send military officers and former civil servants to concentration camps to be reeducated, in some cases to hard labor until they become submissive. And of course, all those whose social class or former position makes them objects of suspicion would be carefully watched by the authorities. To me, the people of Vietnam and especially the peasants who have been militarily and politically trained in the last two decades by the revolutionaries would not be easily terrorized. They are tougher and much more sophisticated than their apparent apathy seems to indicate. In 1956, two years after the prestigious victory at Dien Bien Phu and the immense popularity of the late President Ho Chi Minh, the peasants in Nghe An, Ho Chi Minh's home province, revolted against the excesses of land reforms. President Ho Chi Minh admitted the mistakes publicly and took over the Secretary Generalship of the party to correct them."

If the reason for continuing the US military presence in South Vietnam is to prevent a bloodbath, then the logical thing to aim for, right now is a broad-based Saigon regime that includes Buddhists, whose nonviolent position has been always clear and consistent, the peace-minded generals such as Duong Van Minh (Big Minh) or Tran Van Don. That would be a negotiating government. The Thieu-Ky-Khiem regime is not only an obstacle to negotiations, but polarizes the situation among non-Communist elements as well. "Vietnamization," which attempts to consolidate Thieu's regime, simply increases the likelihood of reprisals.

Those who fear a Vietcong bloodbath ought to consider other possibilities too. What will happen, for example, to thousands of political prisoners (among them Truong Dinh Dzu, the runner-up in the 1967 elections and now condemned to five years at hard labor), if there is no negotiated settlement? Judging from many threats directed against the neutralists and the peace-minded by the Saigon regime, they would be liquidated by Thieu and his friends the day those leaders decided to quit the country. Thieu has already launched a campaign against his political opponents, accusing them of being Communists.

Or consider this: Senator Cranston (D, California), *Newsweek* and *Time* has referred to a Pentagon "contingency plan" to fight the South Vietnamese Army, should negotiations fail. This is not as absurd as it may seem. Anti-American feelings in the South have risen since the Paris talks. The "Vietnamization" program has brought into positions of command young ARVN officers, who, unlike the generals, have never been associated with the French army. They are products of the South Vietnamese military

schools since 1954. They are now part of an anti-Communist army, but they are not anti-nationalist; they know what is going on among their leaders, the corruption and the ineffectiveness. I know of several cases where officers of the ARVN have been demoted because of their close connection with their American advisers. General Ky himself has tried to exploit this anti-American sentiment among young officers. More than once, he has said that if he had to choose again, he "would be on the side of Ho Chi Minh." The young majors and captains do not have money in foreign banks, they are not going to leave en masse after the Americans go home. But to stay with their people, they either have to find the way to accommodate with the "other side," or prove by their actions that they are as patriotic as the Vietcong. The best proof might be to fight the US "residual force." In June of this year, two US military police who had rushed to a bar in response to complaints that a drunken US soldier was making trouble were shot to death by Colonel Nguyen Viet Can, commander of the Vietnamese airborne battalion that guards the Independence Palace. No charge was filed against the colonel. As Mr. Kissinger again rightly notes: "The Vietnamese people have lived under foreign rule for approximately half of their history. They have maintained a remarkable cultural and social cohesion by being finely attuned to the realities of power." To many Vietnamese the realities of power since the Paris talks are shifting. An attack by the ARVN against the US troops would be the final blow.

Finally, President Thieu and the U.S. Embassy in Saigon have claimed that the pacification program has been going extremely well, that the South Vietnamese government controls more than 80 percent of the population. If this were true, then over a million ARVN troops and U.S. residual forces could stage a real bloodbath—against the Vietcong—after the war.

I do not sit in the inner councils of the NLF. I do not know the number of Vietnamese who may be victimized once U.S. forces are withdrawn. But I am not persuaded that a bloodbath would take place if there were no U.S. troops in Vietnam, or if the Vietcong took over. I agree, however, that if only dozens of Vietnamese might be killed in the post-withdrawal period, it is the moral duty of the American people and government to find the way to protect them. In the past, the Chinese invaders always took along with them those Vietnamese who cooperated with them, and provided them with good jobs in China. The French have also been hospitable to their Vietnamese friends. If fears of reprisals are the main concern of the Administration, as President Nixon has indicated, then several steps can be taken.

Adopt Senator Charles E. Goodell's "Vietnam Disengagement Act." This would not only put a limit on the U.S. commitment in Vietnam, but would create "a powerful incentive for that government [of South Vietnam] to mobilize its forces more effectively and to seek the political strength of a broadened popular base," thus reducing the chance of wholesale reprisals.

Support Senator George McGovern's suggestion and provide funds and means to resettle, either in continental America or in Hawaii, those Vietnamese who wish to leave the country at the departure of the US troops. A bipartisan congressional committee could be formed promptly to prepare evacuation plans. Journalists, politicians and others who have expressed concern about a possible bloodbath could be invited to contribute money and effort. The US can argue at the Paris talks (or better, at a reconvened Geneva Conference) for a period of regroupment exceeding the 300 days stipulated in the 1954 Geneva Agreements. As a resident of the US, being taxed without being represented, I

would suggest that the US should ask its allies to share the burden. Perhaps some Vietnamese would like to settle in Thailand, in the Philippines, in South Korea, in New Zealand. Australia needs manpower, and if Canberra can send troops to fight for the "freedom" of the Vietnamese, the Australian Parliament can change its immigration laws to admit the colored Vietnamese.

Give to the International Control Commission (ICC) temporary command of the last batch of US troops being withdrawn, thus guarding against their being assaulted by ARVN, NLF or Hanoi forces.

Let the US insist on strengthening machinery to implement Article 14C of the 1954 Geneva Accords. 14C said that the parties to the agreement undertook "to refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations on account of their activities during the hostilities, and to guarantee their democratic liberties." These pledges are accepted in paragraph C of point 5 of the NLF 10-point program for the settlement of the war.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1969]

TOPICS: HISTORY AND THE BLOODBATH THEORY IN VIETNAM

(By George McT. Kahn)

The Administration's most persistent argument against a rapid or complete withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam has been that a bloodbath would take place if American forces were no longer available to protect President Thieu's regime from the National Liberation Front. Others hold that even if the President's forecast were correct, the number of victims involved would not approach the number of civilians who are certain to be killed during even a few more months of fighting in South Vietnam.

But however one estimates these possibilities, it is essential that a clear distinction be made between battlefield conditions and the situation existing after an armistice. In heat-of-battle conditions both sides in the past—and probably in the future—have carried out reprisals against those identified as working for the enemy—particularly when they occupy positions in intelligence, the police, or are believed to be informers.

This was apparently an important factor in the execution of civilians at Hue, and Army spokesmen have alleged that it influenced American conduct in the massacre at Songmy. So long as a particular battle is simply one episode in a continuing series, both sides will be tempted to take punitive measures against "enemy" civilians.

Such actions will probably continue until there is a cease-fire but they should not be taken as an augury of what will happen after a settlement. This is, however, just what President Nixon suggested in his speech Nov. 3 when he equated a post-armistice situation with that of Hue in early 1968, where many civilians are reported to have been executed during three weeks of terribly intense fighting.

In asserting that Hue was a prelude of what would happen in South Vietnam suddenly left unprotected by American troops, Mr. Nixon has not only argued against withdrawal but has made it much more difficult for Americans to trust in a negotiated peace settlement.

#### MR. NIXON'S WRONG FACTS

Even more damaging to this prospect is the President's appalling misunderstanding of what actually happened after the 1954 Geneva armistice. He charges that with the departure of the French army from northern Vietnam, the Vietminh "murdered more than 50,000 people and hundreds of thousands more died in slave labor camps," and that on the basis of this history we must expect a similar bloodbath in the South if American forces are withdrawn before Thieu's Government can stand on its own.

The President's account is contrary to the historical record. If his advisers have studied the reports of the International Control Commission, responsible under the 1954 Geneva armistice for investigating allegations of reprisal, they must know that in the first two years following that armistice a total of nineteen complaints alleging political reprisal in the North were lodged with the Commission, only one of which involved murder. During the same period at least 214 were lodged against Diem's Government in the South, including several reports of massacres.

Although the I.C.C. did not complain that its inquiries into these allegations were hampered in the North, it soon encountered major obstructions in the South, with Saigon finally forbidding it in early 1957 from continuing such investigations there. At that time the Commission had yet to investigate thirty-five alleged incidents of political reprisal in the North as against 1,047 in the South. Many allegations could have been substantiated. We know that Diem's regime reported publicly that between 1954 and 1960 there were 48,200 alleged Communists arrested in South Vietnam.

#### SUPPORT—OR SOLUTION?

It was in the fall of 1956, more than two years after the Geneva Armistice, that violence occurred on a significant scale in the North. This was unconnected with the anti-French struggle and was not in reprisal against Vietnamese who had supported France against the Vietminh.

Those concerned with political reprisals might well insist that in any future Vietnam settlement the I.C.C. or its equivalent be made much stronger to insure that it is capable of investigating alleged reprisals effectively.

And any President worried about a future bloodbath in Vietnam who looks to historical precedent for instruction should be as much concerned with the actions of an American-supported regime as with those of the regime we oppose.

[From the Christian Century, Nov. 5, 1969]

VIETNAM: THE BLOODBATH ARGUMENT—THE EVIDENCE SUGGESTS THAT HANOI WOULD NOT MOUNT MASSIVE KILLINGS AFTER TAKING POWER IN THE SOUTH

(By D. Gareth Porter and Len E. Ackland)

As pressure builds on the Nixon administration to withdraw American troops rapidly from Vietnam, proponents of the war are beginning to emphasize the argument that if the communists were allowed to gain control, there would be a massive bloodbath of noncommunist Vietnamese.

This argument is not new. Joseph Alsop invoked the bloodbath specter last May when he wrote that "at least a million South Vietnamese . . . would be doomed to prompt execution, in the event of a nationwide Communist takeover." About the same time an aide to Nixon's adviser Henry Kissinger told a group of visitors to the White House that there would certainly be a "bloodbath" if American forces pulled out of Vietnam too soon. Six weeks later Alsop raised his estimate to 1.5 million, a figure he claimed was officially accepted. And in September he warned that "too many troop withdrawals" would expose Vietnamese to massacres that would make Hue look like a "Sunday school picnic."

Like all political propaganda, these predictions are intended to inspire support for official policy rather than to increase understanding. Those of us Americans who are genuinely concerned about the Vietnamese people want sober information on the facts, not appeals to emotion. Let us therefore look at the relevant historical evidence.

Political murder is no new thing in Vietnam. The French used it consistently to destroy nationalist political movements. The Viet Minh and their successors employed

it whenever they thought it would be useful in their struggles against the French, the Americans and their internal foes. In 1945 and 1946 they systematically assassinated many potential rivals for power, and since 1956 they have killed thousands of local officials and other pro-government figures in South Vietnam.

Similarly, the Vietnam Nationalist party (V.N.Q.D.D.) had a reputation in earlier years for kidnaping and assassinating Viet Minh agents, while members of the Hoa Hao religious sect tied groups of Viet Minh together and threw them alive into canals. More recently assassination squads hired by the U.S. have sought out members of the National Liberation Front's political and administrative organization. As we said, political murder is no new thing in Vietnam.

But to predict the mass murder of former foes once the conflict has ended is quite another matter. Alsop asserts—apparently with official encouragement—that both the history of North Vietnam after the Geneva Conference of 1954 and the Communist occupation of Hué during the 1968 Tet offensive portend a policy of mass liquidation if the Communists come to power in the South. The historical record, however, does not support any such conclusion.

The 1954 Geneva agreement called for what was intended to be twofold protection from reprisals by either the Viet Minh or the French administration. First, it provided for free movement of the population between the two "temporary zones" north and south of the 17th parallel, to be effective for a year following the cease-fire. Second, it prohibited reprisals against those who collaborated with either army during the war. While there is evidence that the Hanoi government, stunned by the massive movement of population out of the northern zone, violated the accords in attempting to impede that flow, it also seems clear that there was no campaign of reprisals against pro-French elements.

## I

International Control Commission reports, while not definitive, give us a reasonable account of the situation in North Vietnam after the 1954 accords. During the period from 1955 to 1961, a total of 43 complaints alleging reprisals in the North were submitted to the I.C.C. by the French and the Diem regime. Of the first 12 complaints lodged by the French High Command, the I.C.C. investigated three and dismissed all of them as unfounded. Of 41 personal petitions alleging such D.R.V. reprisals that were presented to the commission, half of them were dismissed as not falling under the reprisal provision of the accords. Although most of the I.C.C. reports do not specify the nature of the uninvestigated complaints, it appears that very few of them involved charges of murder. For example, of the 18 incidents of reprisal alleged by the French to have taken place between December 1955 and July 1956, only one involved murder.

Thus, the sum total of the allegations lodged against the D.R.V. hardly supports the "bloodbath" predictions made by Alsop *et al.* True, the movement of 750,000 to 1 million anticommunists, Catholics and other collaborators with the French to South Vietnam before July 1955 undoubtedly reduced the number who might have been punished. Nevertheless, despite the alarms often sounded about the fate of Vietnamese Catholics at the hands of the communists, 600,000 Catholics remained in the North, and there is no evidence that they were punished for their lack of pro-Viet Minh sentiment. In fact, Catholics in North Vietnam continue to exercise their religion freely, although there are limitations on their seminaries and high taxes on church lands.

Moreover, the small number of complaints against the D.R.V. must be compared with the wholesale reprisals by the Diem regime

in South Vietnam against former collaborators with the Viet Minh. In 1955—violating the Geneva agreements, which were binding on his government—Diem launched an anti-communist denunciation campaign which soon acquired a frenzied momentum of its own and spiraled out of his control. No one knows how many "Viet Minh" were killed during the campaign, which lasted until 1958. It is known, however, that tens of thousands, many of them innocent of any connection with the communists, were rounded up in concentration camps. The High Command of the North Vietnamese army submitted to the I.C.C. 869 complaints, many of which alleged that Viet Minh sympathizers had been murdered.

When proponents of the bloodbath argument mention massacres in the North, they are referring not to political reprisals against former enemies of the Viet Minh but to the harshly implemented land reform program of 1955-56. The purpose of that program was to mobilize political support among the poor peasants, who were encouraged to denounce "rich landlords." As in the South, denunciations went out of control, as zealous cadres and local grudge-bearers combined to bring about massive executions and imprisonments which went far beyond what the regime had intended. Historian Joseph Buttinger, whose sympathies lay with Diem, has estimated that perhaps 10,000 or 15,000 were killed during the period, but here again no reliable estimate is available.

By mid-1956 Ho Chi Minh, aware that the program had been a disaster, admitted "errors" and promised to correct them. In October he dismissed Truong Chinh, the primary advocate of an extreme left-wing "Chinese" policy in agriculture, from both his positions as director of land reform and party secretary. In a display of public repentance the government launched a "campaign for rectification of errors" and did what it could to repair the damage. But the sharp reversal of policy did not come in time to stave off an open rebellion in Nghe An province, where hundreds of peasants were reportedly killed in the fighting. It seems doubtful that, having experienced the disaster of 1955-56, Hanoi's leadership would make the mistake of applying the same extremist policy in the South.

## II

Both Alsop and the administration have exploited American horror at the executions in Hué during the 1968 communist Tet offensive to stir fears of a nationwide massacre in Vietnam following American withdrawal. But closer examination of the circumstances surrounding the executions in Hué is necessary before conclusions can be reached concerning the probability of such a grim outcome.

One of the authors of this paper lived and worked in Hué during 1967 and returned after the Tet offensive of 1968 to interview Vietnamese and reconstruct the events surrounding the N.L.F. occupation there. The focus of this research was Gia Hoi, a precinct with 25,000 residents, one-fourth of Hué's population. Gia Hoi was under uncontested N.L.F. control for 26 days—longer than any other area of the city. There the Front established a revolutionary government, provided administrative services, held public meetings and distributed weapons. The story of Gia Hoi's occupations reveals that the mass executions perpetrated there were not the result of a policy on the part of a victorious government but rather the revenge of an army in retreat.

When, on the first day of the attack, about 20 Vietcong entered Gia Hoi in order to secure the area, they carried with them a list of those who were to be killed immediately as "enemies of the people." According to Le Ngan, director of Hué's special police, the list consisted of five names, all those of officers of the special force. Four were cap-

tured and summarily killed; the fifth, Le Ngan himself, spent 21 days dodging the communists before escaping to safety.

After establishing control the Vietcong drew up a second list naming all soldiers, policemen and government functionaries and all employees of the Americans. A third list, compiled in Gia Hoi by the N.L.F. guerrillas, included high school and university students, workers and servants who would probably serve the revolution once they were contacted.

## III

The administration of Gia Hoi was in the hands of local N.L.F. cadres, most of them poor peasants from the countryside surrounding Hué, who obviously found the city an alien environment. The North Vietnamese troops who had a command post in Gia Hoi kept out of political matters and were by all accounts, well mannered and highly disciplined throughout their stay. Meanwhile, physicians in Gia Hoi began staffing public dispensaries and a social service committee distributed rice from a government storehouse to needy families. But the primary business of the local administration was to create political support for the new regime. Small meetings were held continuously during the following three weeks, with separate study sessions for teachers, workers and students to enable the cadres to use the most persuasive arguments on each group.

During the first week and a half of the occupation few people were killed in Gia Hoi. Some did not report to the committees and were punished as examples; others, such as special police agent Le Van Rut, were executed because they had been particularly unpopular with Hué's population. After February 9, as the fighting across the canal became more vicious and the U.S. counter-attack against the Citadel began, the attitude of the N.L.F. toward those on the "re-education" list began to change. For it became increasingly apparent that the Front would not be able to stay in Hué indefinitely. Every night for the next two weeks their cadres knocked on doors and ordered certain people to attend sessions, and almost every night new executions were carried out in the yard of the Gia Hoi high school.

On February 22 all remaining soldiers, police, functionaries and employees of the Americans were ordered to report a second time, and those who reported or were located never returned. By then the Front knew that it would have to evacuate shortly, and it was in the final three days of the occupation that most of the killing in Gia Hoi took place. On the last day those who had collaborated with the Front during its 26 days were asked if they wanted to return to the mountains with the N.L.F. troops. According to an A.R.V.N. intelligence officer, over 100 did go with the troops, but many persons who chose to remain behind were shot.

According to Ranger Captain Phan Van Phuoc, the government chief of the precinct, 60 per cent of the 350 bodies found in Gia Hoi were those of policemen and soldiers. The remainder were civil servants, employees of the Americans, members of the old right-wing Nationalist party (which had long provided cadres for the government's pacification and counterterror programs in central Vietnam), and some innocent civilians.

The Catholics were not singled out for retribution even after February 22. The Catholic priest in Gia Hoi told one of us that none of his clergy or parishioners were harmed by the N.L.F. In other parts of the city as well, priests reported that the Vietcong who approached them were "correct" though not friendly. One Benedictine priest was killed, apparently because he was chaplain to the Americans. But the murder of two French priests on February 25 was probably not carried out on orders from local

leaders, since both had been known to be friendly to the N.L.F.

Some of the killing in the final three days was apparently the result of individual acts by the Front's cadres, long suspicious of and resentful toward the city people whom they had associated with the enemy and now further embittered by defeat and by the loss of many of their comrades in the battle. A later defector from the Front, who was with the retreating Front forces in the mountains west of Hue when they held a self-criticism session, reported that they were severely criticized by their superiors for excesses which had "hurt the revolution."

Elsewhere in Hue a similar pattern was followed: the vast majority of policemen, civil servants and soldiers were initially on "re-education" rather than on "liquidation" lists, but the number of killings mounted as the military pressure on the N.L.F. and North Vietnamese increased.

The notion that the communists will mount massive killings after taking power in the South is further weakened by the testimony of Tran Van Dac, one of the highest-ranking defectors from the N.L.F. In an interview published last year by the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office in Saigon, he explained that, if they took over, the communists would send military officers and former civil servants to "concentration camps to be re-educated" and in some cases to do hard labor, until they became "submissive." And of course, all those whose social class or former position makes them objects of suspicion would be "carefully watched" by the authorities.

Neither the earlier consolidation of power in North Vietnam, nor the occupation of Hue in 1968, nor the testimony of a high-ranking defector, supports the conclusion that Hanoi intends to bring about a "bloodbath" after achieving control in the South. Whatever the utility of eliminating government personnel during the war, the communist leadership has no interest in liquidating Saigon's military officers or civil servants. If there are political executions, the victims are most likely to be those who are highly unpopular with the citizens, such as the secret police officers on the highly selective list of "enemies of the people" in Gia Hoi.

The past offers ample evidence that longstanding hatreds can result in individual vendettas, and the highly political central Vietnamese are especially prone to such settling of old scores. If the U.S. really wishes to fulfill its moral obligation to those who fear for their safety in the absence of the American presence, it can do so easily by pledging to provide transportation to new homes for all who desire it.

The Nixon administration and its supporters appear more interested, however, in the exploitation of the bloodbath theme than in taking the practical steps to provide safety. And while they appeal to the American abhorrence of an imagined massacre, the real killing of thousands of Vietnamese and Americans goes on month after month.

#### SUBSTITUTE OEO BILL INADEQUATE

### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the substitute OEO bill offered by my distinguished colleagues, Mr. QUIE and Mrs. GREEN. While I am aware that the poverty program has many problems, the substitute bill does not offer solutions. It merely compounds the problems.

First, the substitute measure would

create 50 new bureaucracies of unequal quality across the Nation. This would result in duplication of service and multiplication of costs.

Second, the proposed OEO substitute would not assure active poverty programs in every State. While some State administrations may utilize poverty funds more constructively than a federally administered program, many Governors and State legislatures would not choose to operate meaningful programs, and these would be the States where poverty is most crushing, and where the need for innovative programs which meet the realities and work successfully are most urgently needed.

Third, even fewer funds will be channeled into the large cities because Governors and legislatures are not sympathetic to the problems of central cities, and, indeed, have compounded the plight of cities by their suburban-rural orientation.

Instead of dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity, I would prefer to see it expanded and strengthened, because OEO has shown useful alternatives to the traditional welfare approach to poverty. Programs like Headstart, Followthrough, and my New Careers program, initiated at OEO, have become staples of the American education program.

Beginning as a poverty program, New Careers as a concept has permeated many aspects of the Nation's manpower programs.

VISTA has given many concerned young people a constructive outlet.

OEO has brought food to the hungry and legal and medical service to the indigent; new education, job skills, and employment to the aspiring poor.

A mass of 50, separate, State programs could not possibly follow in this tradition. The innovation and zeal of OEO must not be allowed to disappear.

#### WASHINGTON MEDDLERS

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, recently a very timely editorial appeared in the *Anderson Independent*, Anderson, S.C.

I commend this excellent editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to the American people:

AND NOW THE WASHINGTON MEDDLERS  
PREPARE FOR AN ATTACK UPON EGGS

John Harms, editor of the *Kiplinger Agricultural Newsletter*, warns that the next batch of "consumer protection" in the works to come out of Washington will be a campaign against eggs and already the poultry industry is madder than a wet hen about it because, say the poultrymen, nothing has been proven about the cholesterol content of hen fruit.

Speaking before the Northeastern Poultry Producers Council at Atlantic City, Editor Harms said the groundwork is under way for the blast against eggs and the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health will be used as a springboard by those people who attack eggs.

The Kiplinger man said he has been informed that Jean Mayer, a special consultant to President Nixon, already has publicity campaign in the works. This, Mr. Harms said, will not be a one-shot deal but will continue to grow.

He even went so far as to say he could not be surprised to see, some day, a label that says: "Egg eating may be hazardous to your health."

Before this campaign is launched, if Mr. Harms is correct, the folks in Washington, who quite obviously are working overtime to find products to blast off about, owe it to the poultry industry to use some common sense and be sure of what they are talking about, for as we understand it even doctors are confused about how much cholesterol is in an egg and whether cholesterol is detrimental to the human body.

Let's don't have another cyclamate controversy and let's remember, too, that there are many variances of views on even cigarettes, without hard, uncontradictable facts being available.

The public is beginning to take some of this stuff with a grain of salt, which incidentally apparently has not yet been scrutinized by the headline seekers.

As the detective on TV says, just the facts, sir.

Meanwhile, we are going to keep right on eating a couple of eggs in the morning, and, if you don't mind, the bacon to go with it, crisp. And butter on the toast, please.

#### "LOVE PEACE" BECOMES "HATE AMERICA"—A PSYWAR STRATEGY

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, most Americans, preoccupied with earning a livelihood, raising a family, and enjoying life, do not fully understand that we are at war in this country. They have been led to believe that there has to be shooting for their country to be endangered or to be at war. For this reason, they believe the present war is confined to a tiny Asian country far overseas. They do not understand that a war is being waged without shooting—a psychological war—which the enemy is daily prosecuting to the fullest right here in the United States of America.

The technique of thesis and synthesis, and the "slide-off" is most lucidly explained by J. Edgar Hoover, in his book, "Masters of Deceit," which should be studied by Americans. Most need to recognize the intentional manipulations and distortions of the "slide-off" technique used in Communist education. Education in this misapplication is a weapon of the battle.

Failing to understand the technique, many Americans do not understand the development and use of the Mylai incident as "hate America" propaganda to further confuse our people and damage our national unity against a common enemy.

The initial psychological thrust was to indoctrinate our impressionable youth in a belief that peace is imperative and must be cherished; and since war is the antithesis of peace, they must hate war.

To translate the abhorrence of war into a hatred of America, it was only

necessary to find an incident which would identify the horrors of war with our own country. The My Lai or Pinkville incident served as the vehicle for transfer for hate of the war to hate of our country.

Thus, what began as love of peace became hatred of America.

I include in my remarks an interesting report by Mr. Frank Capell in the Herald of Freedom for December 12, 1969, entitled "More Hate America Propaganda," a report by Mrs. Shirley Scheibla from Barron's for October 6, covering the Institute of Policy Studies and its co-director, Richard Barnett, and a news clipping on the moratorium:

#### MORE "HATE AMERICA" PROPAGANDA

The Communist take-over of the United States is proceeding along the tried-and-true lines established by the Communist take-over of Russia. The importance of the disintegration of the military was recognized by the Bolsheviks (they called it democratization) and is being accomplished in the United States Armed forces through "atrocious stories" and "incidents" discrediting our soldiers and officers fighting in Vietnam. The Green Beret "incident" did not arouse enough horror, although it did have a debilitating effect upon the morale of the Armed Forces and did force top-flight officer, Col. Reault, out of action. To accomplish what the Green Beret "incident" failed to accomplish, we now have a new "incident," the "My Lai Massacre," which seems to have many of the earmarks of a "planned incident." The photographer, whose horror pictures have shocked the world, requested that he be assigned to cover this particular action. The men were briefed by a "field paragraph" from headquarters, stating that My Lai harbored Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops and ordering C Company to take and destroy the village. This was the first combat engagement of C Company, according to one of its members, Charles A. West of Chicago. Mr. West, a participant in the so-called "massacre," gives an entirely different story from the publicity-seekers and money-makers who have jumped into the picture with both feet, and has stated that he will testify for the defendants, Lt. Wm. Calley and Sgt. David Mitchell.

This particular can of worms was opened by a new left-wing "news" (propaganda) service called Dispatch News Service which was started in late 1968 in Taiwan by David Obst and another American, Michael Morrow, a former Dartmouth student. Obst, who is 23 years of age, went to Taiwan as a student and returned to the United States last year to study Chinese at the University of California. He is the son of a Los Angeles advertising man. Morrow went to Vietnam to seek information and was joined by Donald Luce. Others on the Dispatch staff in Saigon are Don Ronke and Dick Berliner. In Washington they have Derek Norcross who also writes "Youth Notes" for Parade. Assisting Dispatch as an "adviser" is Richard J. Barnett who has just returned from a visit to Hanoi and is co-director with Marcus Raskin of Washington's Institute for Policy Studies, a radically leftist oriented "think-tank." Michael Nussbaum of 1156-15th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. is attorney for Dispatch.

Associated with Dispatch is Seymour M. Hersch, age 32, a Washington free lance writer who began his career as a police reporter with Chicago's City News Bureau. He has spent the last few years in campaigning successfully against chemical and biological warfare. He was press secretary for Eugene McCarthy during his presidential try. Hersch reportedly has numerous Pentagon contacts and got a tip on the "massacre" story from them. With a \$1,000 grant from

the Philip M. Stern Foundation, financier of left-wing causes, Hersch spent two months travelling around the country tracking down ex-GI's who might have information on the "massacre," which supposedly took place in the hamlet of My Lai, village of Song My, province of Quang Ngai, March 16, 1968.

The "massacre" story begins with a man who supposedly started the whole thing when his "conscience" caused him to write a 1,500 word letter to various and sundry U.S. officials, Senators and Congressmen. Ronald Lee Ridenhour, age 23, now a student in Claremont College in California, was a door gunner on an observation helicopter assigned to the 11th Light Infantry Brigade when he first heard about the "massacre." When he was subsequently transferred to commando reconnaissance he had the opportunity to talk to soldiers in many different camps. He had first heard about Song My, nicknamed "Pinkville" because it was a Viet Cong stronghold and colored thus on Army maps, about a month after the "massacre." By June he had located four members of C Company, 1st Battalion of the 20th Infantry, 11th Light Infantry Brigade who had participated in the action on March 16, 1968 and were "willing to talk." In November, just before he returned to the United States, Ridenhour located a fifth participant. Returning to his home in Phoenix, Arizona, Ridenhour pieced together his hearsay story and by the end of March, 1969 his letter was on its way to President Nixon, Secretary Laird, and the Senators and Congressmen.

As a result of his letter, Ridenhour was interviewed by an Army investigator but, when great headlines concerning his informational coup did not burst upon the American scene, he was discouraged and contacted a "literary agent" by the name of Michael Cunningham who attempted to sell Ridenhour's story to various newspapers, magazines, news agencies and television networks with no success. Although we are assured by the news media that Ridenhour's motives in "exposing the massacre" are most honorable, we can't help agreeing with Col. Oren K. Henderson, former Commander of the 11th Brigade, who stated: "I can't believe a guy who did not participate in something, that his conscience would bother him a year later more than the men involved."

One of the first men who supplied Ridenhour with information was his good friend, Charles Gruver, age 24, now a construction worker in Tulsa, Oklahoma. That Gruver might have an ax to grind was indicated by his statement that Lt. Calley was intensely disliked by the men (Newark N.J. Star Ledger, 11/24/69). Gruver was quoted as stating that his outfit was told the village was a Viet Cong stronghold and ordered to destroy it completely. He stated: "We confiscated several weapons and took a few prisoners and later they found an underground military hospital in the village." The horror story in Life magazine of Dec. 5, 1969 does not mention these statements, the one they have picked being the following concerning a small boy: "The boy was clutching his wounded arm with his other hand while blood trickled between his fingers. He just stood there with big eyes staring around like he didn't understand. Then the captain's RTO (radio operator) put a burst of 16 (M 16) fire into him."

The story in Life was written around the "exclusive" color pictures they bought from Ronald L. Haerberle, identified as a 28-year-old Cleveland businessman who was assigned to Company C, 20th Infantry of the Americal Division, 11th Light Infantry Brigade as a public information Sergeant at the time of the incident. He and SP5 Jay Roberts, both of the 31st Public Information Detachment, had volunteered for this operation because "word was out that it would be a hot one." Haerberle was well prepared with three cameras, one for the Army and two for himself,

the Army film being in black and white and his private film being in color. When he returned from the war he lectured and showed his "horror" films around the Cleveland area without causing any excitement.

He recognized his opportunity, however, when the story of the "massacre" finally hit the news and took his pictures to Joseph Eszterhas, a reporter for the liberal Cleveland Plain Dealer. The paper printed eight of his pictures on November 20th and that same night Haerberle and Eszterhas flew to New York to go in business. They set up shop in Room 801 of the Gotham Hotel and invited bids from newspapers and magazines on the eighteen color slides. For a while it seemed that there was lots of money to be made but questions arose as to legality and ownership and such technicalities, as well as the propriety of selling rights to atrocity pictures. A package deal was made with Life for Haerberle's slides, accompanied by Eszterhas's words which were as gory as the slides. For instance: "This man was old and trembling so that he could hardly walk, he looked like he wanted to cry. When I left him I heard two rifle shots." and "Haerberle found the bodies above on a road leading from the village. 'Most were women and babies. It looked as if they tried to get away.'" and "They just kept shooting at her. You could see the bones flying in the air chip by chip. . . ." and "The GI fired three shots into the child. . . . The third shot put him down and body fluids came out. The GI just simply got up and walked away."

Another eyewitness who emerged was Paul David Meadlo who appeared in a televised interview with Mike Wallace on C.B.S. The "news" interview was arranged by Dispatch News Service which was reportedly paid \$10,000 by C.B.S. Meadlo got nothing but has since told a prospective interviewer: "I ain't talking to nobody now unless they pay." We hope no one will pay him for we agree with Sen. Ernest F. Hollings who criticized the C.B.S. for carrying the interview, stating that Meadlo "was obviously sick" and that a man in his condition "ought not to be exposed to the entire public." In the interview Meadlo stated that Lt. Calley had ordered "about 370" villagers killed and that Meadlo himself had killed possibly "10 or 15." At the end of the interview he stated: "I see women and children in my sleep. Some days . . . some nights, I can't even sleep. I just lay there thinking about it." Meadlo, who lost a foot in action shortly after the "massacre," also thinks it is not fair that his disability pension has been reduced now that his injury has healed.

Another participant, Varnado Simpson, did not look upon the inhabitants as "civilians". He stated: "To us they were not civilians. . . . To us they were VC." At the time Simpson, from Jackson, Mississippi, was a 19-year-old assistant platoon leader.

Although newspaper headlines have screamed that "Only the Chickens were left alive," Chief WO Hugh C. Thompson, Jr. (27) of Decatur, Ga. who is now an instructor pilot at Army Aviation Center at Ft. Rucker, Ala., received the Distinguished Flying Cross for his actions as a helicopter pilot on March 16, 1968 at My Lai. The citation read: "He spotted 15 young children trying to hide in a bunker and evacuated them to secure area. Moments later he located a wounded Vietnamese child and disregarding his own safety he again landed and evacuated the child to the Quangngai hospital." Thompson is reportedly responsible for the first Army inquiry into the way the operation at My Lai had been run.

The can of worms also contained some other "atrocious" stories whose time had come. Thomas F. Lofin 3rd was an adjutant of the 88th Supply and Service Battalion at Pleiku and is now a law student at the University of North Carolina. He says he heard U.S. helicopter pilots brag about killing

South Vietnamese civilians. When he returned to the U.S. in December 1966 he wrote an article about these "atrocities" which was published in convicted pornographer, Ralph Ginzburg's *Avant-Garde* magazine of January 1968. Another helicopter "atrocities" was brought forth by Alan Jones (22) of Oak Forest, Illinois, a teacher at DuSable Upper Grade Center. He furnished to the Chicago Sun-Times photographs purporting to show prisoners being dropped from helicopters. The pictures were reportedly mailed to his parents, Mr. & Mrs. Karl Jones of New York City by a pilot-photographer but Jones and his parents refused to identify the photographer. The Draft System draws into the service all types, and the leftist propaganda among U.S. Servicemen is showing results.

Of course, the Communist press is loving every minute of this and having itself a field day. The Communist Daily World of Dec. 3, 1969 carried an interview with Ridenhour and a picture of Jack Levin and Lloyd Ziff, identified as two University of Pennsylvania law students. The picture shows them standing on the steps of the Capitol with a large sign which asks: "How do you shoot a baby and hear the shot 20 months later?" The Nov. 29, 1969 issue the Daily World makes some suggestions under the title of "What Can be done?" they state:

"After the disaster of Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt appointed an extraordinary commission headed by Supreme Court Justice Roberts to probe the guilt of the U.S. military.

"Is the blow dealt the American people and the name of America by the Songmy atrocity less a disaster than was Pearl Harbor?"

"A full Congressional inquiry into Songmy is called for.

"An investigation by International tribunals should be welcomed.

"The labor, peace and black—and—brown movements that have a patriotic stake in ending the war and atoning if possible for the horrors inflicted upon the Vietnamese people could establish their own tribunal.

"Above all, efforts to end the war must now be redoubled, for it is cynical hypocrisy to pretend that the war can be continued without war crimes and atrocities. This criminal U.S. aggression against the Vietnamese is one continuous Songmy."

James Reston in the N.Y. Times states that "the Songmy tragedy cannot merely be left to the military and forgotten like the Green Beret affair. The President . . . has the power to create a Presidential Commission of distinguished and disinterested citizens to review the evidence free from the tug of politics. This has been done from time to time in our history, most recently in the murder of President Kennedy, and it could usefully be employed again in this case." Government lawyers are thinking in terms of a "War Crimes Tribunal." The N.Y. Times of Nov. 30, 1969 states: "Legal authorities in Washington believe that a military-civilian tribunal may have to be created if the men who were allegedly involved in a reported massacre in Vietnam but who have since been released from service are to be brought to trial. . . . The Tribunal would have some of the attributes of the type of military commissions widely employed during and after the Civil War."

It looks as if the soldiers who thought they were doing their duty in a "search and destroy" mission in a Vietcong stronghold are going to be put in the same position as the local policeman who must always be afraid of being accused of "Police Brutality" if he does his duty properly. In Vietnam it is impossible to distinguish friend from foe and waiting to find out is usually fatal. While 2 and 3 year old children are not utilized by the Viet Cong, there are untold incidents of children not much older being in their employ. Innocent-looking old men and women make booby traps and protect the

Communists and therefore cannot be considered "innocent civilians." The guerrilla technique makes it impossible to identify the enemy.

Ralph De Toledano describes the action at My Lai according to the story of Charles West:

"In moving on My Lai, says Mr. West, Charlie Company was badly bloodied—with soldiers killed and wounded by snipers and booby traps. The company was pinned down by enemy fire just outside the village and took shelter in a rice paddy. When it attacked, it was met by sniper fire. When the company entered the village, they found many dead as a result of artillery shelling and bombing from the air. The only firing into groups of old men, women and children he saw occurred when military age males deliberately ran among these civilians. Eventually it was established that at least some of these were Viet Cong or NVA troops."

An official investigation was conducted by the U.S. Army shortly after the March 16, 1968 encounter and no grounds for "atrocities" stories were found. An investigation ordered by President Nguyen Van Thieu showed that reports that 527 civilians were massacred "were completely inaccurate" and actually about 20 civilians were killed in a battle for the village. A South Vietnamese communique, based on an investigation by Lt. Gen. Hoang Xuan Lam, commander of the area that includes the Village of My Lai in the Quang Ngai area where the incident allegedly occurred, stated: "More than a year ago in March 1968, an operation was launched by the Americal Division's Task Force Barker in the area of My Lai hamlet, Son My village, Son Tinh district, Quang Ngai Province, with the aim of destroying an important Communist force in that area.

"When Task Force Barker moved into that area, they met strong resistance from the enemy. . . . The result of the contact was 125 enemy killed and at the same time about 20 civilians living in the hamlet were killed by tactical air strikes and artillery while the fight was going on.

"Reports from newspapers and foreign news agency saying that 527 civilians were killed were completely inaccurate."

Col. Ton That Khien, chief of Quang Ngai Province, conducted his own investigation and said he did not believe the villagers were telling the truth when they told newsmen that Americans entered the village, herded the people from their homes and killed them with rifles and machine guns. He said he could find none who saw any massacre and said the village was dominated by the Viet Cong. The South Vietnamese Government's conclusion is that the "massacre" just never happened. They do not find Communist propaganda as convincing as others, not so well educated in Communist ways, may find it.

The man who was the Commander of the Army's 11th Brigade at the time of the alleged "massacre," Col. Oren K. Henderson, has stated recently: "Up until two weeks ago, I would have sworn it could not happen without me knowing about it. But when I start seeing TV broadcasts and hearing soldiers speak about this subject who were themselves eyewitnesses, I begin to wonder." Col. Henderson checked into the matter at the time and considered the charges to be Viet Cong propaganda, for they began bombarding the area with propaganda messages about two weeks later, claiming that the U. S. forces had killed an abnormal number of civilians. Since Communists are well known for using the "big lie," the fact that they began to push this "atrocities" story would make one wonder about its authenticity. As for the bloody photographs, none of them show Americans doing any shooting. . . . for this we have but the photographer's word and we really don't know how good that is. We must remember that in the United

States we have our American Cong who look as much like normal Americans as the Viet Cong look like innocent civilians.

One has but to read an analysis of the events leading up to the Communist takeover of Russia to realize that the United States is not too far away from the same terrible fate toward which its own "revolutionaries" are pushing it. Abroad and at home skillful propagandists discredited the Czarist Regime as they are now discrediting the United States. Spreading seditious propaganda among the soldiers, fighting an unpopular war, the Bolsheviks and their "liberal" agents undermined the morale of the army causing it to collapse and eventually split into two forces, one of which supported the lawful government and the other the so-called "revolution." Here and now in the United States, as in Russia immediately before the Bolsheviks (hiding behind their "liberal" stalking horses) moved in, the people are tired and frustrated by a seemingly hopeless war which we are not able, or even trying, to win but which is killing and maiming their loved ones. People are beginning to believe the seditious propaganda that our country is "sick" and eventually they will feel that it is not worth saving. In the government itself in Russia, as in America today, the "liberals" constantly criticized their own government and country, talked of elaborate "reforms" but opposed any suggested improvement because it was not enough. Many "charges" against the government were later proved to be unfounded but by then it was too late. . . . the damage had been done, the government had fallen. Let us not be taken in by our "liberals" and breast-beating pacifists and defeatists as the unfortunate Russians were taken in by theirs.

[From Barron's, Oct. 6, 1969]

THE INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES AIMS TO DISARM THE UNITED STATES

"By giving a tax exemption to an organization like the Institute for Policy Studies, our government is allowing tax exemption to support revolution." Senator Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.), *Congressional Record, December 4, 1967.*

(By Shirley Schebla)

WASHINGTON.—The vicious attack, in and outside of Congress, on the so-called military-industrial complex has enlisted the support of an ally as powerful in and around the nation's capital as it is unknown to the U.S. at large, an organization called the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS).

For example, IPS is represented on the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, which, under the leadership of ———, has spearheaded the assault on the Pentagon's proposed budget. An economist with the committee, Richard Kaufman, is in charge of his staff work; Mr. Kaufman also happens to be an associate fellow of IPS. IPS defines associate fellows as "part-time faculty who have led seminars, participated in social inventions, or have engaged in individual research projects supported by the Institute." It says associate fellows sometimes, but not always, receive honorariums for their work. Mr. Kaufman told Barron's he did not care to comment on whether he has received pay for his work for IPS.

Until 1967, when Mr. Kaufman went to work for the committee, it had left the military budget to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. Now the staff economist, undisputed by ——— recent failure to win major Senate cutbacks on military spending, including a halt to purchases of the C5A aircraft, says he is planning a five-year campaign against military spending.

OFF-THE-RECORD BRIEFINGS

Mr. Kaufman wears his two hats with careless ease. Earlier this year, in his official capacity, he invited 27 Congressional assistants

to off-the-record briefings on military spending under the auspices—and at the expense—of the Institute. They lasted several hours each, included dinner, and were held once a week for several months at the Congressional Hotel.

The Institute has arranged similar conferences for other interested groups, including the National Conference on Military Priorities; IPS officials also have worked with the Council for a Livable World (which now ranks as the third-biggest spender among U.S. lobbyists), the members of Congress for Peace Through Law, and the New National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

What is the Institute, and why is it so concerned with the military-industrial complex? It characterizes itself as a "think tank"; calls most of its officials "fellows," and enjoys tax exemption as an educational institution. It is supported by tax-exempt contributions from foundations, universities, colleges and individuals. And, as will be seen, it is directed by leaders of the New Left, a movement which J. Edgar Hoover, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, recently called "clearly subversive . . . an ever-increasing danger to our national welfare and security."

Organized six years ago, the Institute has an annual budget which currently runs to \$400,000 a year. Financing has come from the Ford Foundation, Edgar Stern Family Fund, Samuel Rubin Foundation, Irving Lauck, the Institute for International Order, Milbank Foundation, "The Fontaney Corp., through the generosity of James P. Warburg," Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, National Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, Field Foundation, Cudahy Fund, Edwin Janss Foundation, Jennifer Cafritz, Walter E. Meyer and Michel Gellert.

#### ACTIVE FELLOWS

Support for the Institute also comes from publishers, who, according to IPS Co-Director Marcus Raskin, have printed about two dozen books and several thousand articles by its personnel. Mr. Raskin explained to Barron's that IPS furnishes an office and a salary for the fellows who perform such work, and fees and royalties go directly to them. Moreover, IPS principals serve on a number of university faculties, including those at Harvard, Duke, the University of Maryland and the University of Chicago.

IPS had its genesis in the Peace Research Institute, which began operation in Washington on April 5, 1961, with an announcement that it would serve as a private agency to undertake and stimulate research in all fields relevant to peace, security, disarmament and international order. Shortly afterward it obtained a \$20,000 contract for a study for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Signed by Arthur I. Waskow, now the senior fellow of IPS, the document called for an international police force to keep world peace and see that nations disarmed. The author also suggested that disputes in a disarmed world could "be settled by reference to the International Court of Justice, to various mediation services, to various organs of the United Nations, etc." A relative unknown at the time, he had come to IPS from his job as legislative assistant to —; Mr. Waskow now has become a public figure because of his active role in demonstrations, including those at the Pentagon and the Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

#### JOINING FORCES

Late in 1963, the Peace Research Institute merged with the Institute for Policy Studies, which had just been founded by Marcus Raskin and Richard Barnet, who once served as deputy director of political research for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (Barron's, April 29, 1968). Mr. Was-

low then went to work for IPS as its senior fellow.

In August of 1965, Mr. Waskow represented IPS at a meeting in Santa Barbara, Calif., at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which produced a "Call for a New Politics," a hope for a united Left in the U.S. A year later, a National Conference for a New Politics (NCNP) was held in Chicago.

Over the Labor Day weekend in 1967, Mr. Waskow attended the first NCNP convention in Chicago; subsequently he was identified on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as "one of the founders and leaders of the NCNP."

Mr. Raskin's Washington career began in 1960, when he served as clerk and free lance writer to several Congressmen, including —, Herman Toll (D., Pa.), James Roosevelt (D., Calif.) and —. Mr. Raskin soon co-authored a report with Mr. Waskow for —. Copyrighted in 1961, it was titled "Deterrence and Reality," and, so far as can be determined, constituted the first advocacy of U.S. unilateral disarmament on Capitol Hill. Mr. Waskow subsequently expanded the report into a book, *The Limits of Defense*.

#### THE LIBERAL PAPERS

According to a press release by —, Mr. Raskin also served as group secretary for the Liberal Papers, a collection of essays written by more than a dozen professors for a number of Democratic Congressmen, made public early in 1962. Among other things, the essays urged the U.S. to allow Russia to plug in to this country's warning defense system (DEW); recognize and admit to the United Nations Communist East Germany, Red China, North Korea and North Vietnam; unilaterally abandon nuclear tests; break up NATO; abandon Berlin and neutralize central Europe under terms proposed by Communist Poland.

With the advent of the New Frontier, Mr. Raskin was called to the White House to join the special staff of the National Security Council as an aide to McGeorge Bundy, who now heads the Ford Foundation. Mr. Raskin also served as a member of the American delegation to the 18-nation disarmament conference at Geneva.

Mr. Raskin subsequently became chairman of the Committee for the Formation of a New Party. On August 1, 1968, the Committee issued a statement by the chairman in which he said the New Party "will stand for the dismantling of an obsolete, dangerous military establishment that is over-extended and over-reaching. It will insist that there be an arms control and disarmament law in the U.S. applicable to citizen and police as well. . . . It will insist that revolution in other nations or insurgencies therein should not cause interventions and suppressions by the American military."

#### IN THE HEADLINES

Last January, the New Party announced it had elected Dick Gregory and James P. Dixon, president of Antioch College, as co-chairmen to succeed Mr. Raskin. Mr. Dixon is an IPS trustee, and Antioch is one of the colleges associated with the Institute. Nevertheless, Mr. Raskin remains in the headlines, primarily because of his indictment (and subsequent acquittal) on a charge of conspiring to advise draft evasion, along with Dr. Benjamin Spock and the Reverend William Sloan Coffin, Jr.

Since its inception, the Institute has fought military defense through "seminars," chiefly for members of Congress and their assistants. In 1967-68 (it operates on a school year), IPS held a series of conferences for Congressional assistants on "The Impact of the War on American Society." Besides Co-Director Barnet, one of the speakers was Michael Tigar, whose subject was "The War and the Draft."

Mr. Tigar is well known as a student leader

of the 1964 disturbances at the University of California at Berkeley. He is a former member of the executive board of the National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union and served as attorney for members of the Students for a Democratic Society charged with seizing and occupying George Washington University's Sino-Soviet Institute in April. Last month he was jailed in Chicago on a charge of contempt of court in connection with his defense of "the Chicago eight," charged with conspiring to incite a riot during the 1968 Democratic National Convention. (The charge against Mr. Tigar has been dropped.)

#### STUDY ASSIGNMENTS

IPS' 1968-69 schedule for "seminars" describes the aforementioned Mr. Kaufman's assignment as "a work study project to analyze the war machine as a public-private corporate structure. Topics covered will include cost, benefits, public relations and distribution of profits." The project assignment for Mr. Kaufman in the IPS 1969-70 budget is "Defense Procurement."

— told Barron's he had heard that Mr. Kaufman is associated with the Institute, but that he is not familiar with it. However, — Committee has published two essays by Milton Kotler, who the Committee itself has identified as a "Resident Fellow Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C." — said further that he considers what Mr. Kaufman does with his time after working hours is his own business.

IPS principals seem to be very busy men. Co-Director Barnet and Trustee Hans Morgenthau, professor of history, government, and international relations at the University of Chicago, are advisers to the Council for a Livable World. IPS Fellows Waskow and Leonard Rodberg, former bureau chief with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, have done work for it.

A Senate report has described the Council's goals as unilateral disarmament and "turning this country into a fourth-rate power at the mercy of the international wolfpack." The Council is the third highest spender of the lobbying organizations which filed reports for 1968. With outlays of \$154,022 (up from \$77,470 for 1967), it topped even such famous lobbying groups as the American Legion and the American Medical Association, and was outranked only by the United Federation of Postal Clerks (AFL-CIO) and the AFL-CIO.

#### LEADING PEACENIK

According to the same Senate document, the Council takes credit for assuring the original election victory of one of the Senate's leading peaceniks, —, by having its membership put \$22,000 into his campaign, enough to win a close contest in a sparsely populated state.

—, in turn, is vice-chairman of a group called Members of Congress for Peace Through Law. Its chairman is —, and its members include — (Mr. Waskow's former employer), all three of whom have attended "seminars" at IPS headquarters.

Last July that group issued a report, labeled "personal and confidential," which said that the recommendations of the Joint Economic Committee can serve as guidelines for positive reform in military procurement. Among other things, the report called for moratoria on the construction of aircraft carriers, F-14A planes, advanced manned bombers and chemical and biological warfare centers. It also urged drastic curtailment in Sentinel-Safeguard deployment and the ABM research and development program.

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 16, 1969]  
CROWD AT MONUMENT SWAYS TO SONGS AND SPEAKERS

(By Christopher Wright)

Like a great sea lapping against the columns of government, the crowd at the Wash-

ington Monument swayed back and forth to the tune of the song. "All we are saying is 'Give Peace a Chance,'" they sang again and again.

Throughout the afternoon, the cold wind whipped across the packed monument grounds, where the crowd of young people sat, shivered, sang, cheered and milled about as speakers ranging from U.S. senators to radical David Dellinger urged an ending to the Vietnam war.

For the most part the massive congregation was peaceful, friendly and well-organized. At one point they were told by Howard Samuels, one-time head of the Small Business Administration, "It's you who are here today—not Spiro Agnew, not Richard Nixon—who are the traditional Americans." Samuels added that they were participating in "a tradition of protest . . . of striving for justice in this land. You are the best in America, not the worst."

#### SPOCK LAUDS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MAYOR

Not all public officials were chastised by the moratorium speakers, however. The District's Mayor Walter Washington was praised by Dr. Benjamin Spock, who described him as "the man who put his job on the line to get us that permit" to march.

Relations between police and marchers along the route of the procession appeared unusually cordial. Near the Interior Department one officer halted the procession to allow traffic to pass. When the last car went by he told the waiting kids "Thank you," to which one blond girl replied "Thank you officer," as they went by.

At one point, early in the proceedings, when it was still possible to scale the tall metal scaffold that held the speakers and some of the sound equipment, one could see from that vantage of more than 40 feet the size of the crowd stretching away toward the Monument, speckled with flags and the colors of clothes. It seemed a vast solid body, but was in fact full of its own colonies and encampments as the marchers found ways to pass their time.

#### THE REVOLUTIONARY DIET

At half a dozen places amid the crowd the National Welfare Rights Organization set up metal horse tubs full of water on cinder blocks with fires underneath. Manned by heavy women, they supplied an endless number of soft hot dogs and rolls, apples and potato chips, the staples of the revolutionary diet.

When the crowd came together, it came with a rush and without warning. Dick Gregory got them on their feet when he roared: "We go on record to say, not only to the Nixon administration but to tyrants all over the world, we going to see to it, there will be no more war." He roared and shouted to the microphones in a high pitch, and they were on their feet instantly, hands up and fingers V-ed giving a mighty growling cheer.

At one point, radical students waving Viet Cong flags began to shove their way toward the platform. The push mired down in the sheer numbers of the crowd and finally most of the radicals sat down under the banners with everyone else. Student marshals continuously squeezed their way between the ranks of dissidents keeping the groups separated and attempting to hold down the tension.

Folks songs of another, perhaps more hopeful, era found their way into the program. With the winter wind whipping her light blond hair Mary Travers sang "The Times They Are A-Changing" and brought the kids to their feet for yet another time.

Six years earlier—almost in another era—Mary, of the Peter, Paul and Mary group, sang the eulogies and the hopeful aspirations of the 1963 civil rights march.

Singer Arlo Guthrie, second-generation folk idol, told the crowd, "I don't think any-

body needed to show up. As soon as they put the machine guns at the foot of the Capital the point was made."

Folk singer Pete Seeger and the Rev. Frederick Douglass Kirkpatrick began to sing the John Lennon-written song. "All We Are Saying Is 'Give Peace a Chance.'" Seeger asked everyone to join in, took off his coat, and started waving it in circles as he sang.

#### ENTIRE ASSEMBLY RISES

Others in the crowd began to wave their coats in the air, then the entire assemblage rose, waving the "V" sign from one side to the other, and started singing.

The sing-along king, Mitch Miller, joined Seeger and Kirkpatrick on the platform and helped lead the crowd and the song went on for about five minutes, ending with a rousing cheer.

Mrs. Martin Luther King, addressing a peace rally on the Monument grounds for the second time this fall, told the mass that unless the war in Vietnam is ended, "Everyone will live in stagnating slums and cities." Calling the war in Vietnam "a war that was a blunder in the first place," she accused the administration of "trying to end opposition to the war rather than the war itself."

The sentiment of the demonstrators toward the Nixon Administration was also reflected by Senate dove Charles Goodell, R-N.Y. "There are some leaders today who instead of lowering their voices, are raising strident calls to the flag, to patriotism, against communism . . . may our actions today and hereafter hasten the time when our flag once again can be used to celebrate peace and reason," Goodell said.

But the flags seen on the monument grounds today were of a different nature from the senator's theme and a different kind from those that usually ring the white Monument spire. At least one large Viet Cong flag waved in the breeze from a flagpole at the foot of the Monument.

Downtown streets were clogged with youths who moved in and out of the main rally body which packed an area from the tidal basin to the Justice Department.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1969]

#### HANOI'S USE OF AMERICAN PRESS IS MAJOR PHENOMENON OF WAR

(By Joseph Alsop)

**HIEPDUIC.**—Hanoi's cynically astute exploitation of the American press, and the resulting anger of many Americans fighting for their country in Vietnam, have become major phenomena. Frankness is in order, and Hiepduc is a good place to begin.

Its scenery, all lofty mountains and sweetly fertile miniature valleys, and its history, which is both sad and inspiring, are Hiepduc's only stirring features. It is the most remote, least populous district in southern I Corps. It was overrun by the VC; the district town was burned, and the whole place was totally abandoned in 1965.

Only last March, about 4500 of Hiepduc's refugees, trusting in their government and its American allies, at last returned to till their fields. They now live in a new-built, tin-roofed village in the main valley. Here, on a little hill above the village amid barbed-wired entanglements, the resilient "district chief," Maj. Soan, leads his people from a "district office" that is nothing but a muddy bunker.

This is the politically, tactically and strategically ludicrous objective against which Hanoi's high command chose to launch the enemy's heaviest single ground attack this year, by two full-strength regiments of the 2d North Vietnamese Division. And this, in itself, was profoundly significant.

Sane commanders do not normally attack pimpled with meat-axes. Hence the attack on Hiepduc first of all signified a remarkable decline in enemy capability and self-confi-

dence. Whenever two whole North Vietnamese regiments were employed in the past, it was at least against a province capital, and certainly not against a lonely little village. Therefore, in the second place, the only possible aim of the attack was to make misleading headlines at home.

"District Town Overrun by VC"—one can imagine how the hoped-for headlines would have looked, and the false impression they would have conveyed. In fact, however, the attack on Hiepduc was repelled, after fearful North Vietnamese losses, by the brave men of the Americal Division, the ARVN and the Marines. But that was hardly noticed at home, since Hanoi had a bit of luck.

A long-embattled U.S. company hesitated to press forward for less than an hour, as must happen sometimes in hard fighting. The hesitation was so reported that the normally sensible James Reston, of The New York Times, wrote about a "sniff of mutiny." Later The Times sent an able young reporter to find out what had really happened. He learned that the men of the company in question were furious because it had been made to sound "like we were refusing to fight, and that wasn't so." But by then it was too late.

In sum, the real story was not told, and a basically unreal story got a great deal of notice. There was no evil intent, any more than there is evil intent behind the misreporting when Hanoi sets off fire-crackers to simulate an offensive. In these endlessly recurrent cases, the headlines read "Seventy-four places attacked in new VC offensive"—omitting the rather important fact that 70 or more of the "attacks" are a couple of hasty mortar rounds that have missed their targets.

You can better understand the bitterness of the soldiers at the front, however, if you study the background of an episode like the rather earlier excitement about "Hamburger Hill." The hill's real name is Dongapbia—the other name simply adopted for headline purposes and it dominates the strategically critical Ashau Valley.

When a North Vietnamese regiment slipped across the Loatian border and occupied Donapbia, there were in truth two choices: either get the North Vietnamese off the hill or get ready to abandon the hard won Ashau Valley. With the valley abandoned, the North Vietnamese would have installed a forward supply system in two months and in three months, the 101st Airborne Division would have been fighting on the approaches to Hue, and would have been losing three or four times as many men, too, as the division now loses while controlling the Ashau and the border mountains.

"What do you blank blank guys think? That we risk our lives and our buddies' lives just for the hell of it?"

The question was put, with considerable bitterness, by a battle-hardened young sergeant who was proud that he had helped retake Donapbia, and broadly understood the hill's importance. It seems to this reporter to pose a grave problem for the trade he has been proud to follow for going on four decades.

#### PROF. FRANCIS L. LOWENHEIM AND THE GSA—THE GSA SIDE OF THE ARGUMENT

#### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, I placed a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from Prof. Francis L. Lowenheim of Rice University in which he charges

that the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park withheld information from him. Since then the General Services Administration wrote me their side of the argument. In the interest of fairness, I submit their letter for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., December 2, 1969.

HON. GEORGE BUSH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUSH: I have read with interest your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 25, 1969, regarding charges made against the General Services Administration's Franklin D. Roosevelt Library by Dr. Francis L. Lowenheim in his letter to you of November 11, 1969.

The charges printed in this letter are repetitions or restatements of allegations made by Dr. Lowenheim on numerous occasions during the past year. All of these allegations are without foundation. To answer every charge in the portions of the letter printed in the RECORD would require many pages, but in the attached statement I have replied to a few of the most significant charges and misstatements to demonstrate their lack of substance.

I hope this will answer any questions you had with respect to this matter. If I may provide you with any further information in connection with these charges, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. KUNZIG,  
Administrator.

STATEMENT ON CHARGES AGAINST THE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY CONTAINED IN A LETTER FROM DR. FRANCIS L. LOEWENHEIM TO REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE BUSH DATED NOVEMBER 11, 1969

The charges in this letter are repetitions or restatements of allegations made by Dr. Lowenheim on numerous occasions during the past year, all of which are without foundation. In the following paragraphs the facts are set forth to a few of the most significant errors and misstatements to demonstrate their total lack of substance.

**Topic of research.** In the very first paragraph of his letter Dr. Lowenheim states that he went to the Roosevelt Library "to put together in book form the correspondence of President Roosevelt and Professor William E. Dodd." On the contrary, Dr. Lowenheim's application to study at the Library stated his topic as "Munich—A Documentary History" and added "The documents and related materials are to illustrate the role and attitude of the United States during the Munich crisis, showing also what information about the growing German-Czech crisis, 1933-1938, was available to the United States—and, in particular, to President Roosevelt—during this period." Most of the records used by and copied for Dr. Lowenheim during the 75 hours he spent at the Library between September 1966 and February 1967 are related to his originally announced topic—Munich. Most of the Dodd items ordered by Dr. Lowenheim were not requested until February, at the very end of his visit.

**Alleged withholding of Dodd documents at the Roosevelt Library.** Dr. Lowenheim says that after "most careful search" at the Library he was unable to locate early correspondence between President Roosevelt and Professor Dodd—six letters in a single folder.

In this case, the question narrows down to whether one specific file folder in President Roosevelt's "Official File" (OF 523), containing correspondence with William E. Dodd, Ambassador to Germany, was or was not withheld from Dr. Lowenheim.

When a folder or box is requested and is

charged out to a searcher, the Library records the item that is charged out. Records in the Library do not show that this particular folder on Dodd was charged out to Dr. Lowenheim.

We do not know why Dr. Lowenheim did not request this folder. He had available to him (as were available to all searchers who requested them) a numerical list of folders and an alphabetical index to the folders in the "Official File," both of which clearly indicate that OF 523 contains Dodd material. This particular folder on Dodd is also referred to on five separate cross reference sheets in another folder on Dodd in the "President's Personal File" (PPF 1043). The latter folder on Dodd was charged out to Dr. Lowenheim three times during his visits to the Library.

Two additional sources which would have been known by a scholar doing research on Dodd in 1966-67 also pointed to the folder not used by Dr. Lowenheim. One, an article by Franklin L. Ford, "Three Observers in Berlin: Rumbold, Dodd, and Francois-Poncet," in Gordan A. Craig and Felix Gilbert, eds., *The Diplomats, 1919-1939* (Princeton University Press, 1953), cites the folder OF 523 five times. The other, Robert Dallek's Ph. D. dissertation, "Roosevelt's Ambassador: The Public Career of William E. Dodd" (Columbia University, 1965), also cites folder OF 523. A copy of Dr. Dallek's dissertation is in the Roosevelt Library and is listed in the Library's card catalog under "Dodd." Dr. Lowenheim did not have Dr. Dallek's dissertation charged out to him.

When Dr. Lowenheim failed, at least ten other scholars, using the same indexes available to Dr. Lowenheim, requested and used this same folder, including two scholars who were at the Library during the same months as Dr. Lowenheim. Dr. Lowenheim did not ask Library staff members for the missing Dodd letters even once, and certainly not repeatedly, and Dr. Lowenheim gave no indication to the Library staff that he was in fact concentrating on Professor Dodd rather than on his announced topic of Munich.

**Dodd Papers at the Library of Congress.** Dr. Lowenheim does not hold the General Services Administration responsible for his inability to find, in the collection of Dodd papers in the Library of Congress, copies of the six letters he says he sought at the Roosevelt Library. Nevertheless, copies of four of the six letters are actually in the Dodd papers at the Library of Congress. It is a curious coincidence that Dr. Lowenheim was apparently no more successful in locating them than he was in locating the letters at the Roosevelt Library and that other scholars were able to find and use the four Dodd letters at the Library of Congress.

**Alleged concealment of manuscript of publication.** Dr. Lowenheim states that the manuscript compiled by Dr. Nixon "had been systematically concealed from countless scholars working at the Roosevelt Library over many years." The real facts are diametrically opposite.

1. Dr. Nixon's manuscript consisted of reproductions or transcripts of documents in the Library. The documents themselves were always in the files, except for the few hours they were being copied or checked (this was completed long before Dr. Lowenheim came to the Library), were always available for research, and were in fact used by hundreds of scholars.

2. The preparation of the manuscript for publication was announced (a) in the annual reports of the Administrator of General Services to Congress for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958; (b) by the Director of the Library in a paper read before the April 1965 annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, one of the two major professional historical organizations in the United States; and (c) in the *Midwest*

*Quarterly*, VII (Autumn 1965), 53-65, which published the Director's paper. This obviously does not constitute systematic concealment.

3. The compilation was mentioned to many searchers at the Library, because the Library staff tries to bring the material in the Library's custody to the attention of a maximum number of users. No list was kept of those so informed, but among searchers who knew of the compilation before its publication were such scholars as Professor John M. Blum, of Yale University; Professor Frank Freidel, Jr., of Harvard University; and Dr. Fred L. Israel and Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of the City University of New York. Dr. Lowenheim is incorrect in stating that his attorney has requested information about such individuals from the General Services Administration; had he done so it would have been supplied promptly.

4. Dr. Lowenheim is also incorrect in characterizing the manuscript as "an absolutely indispensable guide or finding aid to the thousands of Roosevelt foreign policy documents at Hyde Park." The Roosevelt Library contains over 20 million pages of documents on hundreds of subjects, including foreign affairs, and provides many lists and indexes as finding aids to these documents. The Nixon compilation is in no sense a finding aid; it is a reproduction of the texts of 1400 selected documents on foreign affairs during the first 4 years of the Roosevelt Administration.

**Use of documents by Dr. Richard P. Traina.** The allegations regarding Dr. Traina's experiences grow out of an entirely different set of circumstances than those involving Dr. Lowenheim.

Dr. Traina wanted to see a number of documents relating to the Spanish Civil War which, among others, had been placed in files closed to research by a Committee of Three appointed in 1943 by President Roosevelt, which consisted of Samuel I. Rosenman, Harry L. Hopkins, and Grace G. Tully. Documents were placed in closed files if they fell in any one of eight categories, including investigative reports; applications and recommendations for positions; documents containing derogatory remarks about the character, loyalty, integrity, or ability of individuals; documents containing information that could be used to harass living persons or relatives of recently deceased persons; documents containing information the release of which would be prejudicial to national security; documents containing information the release of which would be prejudicial to the maintenance of friendly relations with foreign nations; and communications addressed in confidence. The Library has no choice under the conditions prescribed by President Roosevelt but to withhold documents of the categories specified.

Provisions for periodic review and release were set forth by President Roosevelt's committee under which documents in the closed files have been gradually opened. Some of the documents in which Dr. Traina was interested during his research in 1962 and 1964 were still being withheld in accordance with committee instructions but were opened after a periodic review late in 1966. Dr. Traina was sent copies of these and was given the dates of those still classified. Other documents of interest to Dr. Traina were opened after another periodic review in 1967.

Dr. Traina apparently disagrees with the judgment of the President's Committee in putting at least some of the documents in the closed files and with the pace of Library archivists in removing documents from the closed files. He does not contend that other scholars were given access to documents he did not see. The Library has no authority to release documents except in accordance with rules laid down by the Committee. In these matters, the responsibility for carrying out the wishes of the

President and his committee rests with Library archivists, and their views must prevail over those of Dr. Traina, who has no such legal responsibility.

Dr. Loewenheim is again in error in stating that withholding of material in the closed files was done by Dr. Nixon personally. At no time did Dr. Nixon serve as one of the Library archivists engaged in reviewing closed files nor did he direct the work of these archivists.

*Private publication of Foreign Affairs volumes.* The official connection between the Roosevelt Library and the volumes of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Foreign Affairs, 1933-1937 has never been a secret as Dr. Loewenheim implies. The origin of the documents in the volumes, and the official connection of the volumes with the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, as part of the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration, are stated plainly by the title page, the foreword by the Library Director and the Archivist of the United States, and the editor's preface by Edgar B. Nixon.

Following inquiries addressed by GSA to three university presses—Harvard, Yale, and Princeton—the Harvard University Press offered to publish the volumes without cost to the Federal Government. A contract for publication of the volumes on this basis was signed on December 18, 1967, between the Archivist of the United States and the President and Fellows of Harvard College for the Harvard University Press. In addition to saving money, the contract is also advantageous to the Government because it provides for active promotion through the publisher's distribution machinery in order to achieve wide dissemination of the volumes. No factual basis has been advanced for the contention that publication of the volumes by a private publisher "raises serious questions of legality and propriety."

The printing of such volumes by a private publisher rather than by the Government Printing Office is entirely legal and proper. The Comptroller General of the United States, in a decision dated May 5, 1953 (32 Comp. Gen. 487), held that the law relating to printing in the Government Printing Office does not apply "where the entire cost of printing is not borne by the United States or the printing is not exclusively for the Government." The principle stated obviously covers the present case since none of the cost of printing is borne by the United States.

Dr. Loewenheim's attorney knew of the existence of the Comptroller General's decision as early as September 3, 1969, and at his request was provided with a copy on October 22, 1969, in both cases long before the charges in Dr. Loewenheim's letter of November 11, 1969.

*Charges in letter to New York Times Book Review.* A letter signed by Dr. Loewenheim and 19 other historians and printed in the *New York Times Book Review* for September 7, 1969, has been reprinted in the *Congressional Record* for November 25, 1969 (pages 35718-35719), together with a reply by the Archivist of the United States. Our reply was necessarily brief because of space limitations, so we offered in our reply, and we repeat our offer now, to supply full details on request.

It must be emphasized that the historians signing the letter do not charge, as Dr. Loewenheim implies, that they personally have had experiences during the past 10 years at the Roosevelt Library "including withholding of documents, concealment of the Nixon compilation, gross favoritism to certain scholars." Indeed, 12 of the 20 signers could not truthfully do so, because they have never used the Library facilities, and 4 more have not used them for the past 10 years. Only 4 signers, including Dr. Loewenheim,

have actually done research at Hyde Park during the last decade.

*Dr. Loewenheim's Memorandum of Complaint.* The General Services Administration first learned informally of Dr. Loewenheim's 23-page memorandum of complaint in late January 1969 and received a copy officially with a letter from Representative Bob Eckhardt dated February 25, 1969. This letter was acknowledged March 3, 1969. If Dr. Loewenheim sent a copy of his memorandum to the National Archives and Records Service in December 1968 as he says, it was not received and of course could not have been acknowledged.

*Investigation of Charges.* Dr. Loewenheim's charges were investigated promptly between November 1968 and February 1969 as they came to the attention of GSA's National Archives and Records Service, which administers the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library. The charges were found to be without merit. Independently, GSA's Office of Audits and Compliance, at the direction of the Administrator of General Services, also investigated the charges thoroughly between February and April 1969. Its report of findings in April 1969 found no evidence of improprieties by GSA employees, and the Administrator so reported to Representative Eckhardt on April 29, 1969. A third independent investigation of Dr. Loewenheim's charges was undertaken in February 1969 by the American Historical Association's Committee on the Historian and the Federal Government, which has not yet published a report. Currently, another investigation of the matter is being conducted by an *ad hoc* committee appointed jointly by the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians, the two major professional historical organizations in the United States. The *ad hoc* committee consists of three eminent historians, Dr. Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern University), Dr. Alfred D. Chandler, Jr. (Johns Hopkins University), and Dr. Dewey W. Grantham, Jr. (Vanderbilt University), who have been urged to report on the charges to their respective organizations "with the greatest expedition and not later than December 20, 1969."

#### SUBSTITUTE POVERTY BILL WILL KILL VISTA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the programs most harmed by the Quie-Green substitute poverty bill is VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

The substitute bill would, among other things, give the responsibility for the conduct of the VISTA program to the Governors of the 50 States.

VISTA, like its partial prototype, the Peace Corps, is one of the most clearly successful Federal programs designed to attack the causes of poverty.

It is a program which has given a tremendous return on its investment; a VISTA volunteer, a dedicated, skilled man or woman who works full time, is maintained in the field for a total cost—subsistence, training, everything—of \$4,400 a year.

These volunteers are the cream of young America—lawyers, business school graduates, generalists, health specialists. They live in the poverty areas on an

average of \$45 a week and work directly on basic problems of housing, health, and unemployment. They are among our best investments in the future of our country.

The substitute bill would wipe out the VISTA program. It would substitute 50 separate programs related only in a superficial, nominal way and it would substitute staggering duplication for efficient control.

VISTA now has seven training centers. Its recent reorganization calls for 10 regional headquarters. Its recruitment is regionalized under an overall recruiting plan. Its incoming volunteers are assigned across the Nation on the basis of which program has need for their particular skills. States with well-developed legal programs get lawyers from all over the Nation, economic development programs get the pick of the business school volunteers.

With this bill, with each State in business for itself, none of this would be remotely possible. Each State would conduct its own recruiting and selection and assignment of volunteers. The need for volunteers would be met only if there was a sufficient number of qualified volunteers within that particular State. The administrative costs would jump enormously. Instead of seven training programs there would be 50. A State with a few volunteers, 15 or 20, would still be charged with setting up a full training program, a full selection program, and a full assignment apparatus. The staff would outnumber the volunteers. There would be no national pool to draw on. The problem of matching volunteers to sponsors would be almost impossible. In a particular State there might well be a sponsor who wanted 15 health specialists and in the State the only volunteers available might all be generalists or lawyers or business school graduates. The effort to design effective programs with local sponsors would be rendered impossible. The sponsor would have to design his program not to meet the particular need in his area but to use whatever random skills were available.

A relatively new and most promising VISTA concept, the use of a volunteer team—combining the skills of, say, a lawyer, some health specialists, a business graduate, an architect or city planner, generalists—to work on the varied problems of a particular community would no longer be possible.

What would happen to VISTA if this substitute is accepted?

There are some 5,000 volunteers in the field at this moment. I assume from the language of the bill that these 5,000 would have to be sent home. Even if they were allowed to serve out their year, their projects would die rapidly, as they left, one this week, two next month. Many could not be replaced because there would be no way to replace them, until a large set up effort is made in each State.

Some 2,300 local organizations, both public and private, have asked for VISTA Volunteers across the Nation. Some 100,000 Americans have volunteered their full-time services to VISTA. Funding limitations have not permitted the program to operate at anything like this full

potential, but there are 500 projects now serving in thousands of communities in 49 States of the Union.

This whole program would die.

It could not be replaced. Each State would have to decide if it wished to take on the curious and inefficient burden of administering its own little segment. Many States would not even attempt the impossible.

Those which did would be confronted with a very limited choice of programs. The basic point of a volunteer organization like VISTA is to seek new solutions to old problems. Old solutions have proved disastrously to be no solutions at all. VISTA has, for example, developed complex and successful economic programs in conjunction with business schools and professional groups in certain cities. These programs have enabled a great many inner-city people to organize their own businesses, which support them decently and which put new life into the economy of the whole depressed area. These programs were developed for broad use, across the Nation, with different schools and different professional groups in different cities. This kind of research and development is possible only on a broad scale. At best, in a few big, rich States, such productive innovations would be duplicated needlessly; in many States the resources for such development would not be available.

The problem of recruiting would be similar. Each State would set up its own recruiting machinery. In certain population areas VISTA finds the young men and women who do not want to destroy America, but who want to work to solve its problems. Some States have several such areas. Some have few or none. The number of recruits in some States will be many times greater than the needs of that particular State. In others the need will be many times greater than the number of recruits. This would be particularly true, and particularly tragic as I have already indicated, in the most successful, most promising areas of the VISTA program: projects which emphasize the use of professionally skilled volunteers. One State may have many institutions turning out highly qualified health specialists and relatively little need for them as volunteers. In another the opposite is true.

I submit that this substitute bill would destroy what is perhaps our most effective, most efficient effort to find permanent solutions to the problems of poverty in our Nation.

#### A CALL FOR LEADERSHIP

### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the November 4 issue of Look magazine, Theodore C. Sorensen called on the Nation's Democrats to abandon old complacency and come forth with imaginative and creative leadership. Mr. Sorensen's article is one which I believe will interest

CXV—2431—Part 28

all Americans regardless of their party affiliation and, therefore, I offer it for insertion in the RECORD:

The incident at Chappaquiddick was more than human tragedy. It was a setback as well for the Democratic party. For the absence of Ted Kennedy from the 1972 race makes all the more difficult the defeat of Richard Nixon. The Democratic party once stood for energy and drive and hope. Now it is in danger of becoming a tired second-place defender of the status quo. Those of us who care not only about the party's survival but even more importantly about our children's future must do more than wring our hands. I intend to do so.

More Democratic candidates and incumbents must take the initiative and present constructive alternatives to the Nixon approach. It would be inconsistent with our philosophy to hamper the flexibility of the President's office, notwithstanding the incumbent's Republicanism. But we must fill the policy vacuum Mr. Nixon apparently intends to leave and fill it with something more than the bread-and-butter programs that have dominated Democratic platforms ever since the thirties, something more than a rehash of the domestic programs of the New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier and Great Society.

It is unfortunate that long years of power in Washington have committed many Democrats to a defense of big government, high taxes and centralized bureaucracy for their own sake. They pooh-pooh the concepts of individual involvement and community control as Republican slogans. They stubbornly cling to outmoded Democratic precedents: to public-welfare programs that humiliate those they should help; to farm-price programs not geared to feeding our hungry; to public-housing programs that create new slums; to payroll taxes that run counter to a progressive fiscal policy. New Deal liberalism, convinced that all wisdom stemmed from Washington, built traditional Government paternalism and handouts into LBJ's War on Poverty and opposed RFK's tax and credit incentives for attracting private business into the ghetto. For dramatic proof that the well-intentioned welfare approaches of the 1930's are inadequate for the 1970's, one need only look at the supposed "security" we have provided to the hapless American Indian.

To be sure, the Democratic party must offer new social programs: to make low-cost medical care available to all, to extend free public education beyond high school, and to erase the malnutrition and infant mortality that afflict the richest country on earth, to name only a few. But it must also offer new leadership with new perspectives—on the need to reallocate resources from military weaponry to the abolition of domestic deformities—on the need to give investments in our youth and our environment a higher priority than balancing the budget—on the need to treat the growing urban crisis as a clear and present danger to the prosperous white majority as well as to the black and poor minorities.

The Democratic party must remain the liberal party in the original sense; but the typical liberal-conservative analyses and labels are no longer as relevant as they were.

The movement to bring government closer to the people through decentralized control of schools and other community institutions, for example, is neither "liberal" nor "conservative." While the perils of that effort are many, it is an outgrowth of the same sense of helplessness, the same resentment of a distant, patronizing authority, that has accelerated the movement toward "participatory policies."

The mammoth Bedford-Stuyvesant ghetto project initiated by Robert Kennedy with the backing of private business sought to

give those who were virtually powerless a real voice in improving their lives. It ran counter to cherished liberal notions about Federal patrimony, racial integration and corporate greed, but it was in fact in the best FDR tradition of seeking radical innovations for the future to preserve the basic values of our past.

With this and other equally new and far-reaching concepts, the Democratic party can provide a nonviolent answer to those understandably impatient youth who ask whether our system can be changed through means other than violent confrontation and coercion. Some of our goals, if they are meaningful, will no doubt sound like those now being proclaimed by all kinds of militants and revolutionaries. So what if they do? We intend to achieve them peacefully, not through violence, by changing the system, not throwing it out. "We cannot afford," as Archbishop Camara of Brazil has said, "to relinquish banners which are right merely because they have been carried by wrong hands."

Departures from old entrenched positions are also required of our party in foreign policy. Because Democrats held power immediately before and during both world wars, Korea and Vietnam, many of our traditionalists retain an emotional commitment to the cold war policies of containment. Many believe that the only alternative to isolationism is for America to be a global magistrate, an international New Dealer complete with military assistance to undemocratic regimes abroad and a security-conscious military-industrial complex here at home. That must change. Our party cannot conceal its role in the mistaken escalation of the war in Vietnam. But we can call now for a bargaining and battlefield posture that rejects the illusions of the past and seeks the earliest feasible liquidation of that basically bad investment. We can discard the negative attitudes that characterized Democratic administrations on new approaches to China and Germany; and we can offer our own specific proposals for ending the East-West arms race and for building nonmilitary responses to Communism.

In both foreign and domestic policy, in short, we must shed the old liberal stereotypes. "Liberal" once meant open-minded, receptive to change, willing to try and to dare—not tied to any dogma or doctrine of the past. I do not consider myself illiberal because I am against inflation, crime, obscenity or teen-age drug abuses. Nor do I think it liberal to condone violence on the campus or in the ghetto, or to pretend that the United Nations is more than it really is. Our party, to succeed, must recapture the enthusiasm of those tuned out by last year's series of tragedies. Those young and concerned voters must be shown that a peaceful revolution is possible, and that violent confrontations are unnecessary. Only if the Democrats, nationally and locally, offer that kind of action instead of clichés can we win and deserve to win.

Reports of the party's good health, following Hubert Humphrey's surprisingly narrow loss to Richard Nixon last November, were unfortunately exaggerated. The Republican-Dixiecrat coalition emerged in control of the White House, both Houses of Congress and the governorships of the principal states. The new President, unlike the last Republican President, has both the political know-how and the determination to perpetuate his party in power. Among the industrial states of the North, on which Democratic presidential candidates must depend, Republican governors sit in all but New Jersey (which holds its election this year).

Republican governors in fact control states with two-thirds of the nation's population. Republicans, if present trends continue, could organize the Senate after the 1970 election. Republican control of the House of Representatives is a distinct possibility in 1972—

after the 1970 census enables Republican-controlled state legislatures to reapportion congressional districts. Even now, among the new and relatively new members of the House and Senate, Republicans have a two-to-one majority. Moreover, on most key issues dividing the 1968 Democratic platform from the Republicans, roughly six out of seven Southern Democratic congressmen can be expected to vote with the Republicans.

The defection of the once Solid South typifies the erosion and division that have emasculated FDR's coalition of power-brokers. Labor unions and big-city political machines can still provide important manpower and money to a Democratic candidate, as Hubert Humphrey's campaign in 1968 demonstrated. But as the members of these political, trade union and other organizations move to the suburbs, achieve economic security and make up their own minds after viewing TV, they are less influenced by a leader trying to enlist them behind some lackluster candidate. Many of these leaders are at odds with the party's young activists and intellectuals, who are in turn too often disdainful of the white nationality groups once prominent in the coalition—the Irish, Italians, Poles and others—who are in turn often resentful of the aspirations of black and Spanish-speaking groups, who can at times distrust each other. Most of the farmers who survived the agricultural revolution achieved their security and defected from the coalition long ago.

In 1968, deep-seated opposition to Nixon and Agnew had a temporarily galvanizing effect, and the patronage and other services dispensed by the party in power helped compensate for growing weaknesses. But 1968 was the last hurrah of the old Democratic coalition. For too long, its leaders had complacently counted on the loyalty of many who no longer felt they could count on the Democratic party. In 1968, some of these voters supported Wallace or fringe candidates, some stayed home, and some reluctantly voted Democratic without knowing why.

In too many places, moreover, the party had grown soft and stale. It repeatedly offered aging candidates more renowned for their past glories than for their appeal to the independent-minded, who saw no merit in automatically voting the straight Democratic ticket. Many high-quality candidates with broad appeal at the state and local level were defeated (or even discouraged from running) by party ineptitude; many ran independently of the party organization; and some ran as Republicans. In the best traditions of our party since the days of Al Smith and FDR, the national and local Democratic campaigns in 1968 were focused on those voters too hard-pressed to feel affluent or too aware of the nation's needs to feel indifferent—only to find that the affluent and the indifferent constituted, regardless of registration, a new Republican plurality.

"In stagnant pools," said Mr. Justice Holmes, "there is decay and death; in moving waters there is life and health." Unless the Democratic party moves to become a more democratic party, it faces continuing decay and decline. The 1968 election—having deprived the Democrats of much of their patronage and power, having taught them not to rely on all the big-city machines or the South, having demonstrated that the support of their middle-class members must be newly won—may prove in the long run to have been at least a partial blessing in disguise if it forces our party to cut its ties with racism and bossism and to build a new coalition from the bottom up.

The basis for the old coalition was largely class. The workingman, the relief recipient, the dirt farmer and the tenement dweller looked to the New Deal and its successors for economic salvation. The basis for the new coalition must be not only the common good but also conscience, including not only the

poor but also those too recently poor to have forgotten and those too secure to feel threatened—not only realistic black and Spanish-speaking Americans but also idealistic white Americans—not only the old-time New Dealers, interested in public power and Social Security, but also their children and grandchildren, interested in black power, Vietnam and urban blight. Those in the so-called white upper middle class, including suburbanites and the well-educated and their voting-age children—once largely written off as traditional Republicans—now hold the balance of political power in the big states. Largely unorganized and uncommitted, unwilling to vote by party label only, uninterested in the old-time economic issues and party history, these voters will more easily find comfort and safety in generally following the lead of their Republican fathers, employers and neighbors unless Democratic candidates can appeal to their consciences as well as their pocketbooks.

A new coalition of conscience can bring the old Democrats and new Democrats together, combining the manpower of youthful activists and part-time housewives with that of regular precinct workers, who know what it takes to keep the party functioning. It can use the energies and skills of countless numbers of young lawyers and businessmen who have expressed to me their desire to take part in elevating American politics and who have the time, money and talent to help bring that about. Nothing would be more self-defeating than to discourage their participation by surrounding the new coalition with an ideological wall so high that only the inflexible purists of the so-called New Left would be eligible for entry. Humorous militants and narrow-minded nihilists, who want freedom for the indulgence of their own moral tastes but not for the majority of Americans (whom they denounce), do not represent the coming wave of New Politics.

On the contrary, the most important of all Democratic party traditions—the one historic trait distinguishing it through history from other parties—is its role as a broad-based, multi-interest, internally divided political party, too diverse to be doctrinaire, too big to be unanime.

The key word in the lexicon of the New Politics is "participation." Real political power in both parties has too often rested disproportionately in the hands of a few party officials and contributors, nearly all of them white, male, affluent, Establishment-oriented and over 50, many of them more concerned about keeping their places on the political ladder than solving the national and urban crises surrounding them.

Until we change that picture, we can hardly preach to other peoples about self-determination.

Having been in power nationally for nearly all of the last 36 years, Democrats have become too accustomed to accepting leadership from the top down and changing it too infrequently. Southern dissent inside the party was expected, but liberal dissent was considered heresy. One of the brighter spots of the dreary 1968 convention in bloody Chicago was the willingness of 40 percent of the delegates to oppose the party Establishment in voting for the minority "peace" plank. That same convention terminated most concessions to the Old South, encouraged as never before the participation of black, young and grass-roots Democrats, ended the unit-rule device by which minority voices were stifled, established one commission to modernize convention rules and established still another to insist hereafter on the democratic selection of all delegates.

These developments must continue. The frustrating sense of powerlessness that many Americans feel toward remote, impersonal institutions applies to political parties as well. I am constantly asked by dissatisfied Demo-

crats: "What can I do?" If our party is to be responsive to its members—and we cannot otherwise succeed—it is not enough that they be "involved" stuffing envelopes or ringing doorbells, important as such activities may be.

We must formulate procedures to redistribute political power to achieve the broadest possible participation in the exercising of that power. Precinct meetings open to all must have an effective voice in the formulation of policy and in the selection of both party leaders and candidates. The notion that a few men should successfully choose the party nominee for any important office regardless of whether he reflects the will of the voters is shocking.

Through direct primaries, periodic surveys and more frequent state and national platform conventions, through more open channels of communication between party members, leaders and public officials, through increased party informational and educational activities, and through a far broader financial base of small contributions, rank-and-file Democrats can obtain new confidence in party decisions, and that kind of direct participation can produce the enthusiasm and momentum that lead to victory.

A national presidential primary would be chaotic and exorbitantly expensive without assuring as representative a choice as an overhauled convention system. It would make even more difficult the prospects of an insurgent candidate. But every presidential and every senatorial or gubernatorial nominee of our party will have greater voter confidence (and surely more workers) if his policies and appeal have first been fairly tested in a contested open primary.

All this will be to no avail, however, without high-caliber candidates at every level. We need men and women who are able to appeal to all elements in the Democratic party and to independents as well, willing to campaign hard at the grass-roots level, and more inclined to explain on TV the new and current issues than to engage in blindly partisan exaggeration. Young people and intellectuals must be involved in those campaigns, their imaginative contributions welcomed regardless of their refusal to support every Democrat or every plank in their own candidate's platform. Storefront headquarters will be more important than smoke-filled hotel rooms. A candidate's convictions, commitment and ability to inspire a majority of the voters will be more important than his acceptability to a few party leaders and donors.

Increased citizen participation does not deny the need for strong leadership. On the contrary, the very turbulence and diversity that have consistently characterized the history of the Democratic party have also made it responsive to those strong personalities who survived spirited intraparty debates and led all factions to victory.

But above all, the Democratic party must not stand still. It must not be the party of the status quo. Its leadership must not be confined to the old and the established. As Edmund Burke cried out long ago: "Applaud us when we run, console us when we fall, cheer us when we recover, but let us [press] on—for God's sake, let us [press] on."

### THREE BUFFALO OFFICIALS TESTIFY ON SMUT MAIL

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Postal Operations Subcommittee held a further hearing today on legislation to ban the

mailing of obscene material into homes where minors reside.

This is a very difficult area of law in the light of court decisions, but it is a matter upon which Members are constantly receiving complaints from their constituents. Despite the difficulty in writing adequate law, the effort must and is being made by our subcommittee.

I commend the diligent effort by the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Nix), and the members of his subcommittee for their thorough and continuing investigation of this problem. I look forward to an early recommendation to the full committee.

#### TRIO WORKS AS TEAM

At today's hearing, I had the honor and pleasure of introducing three expert witnesses from my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., who have been working as a team in the effort to control distribution of obscene and pornographic material in the Buffalo area.

They are: Associate City Judge Theodore S. Kasler, Senior Assistant District Attorney Julian F. Kubiniec of Erie County, and Detective Sgt. Frank V. Spano in charge of the Buffalo Police Department's salacious literature squad.

The gentlemen made excellent formal presentations and then submitted to questioning by subcommittee members.

Mr. Speaker, their formal statements warrant the attention of Members and I include the texts with my remarks:

STATEMENT BY ASSOCIATE JUDGE THEODORE S. KASLER, BUFFALO, N.Y.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I am Theodore S. Kasler, an Associate Judge of the City Court of Buffalo, New York, and I want to thank you for granting me this opportunity to address your subcommittee.

At the outset, let me indicate that my problem and that of all trial Judges, whether they be on the federal, state, county or municipal level, is in the interpretation of the obscenity laws, as governed by the interpretations of the United States Supreme Court, the various Circuit Courts of Appeal, and the various Appellate Courts on the State level.

It is also obvious to the committee that all the State laws, and even the proposed bill which is before your committee now, being number HR-10867, are synthesized from these Court decisions, and until each law is finally tested by the United States Supreme Court, no trial Court can ever be sure of its true meaning.

The nature of the problem which is the subject of the bill under consideration by your committee is one which has caused anguish to the Courts and alarm to the nation.

#### FRUSTRATION WITH PROGRESS

This committee is aware, Mr. Chairman, that distinguished lawyers, jurists and public officials have become discouraged at the inability of government to stop the flow of hard-core pornography through the malls and the bookstands, and its open, brazen display, regardless of age, on the stage and on the screen. It has been my experience that the public does show some concern for pornography only when it "hits home."

And, I repeat, it is only when sexually oriented advertising is received in the home that parents move into action, and then they demand immediate action from you gentlemen, from State legislators, from the Judges, and from the police.

Therefore, I commend this committee for taking action in this field, because I believe it is the function of the government to do for

the people what they cannot do for themselves, or, as in this instance, what they are not inclined to do for themselves.

It is my observation that, to many parents of minors, pornography is not a reality until they are faced with it in their homes, or it is found on the persons of their children.

I have found that people have a vague idea of what hard-core pornography is, and their impression of it consists of mere nude figures.

However, on occasion, when I do take examples of the hard-core pornography which is received through the malls or which is found on the bookstands, and I describe the various sexual aberrations practiced in the movies bought by Sergeant Spano in the open market and viewed by me, only then is the full impact of obscenity brought home.

#### ACTION IS AFTER THE FACT

In Subsection B of Section 4012, mailing of sexually oriented advertisements, the bill places the onus on the householder to file a statement with the Postmaster General, stating that he does not want to receive any sexually oriented advertisements through the mails. This, in my opinion, places too great a burden upon the citizen.

It is simply human nature that the citizen will not be moved to action until he does receive such sexually oriented material through the mail.

But, by that time, the minors for whose protection this bill is being enacted may have already examined this material, may have replaced it, and whatever damage has been done will remain permanent.

I agree with those advocates who are urging this Congress to make it strictly unlawful to send any sexually oriented advertisements to all classes, adults as well as juveniles.

#### CONSTITUTION BEING COMPROMISED

In conclusion, may I state to this committee, Mr. Chairman, that a great document like the Constitution of the United States is being compromised and degraded for the benefit of the very few, for the sole purpose of making money, and in total disregard of the consequences. May I quote from an address by Mr. Richard L. Evans, delivered from the Tabernacle in Salt Lake City, on November 9th, 1969, wherein he stated:

"Evil is greedy. Evil is pursued by many to make money. And always we ought to remember that the more profitable evil is, the more powerful it is, and the more prevalent it will become. Evil will go just as far as we let it. If we patronize it, encourage it, it will go to unlimited lengths."

It is indeed a sad commentary upon our times when cynics can use the Constitution of the United States to promote pornography for profit, and I am in full accord with the conclusions reached by Mr. Edwin A. Roberts, Jr., editor for The National Observer's Newsbook series entitled, "The Smut Rakers", under a 1966 copyright by the Dow-Jones Company, Inc., wherein he stated, at Page 127:

"Since the beginning of obscenity legislation in the United States, the cause-and-effect element has been a principal justification of relevant laws. But we might ask ourselves if such justification is necessary.

"Obscenity is more than 'controversial sex speech,' as one lawyer puts it. It is more than the 'occasion of sin' of clerical parlance. And it doesn't have to be a threat to Western civilization to be intolerable. Obscenity is a nuisance worthy of legal control because it offends the dignity, spirit, and sensibilities of civilized people. If it did nothing more than that it would be as suitable for censure as the power plant that fouls the air.

"The First Amendment? Americans may disagree on its application, but it seems at least arguable that the Founding Fathers did not consider every impression of ink upon paper to be automatically superior to all competing values."

Once again, I extend my thanks to the

subcommittee for inviting us, and I am sure that I am extending the thanks of concerned people of the Niagara Frontier for having an opportunity to be heard.

STATEMENT BY JULIAN F. KUBINIEC, SENIOR ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY, ERIE COUNTY, N.Y.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to thank you for affording me the opportunity to testify before your committee relating to the problem of pornography and obscenity.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I am Julian F. Kubiniec, an Assistant District Attorney in and for the County of Erie, Buffalo, New York.

Among my other duties as an Assistant District Attorney in Erie County, I am in charge of the Obscenity Bureau in the District Attorney's office with the responsibility of prosecuting local violations and in cooperating with and assisting local law enforcement agencies in the never-ending crusade against the dissemination of pornographic and obscene materials.

On the local (county) level, convictions for the possession of and on the promotion of obscene materials are quickly becoming a rarity.

Higher court opinions have imposed a quantum of proof upon the prosecutor so burdensome that it is beginning to appear that only photos or films actually depicting sexual intercourse, sodomy, etc., are deemed to have no constitutional protection.

#### PROTECTED BY FIRST AMENDMENT

Yet, possession of a "stag" film, for private use in a home, have been recently cloaked with the protective mantle of the First Amendment.

In spite of these recent trends towards a complete carte blanche for the dissemination and possession of highly erotic books, films and magazines, the Supreme Court has on several occasions, reaffirmed its feeling that the States are completely free to legislate against the sale, dissemination and promotion of pornographic and obscene materials to minors.

New York State has an excellent statute prohibiting such dissemination to minors. The law is so explicit and firm that the book stores in Buffalo, which specialize in "girlie" and "nude" magazines, warn away minors with large signs displayed on their doors and windows.

In the event that a retailer is arrested for an illegal sale to a minor, the prosecution must prove that the particular book or magazine was "harmful to the minor." This element of proof requires the testimony of experts in various fields who may or may not be available to the prosecution and if so, at considerable expense.

#### PROTECTING MINORS

Bill 10867, which is the subject of this Committee, has as its theme the prevention of sexually-oriented material from reaching minors through the mail.

The definition spelled out in the Bill are excellent and would more than cover the types of magazines which I have brought for this committee's perusal. These magazines were purchased in retail stores in Buffalo which feature such works.

Although these retailers appear to make an effort not to sell to minors, they can nevertheless be purchased by minors through the mail.

You will note that each magazine has an advertisement touting other titles purported to be similar to the magazine in hand. The coupon may be cut out and forwarded to the publisher or distributor with the required price and the ordered magazine will then be mailed.

The proposed Bill will not prevent the mailing of such a magazine to a minor who places his order after the magazine was carelessly or deliberately passed on to him

by an adult. However, I do believe that Postmasters in the various states are aware of publishers and distributors who mail out such magazines.

Perhaps, by appropriate legislation, they could be required to prove or at least vouch that a specific mailing is not addressed to a minor.

#### FEEL INSPECTION CAN BE REQUIRED

I feel that publishers and distributors of magazines which portray scenes, conduct and activity as defined in this Bill can legally be required, not only to submit them to the Postal Department for inspection and categorization, but can be further required to attest that none are being mailed out to minors.

It may be impossible to prevent these publishers from running ads in their magazines (unless this can fall under the "pandering" doctrine of the Ginzburg Case) but such requirements might eliminate or seriously curtail the sale of such magazines to minors through the mail.

This would have the long range effect of making the local retailer the only major source of distribution and he can be controlled at the local level by the police as far as illegal sales to minors are concerned.

By virtue of a contempt proceeding in Erie County Court, it became public knowledge in the press that the October 1969 Grand Jury of Erie County is conducting an investigation under a new law in New York State which makes it a felony to "wholesale promote" obscene material.

#### LEGISLATION AIMED AT WHOLESALER

The legislation is aimed at the wholesaler who, by virtue of his operation, makes substantial profits on volume sales to various retailers.

Police investigations reveal that large shipments of highly erotic and sexually oriented magazines are shipped by air-freight to distributors by various publishers.

I believe that the Postal Department has contracts with many airlines worth millions of dollars for transporting United States mail; in fact, a recent issue of Life magazine states that air mail brings in more revenue than passengers on a per pound basis.

I propose that this committee study the feasibility of limiting or denying air mail contracts to airlines that transport magazines and materials that meet the definitional sections of this Bill.

Although the Courts have, in a series of decisions, expanded individual rights in this area, yet their expression of serious concern for the protection of minors leaves open many roads to approach the curtailment and elimination of sexually-oriented works.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST PROTECT

The United States government must now accept the responsibility of protecting its citizens, especially the children. The Federal judiciary ignited the civil rights explosion under the First Amendment and now is the time for our Federal legislators to use every tool at their disposal to regulate the flow of material which may fall into the hands of the youth of this nation.

Smut is a national business. Magazines printed in California are wholesaled and retailed in Buffalo, New York.

This Bill proposes to stem the flow of sexually-oriented material to those families who actively indicate their disgust.

Cannot the might of the Postal Department be exerted in other legislation to reverse the interstate movement of these types of magazines?

The local prosecutor and law enforcement officer needs help and shackling the flow of obscene and pornographic material may very well be the first important step to a rededication to the moral values which we cherish.

#### STATEMENT BY DETECTIVE SERGEANT FRANK V. SPANO, BUFFALO, N.Y., POLICE DEPT.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the outset I want to thank you for affording me the opportunity to testify before your Committee relating to pornography.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I am Frank V. Spano, Detective Sgt. in charge of the Salacious Literature Squad of the City of Buffalo Police Department.

Although, my connection with the sending of smut through the mails, may seem remote because I am not a member of the Postal Inspection Division of the Post Office, nevertheless I am certain that I received at the Buffalo Police Department concerning smut mail, a substantial measure of the complaints, which I immediately refer to the Postal Inspectors.

May I add, that I have received excellent cooperation from the Postmaster of Buffalo, New York and the Postal Inspection Service, and this cooperation has been reciprocated by the department, by aiding in local prosecutions of obscenity cases.

#### PROBLEM OF ENFORCEMENT

Gentlemen, I think that I should inform you of my problem in enforcing the obscenity statutes of the State of New York in that, under *Peo. vs. Rothenberg* decided by the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, a police officer is not permitted to make a determination that any material is obscene.

As a result, I must purchase or view film and other obscene material and present it to a judge for determination as to its obscenity before a search warrant directing the seizure of such material or the arrest of the promoter can be ordered.

As recently as October 6, 1969 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit in the *Bethview Amusement Corporation vs. William Cohn*, District Attorney for Nassau County case ruled that an "adversary hearing" must be held before a search warrant and/or an arrest warrant can be issued.

These judicial decisions have made it virtually impossible to enforce the obscenity laws of the State of New York; this fine bill being H.R. 10867, is of no help to me as a police officer attempting to enforce any laws of obscenity, be they Federal or State.

#### POLICE OFFICERS INHIBITED

In view of the recent Supreme Court ruling which now constitutionally protects the possession of obscene and pornographic material in the home, police officers are now prohibited from making arrests for such possession and this now raises the question: How does this obscene material get in the home?

Undoubtedly the U.S. mails will be one of the main vehicles for bringing obscene material to the attention of the "consumer."

A study of the present bill discloses that it is geared to protect the individual and his family who specifically make the effort to place their name on the "Postmasters List" indicating their desire not to receive sexually oriented advertisements.

I respectfully call this Committee's attention to the Supreme Court's ruling in the *Ginzburg Case* wherein it was held that a material which is advertised as having been created for the purpose of sexual stimulation, is denied the protection of the First Amendment.

#### SUGGEST COMMITTEE STUDY

I would suggest to this Committee that it study this aspect of the law as a solid basis for prohibiting from the mail any and all sexually oriented advertisements that key upon the aspect of sexual stimulation.

The heart of the proposed bill appears to be under Section 4012 paragraph (b) which

would proscribe the mailing of such material only to those persons and families who comply with this section.

Gentlemen, do you appreciate the fact that an extensive nationwide publicity campaign would be necessary to alert the public to this protective section?

The burden is placed upon the citizen to take the first step in protecting himself from unwanted and offensive advertisements.

Assuming that he does, what is to prevent the purveyor of filth from mailing his advertisements by merely addressing it to "Occupant".

#### BELIEVES BILL SHOULD GO FARTHER

It is my feeling as a police officer, that this bill should go further than it does.

Under the above mentioned *Ginzburg case*, I feel that this Committee should make a thorough study of barring, prohibiting and refusing to deliver any and all sexually oriented advertisements that meet the test expounded in this case.

If such a prohibition were possible, then the police officers present inability to arrest the home occupant for possession of pornographic material would become moot because the main source would then be local commercial outlets rather than through the mail.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I thank you for affording me this opportunity to present my views regarding this legislation.

#### NOT QUITE SO FAST ON A LAKE AIRPORT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is currently much talk in Chicago about the need for a new airport to relieve some of the congestion at O'Hare, the Nation's busiest airport, and at Midway. Although no one disputes the need for an additional airport, there are many concerned citizens who dispute the location which is currently being prominently mentioned by airport planners—in Lake Michigan.

Many of us who are concerned about what we have already done to our environment, either through negligence or purposeful pollution, dread the potential ecological effects of a lake airport, effects which at this point can only be guessed at. In light of the fact that Federal money will almost certainly have to be used in the construction of any future airport for Chicago, I think that airport planners might well want to keep in mind the words of section 16(c) (4) of the Aviation Facilities Expansion Act of 1969 which was recently passed by this House and is now before the Senate. That provision stated:

It is hereby declared to be national policy that airport development projects authorized pursuant to this part shall provide or the protection and enhancement of the Nation. In implementing this policy, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretaries of the Interior and Health, Education and Welfare with regard to the effect that such project may have on natural resources including, but not limited to, fish and wildlife, natural scenic, and recreation assets, water and air quality, and other factors affecting the en-

vironment, and shall authorize no project found to have adverse effect unless the Secretary shall render a finding, in writing, following a full and complete review, which shall be a matter of public record, that no feasible and prudent alternative exists and that all possible steps have been taken to minimize such adverse effect.

Not only do the provisions of Federal law make it unlikely that a plan for a lake airport would be judged ineligible for Federal support, but the opposition currently developing in Chicago itself should make promoters of this ill-conceived scheme think again about their plans. As an example of this growing citizen opposition, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the November 27, 1969, edition of the Chicago Tribune. The editorial is entitled "Not Quite So Fast on a Lake Airport."

The article referred to follows:

#### NOT QUITE SO FAST ON A LAKE AIRPORT

William E. Downes, city aviation commissioner, no longer has any doubts about where Chicago should build the new major airport which will be needed in a few years. He wants it in Lake Michigan on a site created by building a huge dike.

Such an airport would be the most important single thing that has happened to Chicago in this century, the commissioner told the city council finance committee.

Mr. Downes is jumping the gun. Several important questions remain to be answered before anyone can say with confidence that a lake site would be the best.

Could an airport be built there at a reasonable cost? Estimates of the site cost have ranged from 250 million dollars to half a billion dollars. Estimates of the cost of a bridge or tunnel to the mainland also have varied widely. The grand total might be a billion dollars.

The airport is expected to be used by 50 million people annually. What plans have been made for moving them to and from the mainland? A four-lane roadway proposed in the original plan obviously would be inadequate. If the airport is to be off 55th street, as now suggested, Lake Shore drive is hopelessly inadequate to handle the additional vast volume of airport traffic.

Would it be necessary to build a subway tunnel directly to the Loop? If so, this would add tremendously to the cost.

Various suggestions have been made for using new kinds of high speed vehicles. Have these been invented yet, and if so how much would they cost? There is no use considering a lake site further unless a feasible transportation system can be developed.

What about water and air pollution? Not enough is known about the effect of such an airport on lake currents. The plans call for pumping sewage to the mainland, but there would be a reservoir within the airport to collect seepage thru the dike and rain runoff. How much pollution would be added to the lake in this way?

Air pollution would be the same, of course, whether the airport is in the lake or at a site south or southwest of Chicago. The lake site, however, would contribute much more pollution to the blanket of smog which often hangs over the city.

Would a lake site be as safe as one more distant from the Loop? The experts disagree on whether air traffic to and from a lake airport would interfere with the traffic patterns for O'Hare and Midway. And what about weather conditions in the lake? Some pilots contend that winter conditions would be much more hazardous there.

Studies are being made in an effort to answer most of these questions and to find solutions for the obvious difficulties. It is possible that the studies will show that the

advantages of a lake airport close to downtown Chicago will outweigh its disadvantages.

Meanwhile, however, it would be prudent for city officials to withhold their judgment. This decision is indeed one of the most important to be made by the city in the next century, and no mistake should be made.

### THE MINORITY VIEW ON MONETARY POLICY MUST BECOME THE MAJORITY VIEW

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a year now this administration has relied on a highly restrictive monetary policy as its chief weapon to win the battle against inflation. As early as last June, in letters to Treasury Secretary Kennedy and Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin, I argued that this was a most serious tactical error. We are and have been for several years now in the grip of the most pernicious kind of inflation, characterized by an alarming climb in total spending and prices. Fiscal controls—particularly the income surcharge—applied during the previous administration and continued today, have been virtually discredited as effective tools in this current period of inflation. Nor is tight money the answer. So far, this policy has produced only one clear result—the most extraordinary rise in interest rates in modern American history, up to a new historical high.

Though the housing market is drying up, farmers are badly pinched, and small and big business alike are increasingly boxed in, the administration remains wedded to this ill-fated policy. The perpetrator and grim director of this policy, the Federal Reserve Board, has clung tightly to the reins of the economy, as much unable as unwilling to ease up.

Today we still have rising prices, we still have spending moving upward, with big business planning an 11-percent increase in capital investment next year compared to this year. The only change is that thanks to tight money and high interest rates, we stand perilously close now to a serious breakdown of the economy. High interest rates are sapping the strength from the very fiber of the economy. This strength is historically based on the opportunity for all to invest in the Nation's growth. This opportunity is disappearing for many who cannot afford to pay the price on new investment. High interest rates must come down if our economy is to survive. Monetary policy must be changed now.

Mr. Speaker, I have begun to despair that the administration and the Federal Reserve Board harbor reasonable men in this matter. But an article this week in the Washington Post revives a faint hope that we may yet come to our senses in time. It observes that at least some members of the Board now believe that we are going too far with our monetary policies. It reports that these members are aware that within the area of monetary control there is more to be con-

sidered than simply money market conditions, more results to be looked for than just higher interest rates. It suggests, too, an understanding by some that as monetary policy is eased, restraint and selectivity must be exercised in directing credits to those segments of the economy in most difficulty.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that the minority opinion of the Board reported therein will soon become the majority opinion, and we can turn to a more sensible solution to our economic problems:

#### MINORITY FEEL IT'S TOO TIGHT: MONEY MANAGERS SPLIT ON MONETARY POLICY (By Hobart Rowen)

A basic policy split among the 12 men who manage the nation's monetary policy has emerged, and is likely to grow deeper in the next several months.

The 12 includes the seven governors of the Federal Reserve Board and five regional Federal Reserve Bank presidents who on a rotating basis represent all 12 presidents. This group forms the Federal Open Market Committee that meets in Washington about every three weeks.

A minority of the OMC feel that existing monetary policy is excessively tight, and could even lead to a financial crisis—although they think odds are against that.

But even more significantly, there is a growing belief that in deciding whether money policy should be tightened or loosened, the OMC should pay more attention to the big monetary aggregates (money supply, demand deposits, total reserves, and bank credit), and less to the traditional federal reserve concern with short-term interest rates and money market conditions.

It is a bow in the direction of Milton Friedman, but short of his single-minded focus on the sole importance of the money supply to the exclusion of other considerations.

The argument surfaced anew yesterday with publication by the Fed of OMC minutes for Sept. 9, which showed Governors Sherman J. Maisel and George Mitchell for the second month in a row dissenting from the current highly restrictive money policy.

These minutes are published with a 90-day lag. It was learned, however, that there has been no change in Fed policy—or in the majority and minor views—in the most recent sessions.

Many economists, in and out of government, and many business analysts have suggested lately that an overly tight monetary policy as being pursued by the Fed will lead to a recession in 1970.

#### SUPPORT FOR EXISTING POLICY

Except for Governors J. Dewey Daane and J. W. Robertson, who were absent, all of the others voted in September to continue—but not make firmer—the then existing policy. (In August, Daane and Robertson voted with the majority along similar lines of division.)

Maisel and Mitchell, argued, however, that monetary restraint in effect was actually tightening up, if the key aggregates were taken into consideration. Maisel yesterday elaborated by citing figures showing sharp contractions in the growth of the aggregate measures. For example, the most inclusive definition of money supply is showing a contraction (minus 3.1 per cent) for the second half of 1969.

Taking the monetary aggregates as a group, Maisel pointed out (along with the fact that long-term interest rates have been rising, these figures show that monetary policy has really grown tighter).

#### WANTS RESTRAINTS EASED

He advocates easing restraints to a level of about two-thirds the 1957-67 average, which

he would label "normal." Thus, in terms of the narrowly defined money stock, he would permit a growth of about 3 per cent, then watch it closely for any necessary adjustments.

Maisel and Mitchell fear that if the Fed keeps to present policy, it makes it more probable that when an attempt is made to reverse direction, the Fed will once again "overshoot" the necessary target and re-inflate the economy.

Maisel feels that the private markets tend to get carried away after a turn in Fed policy; in 1968, for example, actual reserves were enlarged by 50 per cent more than any one at the Fed envisaged.

The dissenting governors think that the risk of an over-reaction would be mitigated by making the turn now, instead of engaging in a game of "chicken" with financial markets, in which the Fed says that it will not loosen up until there is a financial crisis, and the market says, in effect, that it doesn't believe the government would permit one.

There are indications that some of the presidents of the regional Fed Banks, who until now have been following the course set down by Chairman William McC. Martin, are shifting their ground toward consideration of the aggregates.

It is possible that the drift may become more pronounced after Martin leaves his post in January, after 18 years at the helm. Obviously, much will depend on the new stimulus injected by his successor, Arthur F. Burns.

Maisel said that it was possible to find four basic reasons for the Fed to shift from a sole focus on money market conditions and short-term interest rates to include more attention to the monetary aggregates: 1) the general Friedman view that insufficient weight has been given to money supply; 2) the Keynesian view that over-reliance on money policy may lead to a recession; 3) the squeeze developing on liquidity means that a prospect of a financial crisis exists; and 4) even without a general recession, monetary tightness may be causing crises in various sectors of the economy, such as housing, and state and local ability to finance necessary projects.

#### ALREADY GONE TOO FAR

Because there is probability that all of these arguments are true to a degree, Maisel has been insisting in private, the Board's existing policy has already gone too far. He would guide money market operations so as to pump more reserves into the system.

But the OMC so far has been focusing on the inflationary expectations in the economy. The OMC minutes for September noted that there were indications "that the rate of real economic growth was slowing, but it was agreed that the persistence of strong inflationary pressures and expectations militated against a relaxation of monetary restraint at present."

The opponents of this policy suggest that although few will say it openly, a free translation of the OMC majority's words is that a depression will be necessary to reverse inflationary expectations and to reduce prices. They (the minority) say that this is a "bad target for monetary policy."

In essence, then, the debate is over what should trigger Fed decisions to pump up or restrict the supply of money and reserves. The conventional wisdom, still being followed by the Fed, relies largely on "conditions" in the short-term money market, and on price developments; some policymakers also take balance of payments considerations into account.

#### MAISEL-MITCHELL ARGUMENT

The Maisel-Mitchell argument is that this standard has proved to be inadequate. More attention must be paid as well, they say, to the actual supply of money and credit in various forms.

In a speech yesterday in New York to a

Business Week conference, Mitchell said "there is no doubt, in my opinion, that financial aggregates will steadily become more useful in guiding policy-makers and the judgments of those who are searching for clues to policy changes."

Like Maisel, however, he rejects the Friedman notion of tagging the money supply alone as the single determinant of policy: "I believe we are a long way from being able to specify a particular aggregate as a 'North Star' for monetary navigation."

#### THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau Federation annual meeting here in Washington this week has special significance. It marks the 50th anniversary of this great farm organization. We have a large delegation attending from my State and I welcome them on this great occasion. We have one of the finest State organizations in the country and I do want to pay special tribute to Dave Sloan, our State Farm Bureau president, our vice presidents, Sam F. Wheeler, James Williams, E. B. Funderburk, and J. P. Hodges. We appreciate our officers and directors who have been so dedicated and devoted for so many years in cooperative efforts to improve the farm industry in South Carolina. We want to also recognize our State women's chairman, Mrs. C. F. Price, of Mullins, and my warm personal friend, the Honorable E. H. Agnew, of Starr, who have contributed so much to the Farm Bureau program. On November 12, 1919, delegations from 35 States met at the Lasalle Hotel in Chicago and the American Farm Bureau Federation was founded. South Carolina was well represented at that meeting which launched a national farm organization. The Federation's growth during a half century has been tremendous and today it serves nearly 1.8 million member families in 49 States and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, we should note that the American Farm Bureau was not born as a protest organization. The Farm Bureau is a positive organization. It stands for something. It is dedicated to preserving those principles and ideals which made our Nation great. It grew from the success of county farm bureaus in helping farmers to improve their production practices and in meeting local problems. It handles its affairs in a business-minded manner. There was a recognition that while agriculture's problems varied from State to State and region to region, they were basically similar, and they wanted to do something about it.

The American economy is strong. Capital, labor, the consumer, and the food producer have made it so. Our standard of living is higher than any other country in the world—the farmers of America have played a major role in shaping our economy. With the highly mechanized farm industry we have today, we produce the major portion of the world's food. We have shared this abun-

dance of food and fiber with our needy here in America and throughout the world. It is a tribute to the skill and knowledge of our great farming industry.

I have lived on the farm all of my life and have been an active member of the Farm Bureau for many years. I recommend the sound philosophy of this great organization to the American people:

I believe—

In the American competitive enterprise system.

That man's search for progress should be encouraged by maintenance of opportunity, not hindered by illusions of security.

That a person should be rewarded in accordance with his productive contribution to society.

That every man is entitled to own property, earn money honestly, save, invest, and spend as he chooses.

That property rights cannot be taken away without infringing on rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

That the Constitution is the basic law of the land, and that its interpretation should be in accordance with the intent of its authors.

That government should operate impartially in the interest of all.

That government's regulatory functions should be based on law.

That government should provide only minimum controls and aids.

That government should stimulate, not discourage, individual initiative.

That propagandizing by government is dangerous to the maintenance of self-government.

That monopoly, whether by government, industry, labor, or agriculture, is dangerous.

That voluntary cooperation is a part of the American system.

That all candidates for public office should state their beliefs with respect to communism, socialism, and capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate this outstanding and patriotic organization on its 50th anniversary and wish for all the delegates who have attended the convention and for every member of the American Farm Bureau continued success.

#### WE MUST BE DOING SOMETHING RIGHT

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by John Keats entitled "We Must Be Doing Something Right" which is a treatise on our generation and its accomplishments versus the coming generation. I think most Members with children will find it interesting reading.

The article follows:

#### WE MUST BE DOING SOMETHING RIGHT

(By John Keats)

My generation of Americans—those of us downwind of forty—licked the Depression and won the biggest, most complicated war in history. We developed flash freezing, jet

travel, Salk vaccine and put men on the moon. We also built the richest, most efficient, open and decent society the world has ever seen. We have given more people more and better jobs, opportunities, food, clothing, shelter, education, medical care and consumer goods than any nation has ever enjoyed, anywhere. These perfectly demonstrable facts suggest that we must be doing something right, and it just may be that we do not entirely deserve all the stones being cast at us.

Most of the contumely issues from the more intelligent and privileged members of the pimply and long-haired set, who like to imagine that we are nothing but a gaggle of bloody-minded, sexually-frustrated, gin-soaked, golf-playing, power-mad, irrational and hypocritical money-grabbers who operate a cruel and inhuman System, and who are abject failures as parents. The revolting young particularly despise those of us in the higher middle and upper classes, blaming us for (among other things) the existence of slums, the war in Viet Nam, and the pollution of our air and water. For our sins, our well-educated children say, we should all be groaning under a burden of guilt.

Having been for these past twenty years a journeyman social critic myself, I am quite aware that the poor are still with us; that peace on earth is still an ideal and not a fact; that not a few of our more prominent politicians and businessmen are short on principle and long on greed. I am all for recognizing our faults, and trying to correct them, believing that it is only wisdom to maintain, always, an intelligent dissatisfaction with our accomplishments. But it seems to me that any criticism ought to keep the accomplishments in mind. I also think it only right to examine the credentials of the critical, and to come down on our complaining young, like an office safe falling fourteen stories, whenever we catch them off base.

The Socratic method recommends itself. Whenever a distraught youngster argues, with passionate belief, that our society is sick and evil, let us inquire just which society he is talking about. The one that makes free medical care and legal advice available to the indigent? The one that believes a man to be innocent until he is proved guilty? The one working toward a six-hour work week and a guaranteed annual wage? The one that is struggling, not without success, to make the dream of equality of opportunity for everyone come true? The one that makes it possible for every bright youngster, no matter what his ancestry or economic situation, to acquire a university education? The one that is perfectly willing to listen to what a young man has to say, so long as he does not put his opinions in the form of non-negotiable demands uttered at gun-point, and which not unreasonably requires him to put up or shut up? We might ask him whether he believes that it is only young people who feel a concern for the state of the nation, and only they who are at work on the problems.

Or we might agree with him that the nation is indeed sick, and ask him what he thinks of a society that enforces the laws of peace and good order everywhere but on a college campus, and which otherwise allows children to push adults around. Or which is considering lowering the voting age to 18, instead of more sensibly raising it to 35? Is there not something sick about asking youth to make the decisions, when all societies since the dawn of time have equated age with wisdom and experience, and youth with silliness and lack of experience? We might inquire whether the angry young man would not feel happier and more secure if the generation gap were wider, and if there were a more rigid Establishment to oppose.

There are various ways to skin this particular cat, all of them involving counterattacks

on the youthful critics' ground, which is that of intellectual argument. In any case, I see no reason why our generation, which has worked to build and pay for history's most unique success, should feel ashamed or defensive of its truly majestic accomplishments—and no reason at all why we should take a lot of guff from a concerned, and largely pure in heart but nonetheless wet-earred and half-baked, band of juveniles.

I will admit it is rather tiring for us to have to go on being parents when our children are now in their twenties, but there it is: they still need guidance, and papa still needs to spank, more in sorrow than in anger, in order to instill in the young a proper respect (if not a deserved awe) for what papa has done in his time. Granted, there are still faults to be remedied, but there is much to be praised, and perhaps we should acquaint the young with the war-time motto of our splendid generation: "The difficult will be done immediately; the impossible will take a little longer."

#### THE NEED FOR CORRECTIONAL REFORM

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on few subjects is there more widespread agreement than the need for correctional reform in the United States. All the experts and most laymen agree that our present methods of treating convicted criminals are simply inadequate to the tasks of rehabilitation and reform which are their stated goals.

An article which recently appeared in the New Republic magazine by Mr. Ronald Goldfarb emphasizes the urgent nature of correctional reform in the United States and describes the varied sources from which support for such an effort could be drawn. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 14823, the Correctional Services Improvement Act, which I believe could make a significant contribution to improving the quality of treatment which we now give convicted criminals in our jails and penal institutions. It deals with unifying the correctional effort at the Federal level, providing new and modern correctional facilities at both the State and Federal level, and improvement of correctional techniques, including expanded individualization of treatment for convicted offenders.

Because it demonstrates the near unanimity of opinion in favor of sweeping reform of our approach to corrections, and because it emphasizes that this reform will require money and effort as well as words, I insert at this point in the RECORD the article "The Conspiracy for Correctional Reform."

The article referred to follows:

#### THE CONSPIRACY FOR CORRECTIONAL REFORM

(By Ronald Goldfarb)

The prison system is the only American institution I can think of whose administrators do not believe in the institution they are administering.

A few years ago while attending the annual meeting of the American Correctional Association I found myself in a hospitality suite

chatting with a roomful of very relaxed prison administrators. Each man ran a major penal institution someplace in the United States; all were veterans in the business; none were "bleeding hearts" or "soft" on crime. I mentioned to the warden I was sitting next to that I was writing a book about corrections and was curious to know what percentage of the people under his supervision he thought needed to be in prison.

"By what standard," he asked.

"In order to protect society from personal injury," I replied.

Only about 10 to 15 percent, he said. No one in the room disagreed with him. As I visit prisons in my travels around the country, I always ask my hosts the same question; I cannot recall a single, different answer.

President Nixon has called for the immediate and dramatic reform of our failing correction system and has set up a task force which includes such experts as Robert Kutak, Richard McGee, Dr. Karl Menninger and Professor Norval Morris. Mr. Nixon has called for comprehensive planning and the consolidation of existing corrections systems, putting more money into treatment and noninstitutional programs, juvenile and mental health programs, special facilities and new jail concepts, better training, more research. As a candidate, he had said that by standards of punishment, deterrence, or rehabilitation "our prison system is a failure" and "needs to undergo a major overhaul."

In a speech to an American Bar Association meeting in Dallas last August, our new Chief Justice, Warren E. Burger, put the power and prestige of his office behind the same cause. Pointing out that we have gone far in recent years to correct procedural inequities in the fact-finding and litigation processes, he urged that we should now pay more attention to what happens to those found guilty. "I challenge the social utility of any system of criminal justice," he said, "which allocates, as we now do, a disproportionate amount of our resources to the techniques of trials, appeals and post conviction remedies while it gravely neglects the correctional processes which follow a verdict of guilt."

Last month Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman of the National Commission on Violence, made public that organization's finding that, "... Prisons and correctional facilities operate in isolation and reject public scrutiny. Programs of rehabilitation are shallow and dominated by greater concern for punishment and custody than for correction. Prison inmate work assignments usually bear little relationship to employment opportunities outside. Internal supervision is often inadequate. ... correctional administrators are often said to be presiding over schools in crime. ... Jails ... are often the most appalling shame in the criminal justice system ... notoriously ill-managed and poorly staffed. Scandalous conditions have been repeatedly reported ... the jails have been indicted as crime breeding institutions."

After three years of exhaustive research, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training has also issued a report concluding that: "... Corrections suffers from multiple problems: apathy, piecemeal programming, totally inadequate funding, and the lack of public support and understanding. ... Corrections today is characterized by an overlapping of jurisdictions, a diversity of philosophies, and a hodgepodge of organizational structures which have little contact with one another ... legislators continue to pass laws, executives mandate policies, and both cause large sums of money to be spent on ineffective corrective methods."

This group of 95 professional and governmental organizations advised: "The public and their legislators must understand that

there can be no solution to the isolated prisons, token program resources, and discriminatory practices, which deprive offenders of employment, education, and other opportunities are tolerated. They also must expect that as long as there is a predominance of low-paid, dead-end jobs in corrections, the field will continue to be burdened with a poor performance record."

A few years ago, a Presidential Crime Commission that had undertaken a mammoth investigation and consulted with everyone in sight, reported that: "Life in many institutions is at best barren and futile, at worst, unspeakably brutal and degrading. To be sure, the offenders in such institutions are incapacitated from committing further crimes while serving their sentences, but the conditions in which they live are the poorest possible preparation for their successful reentry into society, and often merely reinforce in them a pattern of manipulation or destructiveness."

All these prestigious authorities have joined the overwhelming majority of informed observers, professionals and commentators in concluding that our prison system is a failure and an intolerable waste.

If this is what the Administration's concern with law and order is all about, and if that concern can be translated into money and programs, we may be at long last on our way toward the kind of radical reform of corrections that we so badly need.

#### HAWAII SUMO WRESTLER EXCELS IN JAPAN'S ANCIENT SPORT

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, this is the season when, throughout the Nation, millions of football fans are either jubilantly or despairingly viewing the polls to note the ranking of their favorite teams among the top 10. The same millions will, no doubt, be viewing the upcoming bowl games with equal fervor and involvement.

A sport in Japan which commands the same avid following throughout the year, as football does at this time of the year in America, is sumo wrestling.

In this regard, I think it will be of interest to my colleagues to know that a young Hawaiian from the Valley Isle of Maui, Jesse Kuhaulua, who journeyed to Japan 5 years ago to master the difficult art of sumo, is now ranked among the top 10 wrestlers in Japan.

A recent editorial in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin paid a well-deserved tribute to young Kuhaulua, who wrestles under the name of Takamiyama. Kuhaulua, or Takamiyama, is lauded not only for his athletic ability, but also for his special personal attributes of diligence and perseverance, coupled with rare humility and good humor, which have characterized his ascendancy to the top ranks of Japan's most ancient and popular sport.

In an article from the Japan Times, reprinted in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Kuhaulua was praised as follows:

A top sumo commentator has suggested that other wrestlers should make him their model for diligent training. . . . He is a

credit to the people of Hawaii and the United States.

The people of Hawaii are justly proud that athletes from the Island State continue to gain recognition in international competition. In order that my colleagues may read more about Maui's sumo star, Jesse Kuhaulua, I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial and reprint from the December 3, 1969 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Dec. 3, 1969]

#### MAUI'S SUMO STAR

Jesse Kuhaulua, the Maui boy who decided to take up Japan's ancient sport of sumo wrestling, is now one of the top 10 rated wrestlers in Japan.

Since no foreigner has ever before gone so high, this is a special point of pride to Hawaii and his friends here—but so is the way he has gone about it.

Jesse, who wrestles under the name of Takamiyama, has won the attention and admiration of millions of sumo fans in Japan, who follow the television matches as avidly as Americans follow baseball or football.

What many Japanese think of him is summarized in the editorial from the English-language Japan Times reproduced on this page.

[From the Japan Times]

#### KUDOS FOR JESSE KUHAULUA

When Jesse Kuhaulua first came to Japan from his native Maui five years ago and announced he was here to become a "rikishi," who of us believed that he would last out the year? After all, the world of "sumo" is a feudalistic realm all its own, which exists only in a very small corner of Japan.

The rikishi lives, eats and sleeps sumo 24 hours a day. Its foods, its customs, and its traditions are entirely foreign, even to most Japanese today.

The life of a novice is a lonely one. He is a servant and slave to his seniors. Many young Japanese tried to make a life for themselves in that strange world, but found that its trials and tribulations were not for members of their affluent generation. Nisei youngsters came from the United States to try their luck and returned home defeated by the environment.

For Jesse, or Takamiyama, it was "total immersion" on a scale which even the institution that coined the phrase may not have imagined. Who knows what loneliness and bitterness he must have suffered? But if he ever lost his sense of humor, or his dignity, the public has never been aware of it. Patiently, he has worked to improve himself and in the process, he has won the respect and liking of sumo fans all over Japan.

In the tournament just ended, he fought as a "sanyaku" for the first time. This is a particularly high ranking, and Jesse is the first non-Oriental foreigner to go up so high in this traditional Japanese sport. In winning a majority of his bouts, he proved that his "komusubi" listing was no fluke. By dint of hard training, Jesse had finally overcome a weakness in his underpinnings; he has learned not to lose his balance.

A top sumo commentator has suggested that other wrestlers should make him their model for diligent training and has predicted Jesse will go even further up the sumo ladder.

The important thing is that he has established a place for himself in the strange and difficult world of sumo. And in the process, he has made a lasting impression on the Japanese—and we can be as cynical and as snide as any other people—with his character and demeanor. He is a credit to the people of Hawaii and the United States.

#### THE MADISON AVENUE APPROACH TO VIETNAM

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the administration will go to just about any length to sell its Vietnam policies to the American people, and particularly to our young people. Its latest ploy, probably dreamed up by a J. Walter Thompson alumnus on the Nixon staff, was to appoint Apollo 11 astronaut Col. Michael Collins as Assistant Secretary of State with the assignment to convince youthful dissenters that they are wrong.

This appointment is a terrible injustice to Colonel Collins, an insult to the intelligence of our young people, and just plain bad political strategy. It may still be possible for sports heroes to sell breakfast cereals, automobiles, and shaving cream, but in taking foreign policy to America's college and university campuses, it is the policy that counts, not the package.

The President was absolutely correct when he said at his news conference this week that the best way to approach young people is to treat them as adults. It is unfortunate that he did not keep that in mind when some creative genius on his staff came up with the idea of using Colonel Collins.

A perceptive editorial on the subject appeared in a recent edition of Patent Trader newspaper, in Mount Kisco, N.Y. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and to those at the White House who may think of the Vietnam issue as something other than an advertising campaign.

#### THE WRONG APPOINTMENT

The Nixon administration's latest move to handle dissent about the war in Vietnam indicates that the President and his advisers are ready to try any strategy except the one that would work: recognizing the merit of the opposition and taking steps to conciliate it.

Instead, this time, the President has drafted an authentic space hero, Col. Michael Collins, to "sell" the administration's viewpoint about the war to the nation's youth.

The effort would be ludicrous if it were not so dismaying. For his new assignment, Col. Collins, who admits to total inexperience in public affairs, has been nominated as Assistant Secretary of State for them. In his first television appearance, he charged the dissenters with a "simplistic approach" to the conflict, saying that "in many of their minds Hanoi is good, Saigon is bad." This is about as simplistic an analysis of the basic of opposition to the war as could be formulated. It is hardly likely to carry weight with a youthful dissenter whose knowledge of the origins and progress of the conflict would seem far broader than Col. Collins' own.

The dismaying aspect of the appointment is the utter lack of understanding it reveals about the makeup of millions of concerned, patriotic Americans, young and old. President Nixon ought to know that opposition arising from conscience, expressed by citizens whose interest is in seeing their country live up to its own noble principles, will not go away because an astronaut says that the war is just. To suggest that it will is to insult the intelligence and the depth of conviction of the dissenters.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION FOR  
UNLAWFUL ACTSHON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN  
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of discussion in recent months has revolved around the issue of preventive detention for those most likely to engage in unlawful acts. In this connection, I am including as a part of my remarks a guest editorial which appeared in the Clarion Ledger of Jackson, Miss., on December 6, 1969. The editorial originally appeared in the Richmond News-Leader. I recommend this to my colleagues' attention as I believe it expresses the opinions of a great majority of our citizens who are tired of criminals being turned loose by lenient judges.

The editorial follows:

## WHILE FREE ON PROBATION

Some of the talk these days around Capitol Hill centers on the thorny question of preventive detention. Is it constitutional to deprive a suspected criminal of his liberty until he can be tried when probable doubt exists that he will commit no more crimes before his trial? Or is the right of society to be protected from further criminal acts the overriding consideration? It is an issue on which reasonably minded men can disagree.

Perhaps those who doubt the need for preventive detention, pending trial, of suspected criminals might want to study a textbook case of what can happen without preventive detention. This case was headlined on the front page of the Washington Post last week. It involves a 30-year-old unemployed truck driver, Walter C. Powell, who was charged last week with a third count of murder within a six-month period. (On the same day, incidentally, the Post carried six ads for truck drivers in its help-wanted columns.)

In May, Powell was arrested and charged with robbery, but the case was not prosecuted. On June 18, a 28-year-old woman was shot to death in her Washington apartment. On June 30, Powell appeared before a U.S. District Court Judge to be sentenced on a conviction of attempted auto theft last year. The judge placed Powell on probation for three years.

Then on August 25, an elderly man was shot to death as he ran from a robbery attempt. The next day, Powell was charged with murder, not for the killing the day before, but in the June 18 case. Bail was set at \$10,000 at first; Powell could not raise this amount. His lawyer petitioned for a reduction in bail, and the judge complied, setting it at \$5,000 with the stipulation that, if \$500 could be put in cash, Powell could be released. A friend of Powell's posted the \$500, and Powell went free, after being in jail one week.

In September, a judge conducting a preliminary hearing into the June 18 slaying concluded that the charge against Powell in the June 18 slaying was justified. He recommended that Powell's bond be increased, but he had no authority to increase it himself. Powell stayed free.

On Nov. 3, a grand jury instructed Powell to appear for arraignment on the charge of murder in the Aug. 25 killing. He didn't show up, and a warrant for his arrest was issued. On Nov. 15, a 42-year-old man was killed by a robber who entered his apartment. On Nov. 19, police arrested Powell and charged him with murder in this most recent slaying. He now is being held without bond.

So during a six-month period, Powell managed to rack up three charges of murder, two of them committed while on probation for another crime. Even the most determined opponent of preventive detention should be able to learn something from this case, and the many others like it that have occurred in the nation's capital. If they refuse to believe that preventive detention has any positive factors at all, it says a great deal more about their sympathy for criminal suspects than about their concern for society's right to protect itself from being further victimized.

EDGAR ALLEN POE

HON. F. EDWARD HEBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, during my 29 years in the House I have had the opportunity to insert many items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but none has given me more pleasure or satisfaction than the article I insert today.

It is a well-deserved tribute to an old and dear friend of many, many years, Edgar Allen Poe, correspondent for the Times-Picayune in New Orleans. The article, written by Mr. Craddock Goins, a longtime friend and colleague of Ed Poe, traces Poe's journalistic history.

Poe's experience runs the gamut of the journalism world, from Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana to the Nation's Capital. He has been in Washington for 22 years, and is one of the most respected and most reliable newsmen—a giant among pygmies—in Washington journalism circles.

At a time when the press has come under severe criticism, and I feel justly so, Ed Poe stands in exile from the group to whom the criticism is directed.

Ed Poe is one of those rare creatures in the newspaper business who knows the subject about which he writes, gets both sides of the story, and whose end result is an objective presentation.

The greatest tribute to Ed Poe, I believe, is the fact that I have never met a man who did not like him. He is a living example that Leo Durocher's adage, "Nice guys finish last," is not 100-percent correct.

I could go on for hours talking about Ed Poe, whom I have known since we both worked on New Orleans newspapers more than 30 years ago. But the article speaks for itself, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Times-Picayune, Dec. 6, 1969]

POE'S CAREER IS LIVING PROOF NICE GUYS  
DON'T FINISH LAST

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This being the Christmas season, publication of a newsmen's rhapsody about a fellow newspaperman (particularly when the latter happens to be our favorite Washington correspondent) seems in order. Mr. Goins has known Mr. Poe in New Orleans, in Jackson and in Washington when both were writing news in those cities.)

(By Craddock Goins)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps no paper has had superior capital coverage more consistently in this century than The New Orleans Times-Picayune. That is believed by many who have known the late Paul Wootton and the unas-

suming chap who now walks his beat—once Edgar Allen Poe.

In his 22 years here Poe has been up front where the action is and the pressure runs high. He lists himself on the press-gallery roster as Edgar Poe, refers to himself as plain Ed and leaves the thought that he is just another Poe boy trying to get along.

Poe had to walk high and fast to match Wootton's strides. That spectacular man had kept pace with the period's public giants, including founding fathers of the National Press Club and the prestigious Gridiron Club, to rate high favor in the White House. Wootton was probably the only newsman to achieve family-friend status with the presidency. That was won by his empathy for a child in tears. This child had fallen in front of her parents apartment. As Wootton helped her up, she said her name was Margaret and "my father—boo hoo—is Senator Troo—boo hoo hoo—Trooman!"

Wootton's kindness to Margaret was so appreciated that Truman's ear was always ready when he needed information not available elsewhere. The Times-Picayune had status position on the executive's reading table.

## NICEST MAN

Before going to Washington, in 1947, Edgar Poe served in The Times-Picayune's Mississippi bureau. Ten years in Jackson won him esteem for integrity and graciousness. Baton Rouge columnist Jack Gould described him in these words:

"Edgar Allen Poe was once described by my wife as 'the nicest man I ever met.' She's right. It was a privilege to work with Ed in New Orleans, Baton Rouge and Jackson, and see him help others, particularly other newsmen. He is a man of his word, a great reporter and as respected in Washington as he was there."

Mississippi's Secretary of State Heber Lader backs that thought: "It is appropriate that you do a profile on my longtime personal friend Edgar Poe. I am glad to have the opportunity to endorse his contributions in journalism to our state, the South and the nation. Ed exemplifies the highest ideals, always sticking to truth and fact, refusing to take statements out of context to mislead the public. He reports objectively without inflicting injury."

Poe is a member of the Gridiron Club, treasurer of the White House Correspondents Association and a past president of the Washington group of Sigma Delta Chi, a journalistic body.

As a member of the Senate and House Standing Committee of Correspondents governing admission to the galleries, Poe resisted a step to bar Soviet Russia's Tass correspondent in respect for America's free-speech traditions.

## FAIRNESS, ACCURACY

Two senators who have known Poe from early days are Mississippi's James O. Eastland and Louisiana's Allen J. Ellender. Ellender knew Poe from stormy days when the Senator was speaker of the Louisiana House of Representatives and believes he is "a credit to journalism, very personable, trustworthy and, unlike some Washington commentators, is not prone to exaggerate. His reputation is based upon close attention to facts. He views thorny problems incisively while presenting an objective view."

Senator Eastland could recall Poe's record from early Mississippi days: "Ed Poe is one of the finer newspapermen in Washington. He had the ability to dig out stories where other reporters often miss them. You can count on him to make an in-depth treatment of any story. His reputation for fairness and accuracy is unequalled. I am proud to call Ed my friend."

A Poe story that drew admiration from Georgia's Senator Herman Talmadge was a review of Senator Ellender's long public career. In asking for unanimous consent to

have that story published in The Congressional Record, Talmadge said: "One of the most respected newsmen in the nation's capitol is Edgar Allen Poe. He writes with balance and insight and is a credit to New Orleans and the South."

Louisiana's Senator Russell Long believes Poe is "one of the fairest, most conscientious men I have ever known. He has a tough job and he does it well. He has the ability to write and the ability to convey, an asset very important to the American republic. Ed is truly outstanding."

#### WAR CORRESPONDENT

One knowing Poe longest is Louisiana's First District Rep. F. Edward Hébert. He remembers when Poe was a local staffer on The Times-Picayune while Hébert was a New Orleans States deskman. "Ed Poe is one of the nicest guys I ever met," he said. "His compassion is something foreign to many newshounds. He is a mixture of good and accurate reporting and human understanding. Will Rogers said, 'I never met a man I didn't like.' Edgar could say he never met a man who didn't like him."

A tribute that touched Poe very much was never intended for publication. He received it in May, 1968, from Mrs. Ruth Lloyd Miller of Jennings, La. Congratulating him for an award from Alabama University "for outstanding political and legislative reporting," she added "a belated thank-you for something you did for me 23 years ago. It was your radio message from the USS Mississippi in Tokyo Bay that brought the first word that my husband, who had been missing, was alive."

Poe had taken time out from his Mississippi bureau assignment to be a war correspondent. He steamed from Okinawa to Tokyo Bay to cover the Japanese surrender on the USS Missouri. His Pacific reporting won commendation from Navy Secretary James Forrestal.

Poe joined The Times-Picayune in 1930 after experience on a Birmingham newspaper. In his Deep South days, he covered historic political events: the campaigns of the Longs, Theodore G. Bilbo, Pat Harrison, Hugh L. White, Martin Sennett Conner, Jimmy Morrison, Dudley LeBlanc and others. He was born in Jasper, Ala., first met printer's ink on The Mountain Eagle, a weekly edited by his grandfather, James R. Gunter. He is married to the former Frances Margaret Harwood. They have two sons, Edgar A. Jr., of Washington and Thomas L., of McLean, Va.

#### MISSISSIPPI ADMITTED TO THE UNION 152 YEARS AGO TODAY

### HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the House's attention that today is the 152d anniversary of the admission of the State of Mississippi to the Union.

During that period of time, Mississippi has made many substantial contributions to America. Her sons and daughters have enriched the heritage of our generation and have added to the illustrious history of our great Nation.

The citizens of Mississippi, just as those of other States, pride themselves in being patriotic Americans, grateful for the freedoms and opportunities unknown in other nations around the globe.

Mississippians have had their moments

of glory and despair, neither of which swayed us from our desire of attending to the individual needs of our neighbor and the collective needs of society as a whole.

As we go into the last third of the 20th century, Mississippi looks forward to the challenges ahead with confidence and optimism. Whatever the future holds, Mississippi and Mississippians have the resourcefulness to overcome any adversity and retain their proud stand beside all true Americans.

Mississippi's natural and human resources are the greener pastures of our era. Its economic future is unbounded and I applaud the energetic efforts of my fellow citizens who are determined that Mississippi will continue its remarkable progress.

#### VIEWS ON ECONOMIC TRENDS

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks I have given serious thought to conversation and correspondence I have had with Mr. William D. Partridge, a widely-known economist, who serves as editorial director of Economic Inequities, concerning his views on the economic trends in this Nation.

Although I do not agree with all of his conclusions, I have pointed out to Mr. Partridge that I am hopeful the "silent majority" will become an "aroused majority" as the result of citizens like him who have spoken out about the economic plight of this country and he feels that an economic collapse is a possibility.

Mr. Partridge comes to me highly recommended and his opinions on this most important subject are intriguing and enlightening. He is most certainly dedicated to his views and is concerned with helping solve our economic inequities.

For these purposes, I would urge that copies of my correspondence to him and his correspondence to me, in addition to an article he wrote which appeared in the Knoxville Journal, one of Tennessee's most outstanding daily newspapers, on April 21, 1969, be made available to the readers of the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., December 2, 1969.

Mr. WILLIAM D. PARTRIDGE,  
Editorial Director, Economic Inequities,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARTRIDGE: I appreciate your allowing me a copy of your letter to Mr. Jerry Robbins, along with your article entitled "Inverted Colonies' America's Invention."

This editorial from the August 21, 1969, issue of the Knoxville Journal is outstanding and of great interest to me. I think you are correct in that the productive powers of America's economy are being destroyed by the eight classes of inverted colonialism which you have outlined.

I am hopeful that the "silent majority" will become an "aroused majority" as a result of those individuals like you who speak out about the socio-economic surrender which is taking place—this trend must be turned around in order to get our nation's economy back on its feet.

Your writing me is deeply appreciated, and please feel free to do so at any time.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

#### ECONOMIC INEQUITIES,

Washington, D.C., December 6, 1969.

HON. JAMES H. QUILLEN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUILLEN: Thank you for your letter of December 2, in which you express the hope that the "silent majority" will become an "aroused majority." You say, too, that the "socioeconomic surrender which is taking place must be turned around in order to get our nation's economy back on its feet." In many respects, your first statement is the general case for the existence of this Book-in-the-making Economic Inequities, and your second statement is the economic position this Book supports with unfashionable bare-bone analysis.

Being an interim reader of Economic Inequities, you know that one of the Book's many deliberate intentions is to halt the promiscuous expenditures of public funds on measures that boast plausibility but have no support whatsoever from plain economic logic.

This unabashed position, which is realistic in terms of getting a job done out in the open, precludes any do-gooding tax-exempt status for the Book. If "noble causes" cannot stand up in the free, business marketplace, then they are not worthy of support other than as conscience-relieving outlets. While 100% of the Book's profits do go to American colleges and universities, Economic Inequities is still very much a business-for-profit affair. The Book does not hide behind the skirts of any permissive tax laws or foundation fantasies.

This Book, you and I, want to rid our people of poverty—and this is not the usual lip-service—but there is a definite limit to what our economy can afford. It is economic madness to believe that we can give away economic goods and services that are needed to produce an ever-greater amount of economic goods and services, which ever-greater amount will enable us actually to increase social welfare on a pure increased-productivity basis.

In other words, it's as simple as the old, old saying, "You can't eat your seed corn." Nations that eat seed corn are dying Nations.

I try to make this clear in the Article from Tennessee, which was published in the Knoxville Journal. The Tennessee Article, one of fifty Articles in the Book Economic Inequities, spells out social appeasement in economic terms. This hurts on all fronts attacked. A reading of the eight or nine inverted colonies now devouring our treasures, as delineated in the Tennessee Article, would cause some to label the Book "conservative," and others to brand it "liberal." The Book is neither, for economic logic knows no color in the sociopolitical spectrum. Economic logic runs through the whole spectrum, glaring the "tilt" light whenever alleged humanitarians—in the form of greedy institutional or intellectual pressure groups—start shaming those who actually with their own hands have earned the round steak, instant mashed potatoes, and television sets portrayed as everybody's "natural rights."

Money chases high interest, and this is one of two major reasons why the stock market is on the skids, and why it won't get off the skids without crashing into the sub-basement. Stock dividends (which are interest) in a profit-shrinking economy cannot compete for shareholders against skyrocketing interest-rates elsewhere. Inflation itself is not the reason for a continued destruction of common-stock prices. The "worthlessness of it all" is a major reason.

The other major reason people are leav-

ing the stock market is plain fright and disenchantment with permissiveness in Vietnam, in mushrooming welfare, inflation, milktoast liberalism, and in everything else on the massive, across-the-board, giveaway philosophy of life now rampant in America.

Ours is a paper economy living on the sawdust of its own mills. In 1968, public and private new total indebtedness went up \$132 Billion over the amount owed in 1967. And in that same period the Gross National Product went up only \$32 Billion in corrected prices. Where's the missing \$100 Billion? In the sawdust, of course.

A third reason for the stock-market collapse is to "get cash" to pay some of the past-due \$132 Billion borrowed in 1968.

Who with the facts and in his right mind can say this is anything but economic disease in a trance-like society? Nobody, unless he is an ostrich or a weasel or an inexperienced in unearned trappings.

Inflation, like economic employment, is composed of several or many different elements. The Government is doing nothing more than withdrawing from the inflation molecule only a single element—pure money. It is not even touching the related element of purchasing-power credit!

Professor Arthur F. Burns, the new Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, tells the Tax Foundation (of all people!) that "civilian programs are the preponderant cause of the growth of the federal budget." Here is a whopping cause of inflation—the maldistribution of unearned income at its capital best. The U.S. is increasing this distribution instead of contracting it down to a size commensurate with pure increased productivity.

Inflation and economic employment are socio-economic phenomena that cannot be treated as iron or oxygen the way we treat and measure elements in the physical sciences. But that is how our fine-trappings "experts" in Washington and in many name-brand universities treat social problems. This is "the stuff dilettantes are made of."

Inflation will be either (1) destroyed by financial collapse or (2) forced to recede to zero after, and only after, we comprehend those elements in its non-monetary inner structure. There is no other exit off the present collision course.

The U.S. today is practicing permissiveness all across the podium of social endeavor. If we continue this appeasement—and that's just what it is—then tragic economic disorder is inevitable. Unlike 1929-1933, this time socioracial upheaval will be a direct consequence of severe economic disorder.

Even though the economic bin is truly empty, way-of-life welfarists, both black and white, won't believe it, cannot believe it. You wouldn't understand, and I wouldn't understand, if our nurtured way-of-life rejected it out of inborn, spoon-fed habit.

Must we put our hard-won political and economic freedoms on the block simply and only because we cannot admit to gross intellectual error? Congressman Quillen, our ego, ir. plain fact, is our worst enemy.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,  
Editorial Director, *Economic Inequities*.

[From the Knoxville Journal, Aug. 21, 1969]

"INVERTED COLONIES" AMERICA'S INVENTION  
(By William D. Partridge)

Inverted colonialism is a new twist in social trends and economic suicide. It could be invented only in America.

England for centuries lived high on the hog because hard-working colonials shipped choice cuts to London, where merchants distributed the goodies to all the nonworking landed gentry.

Mother Country was in the business of "Let's you and him work."

Economic wealth produced by toiling hands and natural resources overseas created

banks at home, large retail houses, insurance companies, and, of course, a domestic political power that protected and enhanced its own economic life.

Today in the United States definite classes of people are developing into their own Little Mother Countries that may well live off the economic production of the working citizens of the same nation that houses the inverted colonies.

Social welfare in its many traditional forms is not expanding naturally. Is not in step with increased "economic" production per capita, but is snow-balling under the guidance of an upside down invisible hand called organized effort.

Anything "economic," indeed, implies it is earned, as well as "bought and paid for."

This intelligent organized effort is working both sides of the street—on the side of the mass recipients as well as on the side of politicians, conscience-stricken businessmen, social scientists with manufactured wisdom, and push-button economists who fine-tune anything not nailed down.

At least eight definite classes of inverted colonialism are destroying the productive powers of America's Whole Economy. They are:

1. Military and space programs of super-nationalistic goals and proportions. Realistic nationalistic goals are quite necessary—but not those based on this vanity of being sheriff to the world.

2. Foreign commitments of men, money, and machinery of like proportions.

3. A social-welfare inner nation that reproduces itself automatically in ever larger numbers.

4. The rising Black Economic Thrust, based on unearned capital acquisition camouflaged by legislated security and phony government interest rates.

5. The easy-credit customers who multiply like rabbits.

6. The agricultural and unemployment non-political lobbies that prey on the innocent for easy funds. These two predatory forces form a single colony in concept because they are based mainly on the motivation of something for nothing. Their economic positions are not even plausible, and their social positions are completely sterile. The other seven inverted colonies do attempt an economic, social, or political justification.

7. The deep trough of sums given to higher education for maladministration and consumption by self-styled research centers, self-styled students who belong either in vocational schools or in manufacturing plants—not liberal arts factories—and entire new academic cities to house the whole "business" of imagined genius.

8. The balloon-like government services at all municipal, state, and federal levels.

Not one of the eight inverted colonies contributes anything to the common bin of economic or productive goods and services. Each takes away huge globs of real wealth in the form of sterile expenditures that die as soon as made.

Every year, for instance, the national net private indebtedness increases at a faster rate than the total population. This in itself illustrates the national check-kiting philosophy behind all eight inverted colonies. This alone would cause classical inflation.

Honest men of national political prominence declare our huge Gross National Product proves we can support all the social luxuries of utopia. But they don't know that the total dollar value of the GNP does not represent the total goods and services available for distribution to the eight inverted colonies.

These eight bottomless pits of economic expenditures are counted at the GNP payment window as part of the very GNP advertised as our economic bank account. This is nutty.

Each of the eight inverted colonies has a

powerful and aggressive political voice that screams "social need" and "economic richness." The increasing mechanization of men's minds and living habits prevents the human structure of the producing economy from fighting back.

The result is that the original economy of abundance is now becoming the central economy of scarcity, while the inverted colonies temporarily become fat, defiant, and certainly imperialistic.

When the last kited check shows up for payment, the eight colonies here at home will become more defiant and demanding. Then things may get nasty.

It has happened before in other nations at other times in other manners. It need not happen in America, if we only determine to put back what we take out of the economic capacity to produce.

This is easier said than done.

REMARKS OF HON. CATHERINE MAY  
AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE  
ON FOOD, NUTRITION, AND  
HEALTH

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent speech made by Hon. CATHERINE MAY on December 4 at the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health:

HON. CATHERINE MAY, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FOOD, NUTRITION, AND HEALTH, DECEMBER 4, 1969

It is a great honor for me to address you at this, and last plenary session of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health. You have met here in response to a dramatic challenge—participation in the building of a sound and workable response to the stark fact that hunger and malnutrition indeed exist in the midst of the most prosperous society the world has ever known.

From this Conference, and government, business and private citizen efforts to put its recommendations into effect, will come, I believe, a massive dedication to doing what must be done to eliminate want in our land of plenty. And from it will come a reaffirmation of a most fundamental American right—the Right to Eat—and a resolve to make this Right a reality for all of our citizens.

On May sixth of this year, President Nixon sent a message to Congress outlining the dimensions of your challenge. At that time, the President said, "We have long thought of America as the most bounteous of nations. In our conquest of the most elemental of human needs, we have set a standard that is a wonder and aspiration for the rest of the world. . . . So accustomed are most of us to a full and balanced diet that, until recently, we have thought of hunger and malnutrition as problems only in far less fortunate countries."

The President went on to point out that, "We have awakened to the distressing fact that despite our material abundance and agricultural wealth, many Americans suffer from malnutrition. . . . That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable."

And it was in that same message to Congress that the President announced that he would call this Conference.

Seven months have elapsed since the day that this Conference was first proposed. During that time, Dr. Jean Mayer has done an

outstanding job of assembling experts from every corner of this land. Twenty-six separate panels of these experts have met to consider every conceivable aspect of improved nutrition. These panelists have given up weekends and summer vacations to put together the recommendations that you have reviewed and considered.

Equally important is the work that you have done in evaluating these recommendations in the light of your own knowledge and experience. This has been an enormous effort and a commendable one, and you should all be proud of your work.

Because of the hard work of all of you, this Conference is indicative of the urgency of the problems of hunger and malnutrition in our land.

And if it is good that we have taken the time to meet and deliberate, what is needed now is something more—what is needed now is a commitment on the part of all of us to act.

Certainly we in Congress have a clear duty to act. It was in recognition of this duty that 37 of my colleagues and I introduced H.R. 12222, the Food Stamp reform legislation requested by President Nixon. And, recommendations of this Conference will, I can assure you, receive prompt Congressional attention as part of our commitment to action.

And the President has a commitment to action as well. While he is still waiting and pressing for food stamp reforms, he has taken steps to expand the present Food Stamp Program as far as possible within the scope of the present law.

And I am sure that each of you here is committed to eliminating hunger and malnutrition—if you were not, you would not be here.

But the elimination of hunger and malnutrition requires a greater effort than you or I or the President, with all the best intentions in the world, can make. Because, ultimately, good nutrition requires the interest and participation of every American, wherever he or she may be.

This afternoon I would like to discuss with you the significance of this Conference to the consumer—to housewives and husbands, to the poor and the not so poor.

Each Conference panel considered a separate aspect of one question: How can Americans obtain and consume the food that best meets their own personal and family needs? The conclusions and recommendations of these panels often overlap and occasionally even conflict. But there are certain common themes that run through all of these recommendations.

One point on which there is virtual unanimity is that if you are poor it is almost impossible to be well fed. Another is that even Americans with adequate incomes can improve their nutritional status. And, finally, many of the panel recommendations point to the existence of a nutritional knowledge gap that has been created by indifference and inattention.

If we are going to look at the impact of these recommendations on the consumer, we should start with a clear understanding of the consumer we have in mind. Let me explain.

There are two consumers in each of us. One is the adventurer, seeking out products and services that are newer . . . better . . . brighter . . . bigger. It is the adventurer part of each of us that wants a more advanced color television set, a purple convertible with racing stripes, and new, exotic and exciting foods. This adventurer—perhaps even radical—side of each of us even has a motto: "Down with the old, up with the new—whatever it is."

But there is a second consumer within everyone as well. That second consumer is the traditionalists—square, straight, and nonswinging—and speaks with the voice of

caution and restraint. This is the consumer in each of us that looks for balance and value in life, and good health and nutrition in food, no matter how new and exciting in other respects.

This Conference has been designed to serve both of these consumer personalities—to point the way to better, more convenient, more nutritious, more available foods and diets.

But, while many of the recommendations of this Conference suggest changes in many aspects of our food system and in our own nutritional lives, I think it is important to remember at the same time that the system as it stands today is the most productive, efficient and available that the world has ever known.

I say this because there is a tendency sometimes among all of us to feel that since some changes in certain areas may result in a net "good," what existed before was necessarily "bad." This is not the case with many of the issues that came before the Conference, and as we go back to our homes and our jobs to translate this Conference into action, I hope it will be accomplished within the framework of the presentation of alternatives, and not the presentation of absolutes.

I say this because we need to recognize that there is no "typical" consumer in this diverse society of ours, and what is good for one consumer may be very much the opposite for another. As a result, it is vital to build and preserve a system that will present enough alternatives to adequately serve the wants and needs of this diversity.

As this Conference has so wisely acknowledged, efficient and pervasive as our commercial food production and distribution system is today, there are those within this diverse society of ours whom it does not and probably cannot fully serve—at least alone. An obvious example is those of the poor who are not receiving the benefits of the Food Stamp Program. Perhaps less obvious, but in many ways equally beyond the reach of our commercial food distribution system today are the aged and sick—especially in rural areas—the blind, and many others who have, for no fault of their own, been washed ashore from the mainstream of American life.

Partnership efforts have been proposed during this Conference to bring these people into the commercial system—or to bring the commercial system to them in some cases—and this is a fine approach.

In the past, a different approach has been used.

For more than 30 years, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been distributing the surpluses of our farms to the needy. Today, such direct commodity distribution systems are operating in more than 1,100 counties.

But such a system has its drawbacks, no matter how well motivated. As both domestic and international demands on our food supply grow, fewer and fewer foods are actually in surplus. And if man cannot live by bread alone, living on flour, cornmeal and lard isn't a big step forward.

But even if a government-operated system of food distribution could provide the variety or quality that is found in a local supermarket—which it cannot—there is still a better way. For living on government-donated foods often results in the further isolation of the poor from the rest of society, furthering the feelings of despair and personal inconsequence that our national pride should refuse to accept in any American citizen.

The recommendations of this Conference support the Administration's decision to phase out commodity distribution over a period of time in favor of the Food Stamp Program. With food stamps, poor families can use the commercial food distribution

system—the corner store and the supermarket—that is used by their fellow citizens. This is the better way, not only in terms of a more varied and satisfying diet, but in terms of pride and self-esteem as well for those of our consumers who are poor.

The best way to improve the nutritional status of low income groups is to give them the means for purchasing a nutritionally adequate diet. The Food Stamp reform legislation being considered in the House of Representatives will provide every American family with enough Food Stamps to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet, at a cost not to exceed 30 percent of income. It will provide free Food Stamps for the very poorest families and will allow simultaneous operation of Food Stamp and commodity distribution programs where local communities believe that is appropriate. If all of our citizens are indeed to have the Right to Eat, these are essential beginnings. But they are only beginnings—both in terms of better nutrition and health, and in terms of a better life as well.

For while food is life's first essential and should have priority over assistance for other needs, we must look to the day when the poor can have the kind of cash assistance that will allow them a decent minimum standard of living.

We have made a start toward an adequate system of income maintenance that will replace the self-defeating and self-perpetuating welfare programs that have been with us for far too long. The President's Family Assistance proposal will provide the poor with the cash that allows them to choose, in the market place, between different products and services. And equally important, Family Assistance will eliminate the discriminations in the present welfare programs against the father who stays with his wife, and against those who are willing to work.

In reviewing the recommendations of the various panels, I find broad agreement that Food Stamps, like commodity distribution, should be an interim measure as we move toward broad and meaningful welfare reform.

While all here agree on the need for helping consumers who are poor improve their nutritional status, the recommendations of this Conference are equally important for the great mass of Americans who do not live in poverty. This is a vital point, for, as we all know, the fact that a family can obtain an adequate diet does not mean that it will.

Studies have shown that nearly two-thirds of the poor may be deficient in one or more vital nutrients. This must be eliminated, but it is at least understandable. Less understandable, but in no way less serious, is the fact that the same studies show that more than a third of those with incomes over \$10,000 also show nutrient deficiencies.

While the greatest single factor in improving the nutrition of the poor is providing the means to purchase an adequate diet, obviously, more than money is needed to assure that both the poor and the middle income person will be well nourished.

The recommendations of this Conference point the way toward better surveillance and evaluation of the nutritional status of the whole nation. With better data, we will know the location of problems such as iron deficiency or iodine deficiency before they become serious and extensive.

At the same time, better nutrition education is important to every consumer, for knowledge helps the consumer to purchase more wisely.

Product labeling is important. The consumer is not better protected because there is a mass of information on every package. The more that is there, the less readable it may be. But it is very important that foods be labeled meaningfully, and recommendations of this Conference suggests ways to

help the consumer to understand a food's nutritional worth at a glance.

I think the consumer will benefit because this Conference has pointed up a nutritional knowledge gap and demanded that it be closed.

The studies of Dr. Arnold Schaefer have shown how little we know about our national nutritional status. Dr. Schaefer has discovered evidence of dietary diseases that we thought that had been completely eliminated. And, yet, he is the first to point out that our problems of malnutrition are very different from those of starving Biafra. Only continuing study will allow us to know the extent of the problem we face and the effectiveness of our attempts to deal with it.

This Conference has also focused on the prevalence of misinformation about nutrition. We cannot afford a knowledge gap that leads to great concern about a relatively minor incidence of protein deficiency, while almost ignoring major and widespread iron deficiency. Until we close the nutritional knowledge gap, we cannot be safe from food fads and misinformation.

A large part of the reason for this knowledge gap is a lack of manpower to close it. We simply do not have the trained professional or para-professional personnel to provide adequate nutrition services or teaching.

And we find that the nutrition gap extends into our medical and dental schools where students receive almost no training in the relationships between nutrition and their patients' physical and dental health.

Yet, if this lack of manpower presents a serious problem as we get to the job of making sure all of our citizens eat well, it presents an opportunity as well.

For this is an area—as some of your panels have recognized—in which concerned citizens—volunteers—can work and make an enormous contribution. And it can be done now.

For example, I learned recently that there are more than 150,000 trained home economists in our country who are not now employed. Most are busy homemakers, but they can—and should—be mobilized to help.

Closing this nutritional knowledge gap is essential, because good nutrition and good health ultimately depend on the consumer making her own decisions and basing her judgments on the information and education she receives. It cannot be done in any other way.

The problems of hunger and malnutrition require action, not just discussion, and it is quite clear that the time for that action is now. As President Nixon pointed out in his May sixth message, "Something very like the honor of American democracy is at issue. . . . The moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time."

The President's commitment will require continuing follow-through within the Executive Branch, and he has indicated there will be no relaxation of effort on this front.

In answer to his request for a reformed and expanded Food Stamp Program, I pledge to the President that Congress will be responsive. I make this statement as a prime sponsor of the Administration's Food Stamp Bill. I make this statement as a Member of the House Committee on Agriculture, which is now working on that bill. I make this statement in the knowledge that there is strong by-partisan support in the House of Representatives for an improved Food Stamp Program.

I am confident our Committee will present a Food Stamp Bill that is adequately financed. It will contain vast improvements in getting food to the recipients more effectively and with less red tape.

In addition to the passage of Food Stamp Reform legislation, Congress must enact the welfare reform contained in the President's family assistance proposal, and move to es-

tablish the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future which he has proposed.

Congress must also provide the funds for better surveillance and evaluation of our nutritional status and for better protection of the public health and safety. But the Federal Government can't do it all.

Industry has a major role to play in improving traditional foods and continuing to develop new and better products. Much of this, of course, has already been done as processors and manufacturers have risen to the challenges before them. For example, the nation's millers and bakers have just launched a major effort to further enrich the bread and rolls we all eat.

Perhaps most important, we need—and I am sure we will get—a sense of mission and dedication from industry to the task of getting the job done—done well and done now.

But, in the final analysis, our progress depends on effective action at the local and community levels. We will never make significant progress toward the elimination of hunger and malnutrition in this country without the support and concern of Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public—without a full mobilization at the community level. And I mean the mayors, city and county officials, local organizations and service clubs, as well as individual private citizens. They are the ones who, if they will, can provide the greatest impetus to this national effort by identifying the problem areas within their communities, by determining the specific needs, and by doing what they can to see that those needs are met—in short, by committing themselves to deal with the problems immediately around them.

Ultimately, the consumer has the most important role of all to play and, given the means and the knowledge, the problems that face us today can be overcome.

We must not look at this Conference as the end, but only as the beginning.

We must take the fine work that has been done here and turn it into a positive force—a force that will assure for all time that the Right to Eat—and eat well—is one that is truly enjoyed by every American citizen.

#### JAMIE L. WHITTEN RECEIVES 4-H CLUB AWARD

### HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, years of devoted public service by a Member of the House of Representatives was given national recognition December 3, when my distinguished colleague, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, was awarded a 1969 4-H Alumni Recognition Key Award.

He was one of eight prominent men and women awarded this solid gold key at the recent 4-H congress in Chicago.

I am told that criteria for these awards, in addition to being 4-H Club alumni, include outstanding records of accomplishment in their chosen profession and also interest in youth, civic, church or school affairs, and active support of such activities.

Certainly Mr. WHITTEN is deserving of this award; we are all familiar with his continuing support of the 4-H movement in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee on Appropriations for Agri-

culture, where through the years his committee has recommended funds for the Extension Service, for 4-H Club work, and for such functions as school lunch program, soil conservation, rural electrification, loans for rural housing and waterworks, and for watershed and flood prevention programs.

I know that he and his office staff personally serve as hosts for 4-H groups visiting Washington.

Mr. WHITTEN has previously received a medal, authorized by Congress, for outstanding contributions to American agriculture. I am proud that the 4-H movement has seen fit to award him this latest honor, and am glad that it may be recorded in the proceedings of this Congress.

#### THE GENERAL ELECTRIC STRIKE

### HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the General Electric strike is now in its 7th week and has affected some 133,000 workers and the general public. It is most unfortunate this strike has lasted so long and continues during the Christmas season, depriving shoppers of the opportunity to purchase various General Electric products.

The Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the city council of Philadelphia has brought to my attention Resolution No. 187, which was adopted unanimously by the council on November 26, calling upon the General Electric Co. and the unions to immediately resume good faith collective bargaining. I am in hearty agreement with the resolution and wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### RESOLUTION No. 187

Calling upon the General Electric Company and the Unions representing its striking employees to immediately resume good faith and collective bargaining.

Whereas, The present strike of the employees of General Electric Company has interrupted the gainful employment of thousands of citizens of this community; and

Whereas, The continuation of this strike will have a substantial negative impact on the economic well-being of this community and all of its citizens; and

Whereas, It is essential that an early conclusion be reached in this strike, not only for the good of the employees involved and for the competitive position of General Electric Company, but also for the economic growth of this City; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we call upon the General Electric Company and the unions representing its striking employees to immediately resume good faith collective bargaining and to make every effort to reach an agreement that will be equitable to all concerned.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the management of the General Electric Company, and to the officers of the AFL-CIO unions representing the employees, as evidence of the sincere sentiments of this legislative body.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by

the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the twenty-sixth day of November, 1969.

Attest:

PAUL D'ORTONA,  
President of City Council.  
CHARLES H. SAWYER, JR.,  
Chief Clerk of the Council.

#### MILITARY JUSTICE COMMISSION

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am in the process of drafting a bill for the formation of a House committee to conduct an exhaustive study of the process of military justice and the practices prevalent therein.

In that regard, I read a very timely and appropriate article in the December 10 edition of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star. It was written by Frank Getlein and the entire text follows:

If on a whim or a dare, you should stick up your neighborhood bank and, through inexperience or bad luck, get caught, you would be tried, eventually, not by members of your family but by total strangers.

If, as the head of a giant electrical corporation, you engaged in a criminal conspiracy with your fellow giants to cheat the government and the public at large and, like your fellow criminal at the bankrobbing level, you, too, got caught, you, too, would assuredly be prosecuted and tried by strangers rather than by members of your own firm.

In general, we adhere in this country to the idea that the administration of justice should be in the hands of people unconnected with the people charged with crime. We take this so much for granted that we can't quite grasp that there are other systems. But there are other systems. But there were and there still are.

Medieval justice was almost always administered by the local landowner, including those cases in which he or his relatives were parties. Ecclesiastical courts were set up and still operate on the principle that accusations against an authority are judged by that authority.

There is only one place we Americans maintain that sort of justice—in the armed forces. It is high time we changed it.

The case at issue is the trial, next year, of Lt. Calley for his part in the alleged My Lai massacre and the investigative procedure—a kind of trial—of the earlier reports and non-reports of the massacre.

It is entirely possible that Calley will be found guilty and given some sort of sentence. What is out of the question is that the Army itself will be seriously investigated on such points as whether the indiscriminate shooting of civilians is widespread, whether anything in our military doctrine or military practice contributes to such a condition and whether there is something about the system of reporting in the Army that prevents higher echelons from hearing unpleasant truths from lower ones.

All of these are much more important to us, taxpayers and citizens and therefore the employers of the Army, than the specific behavior of Calley, and there is no chance at all of our finding out any shred of the truth on any of such points through normal military investigative and trial procedures.

Those procedures have come to public attention quite regularly in the last year or so and they leave a great deal to be desired.

The Pueblo inquiry apparently limited itself entirely to the question of whether the captain of the ship should have gone down fighting rather than have saved his life and the lives of his crew at the cost of embarrassment to the naval command. Unasked were such questions as whether he had, in fact, been ordered to violate North Korean waters and how on earth or sea his messages of alarm were sent on the astonishing ping-pong ball course they followed.

The Green Beret murder case was simply dropped, again with no real explanation of what happened—in our name and with our funds—and why and how it happened, let alone why it was all dropped back into oblivion.

Most recently the Army has announced blandly that while its own probe is continuing, it lacks sufficient congressional-developed evidence for prosecutions in the alleged graft in the operation of Army enlisted men's clubs. As against the Army's inability to come up with evidence, Sen. Abraham Ribicoff, in Senate hearings, uncovered "conflicts of interest, bribery, kickbacks, conspiracy and other criminal actions or violations of regulations."

After awhile, the citizen and taxpayer concludes that military trials and investigations exist primarily to place the blame for anything squarely on the shoulders of the lowest ranking officer or enlisted man available, to exonerate those with higher rank and to ignore the question of whether something about the military system permits, encourages or tacitly commands the crimes investigated.

That such results should flow from a system in which the institution investigates itself should surprise no one. The same things happen in ecclesiastical courts as a matter of course and the same thing happened in feudal courts.

The difference is that, nowadays at least, one can opt out of ecclesiastical justice and even in the olden times one could join a Peasants' Rebellion or a French Revolution.

But we cannot, alas, discharge our military servants. We must therefore, devise some way, probably through Congress, to find out what they do in our name and who is really to blame for the crimes and stupidities that so regularly come to light by accident.

C. B. DEANE

### HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, American political history will record the late former Congressman Charles B. Deane of North Carolina as a man whose principles were not subject to compromise under pressure.

While the chronology of our membership in the House denied me the privilege of serving with him, I met this distinguished gentleman several years ago and immediately joined the ranks of his admirers.

House Speaker McCORMACK, speaking in tribute, said of Mr. Deane:

He had an intense love of our country. He was a great American . . . possessed of deep faith and more so, of strong moral conviction and courage.

It has been more than a decade since Charles Deane concluded his service in Congress. Yet, he is remembered, while lesser men have been forgotten. Colleagues speak of his service reverently,

admirably, as if to suggest that in it is a legacy.

Always deeply involved in the affairs of his church, Charles Deane, a Baptist and a Democrat, blended the ingredients of religion and politics into a salve which he applied to the wounds of his fellow-men.

The Nation has reason to be grateful for the devoted service which this great citizen rendered both in and out of public office.

#### ADMINISTRATION'S RECORD IS ANTI-VETERAN; A DISMAL SHOWING

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, service to the veterans of our Nation, their widows, and children has been—and will continue to be—the hallmark of my service in the House. I will not let lapse the high premium placed on patriotic service in our military forces in time of war. As you know, I have introduced four bills this session to meet the pressing needs of veterans and their families who are being shortchanged by inflation and proposed administration budget cuts. The shocking indifference of the Nixon administration toward the plight of our veterans is revealed by the fact that it has virtually opposed or sought to delay every major, meaningful, vital veterans legislation introduced into Congress and that includes my measures, VFW, the magazine of the prestigious Veterans of Foreign Wars, has a timely article in its December issue detailing the administration's dismal showing toward veterans.

I include the following article from VFW in the RECORD at this point:

A DISMAL SHOWING—ADMINISTRATION'S RECORD IS ANTI-VETERAN

"Veterans' benefits programs have become more than a recognition for services performed in the past. They have become an investment in the future of the veteran and his country."

Those are the words uttered by President Richard M. Nixon on June 5, 1969, setting what was hoped would be the policy of his Administration toward veterans.

His expression gave encouragement to the thousands of veterans who wanted to believe that President Nixon was a man who understood their problems and would address himself to their solution for the welfare of the nation they had fought to defend and as the acknowledgement of their service by a grateful government and people.

Those words of President Nixon last June, less than six months after taking office, sounded just grand, didn't they?

But the sorry and dismal record of his Administration up to now has proved them to be nothing more than words, well-intentioned perhaps, but empty and meaningless when compared to his performance.

In the 11 months of its life, the Nixon Administration has opposed or asked that action be delayed on virtually every piece of major, meaningful, vital veterans legislation introduced into Congress.

One of the most glaring examples of the failure of President Nixon's utterances to match what he ultimately advocated is that

of increasing GI Bill training and education allowances.

The origin of that goes back to last June when President Nixon appointed a commission to study the needs of the returning Vietnam veteran, with special emphasis on his training and education.

An interim report of that commission recommended a 13% boost in subsistence payments and President Nixon implied he would veto anything higher.

The Senate, however, approved a 46% increase. The House voted a 27% hike in the allowance.

President Nixon's attitude toward raising the GI Bill allowance for student veterans is inconceivable in light of his oft repeated concern over the failure of veterans returning from Vietnam to take advantage of the GI Bill to increase their earning power.

Reams of documentation have been provided him demonstrating that one of the principal reasons the young men are not going back to school is that they simply cannot afford it on the basis of the inadequate allowances they would receive. As a result, they are losing a million dollars a day in benefits.

When President Nixon appointed the members of that commission, there was real concern that the Veterans Administration would be controlled not by Donald E. Johnson, a former national commander of the American Legion, named Veterans Administrator by President Nixon, but by Robert Finch, secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; or Patrick Moynihan, an urbanologist with pronounced leanings toward social planning, or Robert P. Mayo, director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Nothing has happened yet to dispel that fear and, except for a few pious pronouncements, Administrator Johnson has given little indication that he is anything more than a puppet dangling from the Bureau of the Budget's strings. The presence of men on that commission whose antipathy toward the VA and veterans benefits in general is well known gives further reason for concern that the VA will be strangled by the HEW octopus.

Further evidence of the Administration's anti-veteran stance is its refusal to permit correction of the deplorable state of many VA hospitals.

As early as last April—two months before the President uttered his noble phrases about veterans benefits—the Administration's bias began to emerge.

That was when the VA budget for the 1970 fiscal year was slashed by nearly \$90 million, \$78.5 million of it for hospital construction and medical operating expenses.

The House, however, restored nearly all the budget cuts in a move vital to the VA because of its increased workload resulting from the discharge of 75,000 young men each month, or a million a year, from the service, many of them in need of hospital care.

Since then, Administration antics would seem inspired by "Alice in Wonderland."

To appreciate just how ridiculous they have proved to be, it is necessary to review the events in sequence.

Former President Johnson's 1970 budget called for 4,000 new jobs in the VA's medical program, but President Nixon's revised budget in April lopped them off.

Then at his request, mind you, Congress restored these jobs. But President Nixon turned right around and cut them out again after signing the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1969.

Net result was not just the loss of 4,000 jobs, but 634 more.

Of these lost jobs, 378 were to have been assigned to VA staffs that handle education and other claims. At the same time that the Nixon Administration was cutting VA jobs

to the bone there was a backlog of 600,000 cases in VA regional offices.

Recently Rep. Henry Helstoski (N.J.), a member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, contrasted the expenditure of \$830,000 in federal funds to "refurbish" Air Force One, the Presidential plane, and "additional millions of federal money on the San Clemente summer retreat and Key Biscayne winter retreat" with the slashing of \$17 million from the VA for air conditioning of four veterans hospitals.

Because of the Administration negativism, VA facilities built and equipped in the past two years to meet the needs of returning veterans stand idle.

As Rep. Olin E. Teague (Texas), Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, told Congress last October:

"Here stands over \$20 million of modern medicine's most advanced technological equipment—installed and waiting—to perform life-saving and life-prolonging miracles for thousands of sick veterans who are suffering with kidney disease, heart disease, blindness and numerous other ailments which require intensive medical treatment."

These facilities total 828 in all parts of the country ranging from a \$592,605 intensive care unit in the Bronx to a \$1,675 speech pathology program in Oteen, N.C.

Despite the Administration's consistent negativism in the field of veterans legislation, Congress has passed much needed laws broadening the scope of legislation to include hundreds of thousands who are in dire straits.

How is it possible for anyone to oppose a measure to let service-disabled veterans stay in nursing homes for nine months instead of six, if there is a need? This Administration is against such a bill now in the Senate.

Can you imagine anyone being against more money in these inflationary times for widows and children of men killed in the service? This Administration was.

Why would anyone object to providing VA medical service for the non-service-connected disabilities of a totally service-disabled veteran? The Administration did.

In spite of Administration obstructionism, Congress passed both of these bills.

Realizing that the representatives of the people were unwilling to submit to Administration dictation when the public interest was involved, President Nixon signed the two into law.

There you have it, the record of the Nixon Administration to date.

It is one that reveals shocking indifference on the part of Administrator Johnson and the Administration to the plight of the millions of men who answered their nation's call willingly, even eagerly, only to face on their return home a callousness from the Administration rarely equalled in this nation's history.

The veterans deserve and have every reason to expect better than this from an Administration pledged to their welfare.

#### IS THE NEWS SLANTED?

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AGNEW recently made certain comments about biased news coverage. After reading a story in this morning's Washington Post which quoted the speech of the Vice President before the American Farm Bureau Federation, I would have to agree. No one could really have said

the statement attributed to the Vice President.

After all, he could not have criticized the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, for attempting to provide the average taxpayer with a modest increase in his dependency exemption, while Mr. AGNEW strongly defended the farm subsidy program and criticized those Senators who opposed such increases in the farm subsidies. The Vice President could not have meant that an increase in dependency exemption of \$200 to the average taxpayer was inflationary while the yearly subsidy payment of \$3,010,042 to the Boswell Farm of Corcoran, Calif., was not.

#### THE FIRST TUESDAY

### HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress witnessed the NBC documentary on their show "The First Tuesday" which was aired December 2, 1969. I appreciate it is not easy to depict both sides of the situation, but in order that Members do not obtain the impression that there is only one side to the problem of Indian integration, I insert a letter written to the National Broadcasting Co., by Ramon A. Roubideaux, an Indian lawyer living at Fort Pierre, S. Dak. Mr. Roubideaux is a highly successful lawyer and one of the top criminal defense lawyers in our State. The letter, which should be of interest to all Members, is as follows:

DEAR TONY: I saw the documentary on the Thomas White Hawk case in your "First Tuesday Show" over NBC on December 2, 1969. It very effectively revealed to the American public the poverty-stricken conditions on our Indian Reservations. The report was effective in this regard.

However, the report was disappointing in many respects. It failed to place the blame for these sub-standard conditions where it belongs, on the shoulders of the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Although the report did not specifically say so, it seemed to accuse South Dakotans by implication of discrimination and ill treatment of Indian people. This is not true and contrary to the facts. After one recovered from initial shock at these appalling conditions, one's reaction would be to support increased appropriations and activity by the very system which has failed so miserably in the past. Your report was particularly misleading and distorted because of the following truths:

1. The State of South Dakota has no responsibility whatsoever for the care of Indian people or the administration of their affairs. This is a Federal responsibility.

2. The Baxter Berry case was misrepresented. Berry was acquitted on the grounds of self defense by a jury after entering a plea of not guilty. Thomas White Hawk plead guilty to premeditated murder against the advice of his counsel. The fact the one was a white man and the other Indian was, in my opinion, immaterial.

3. Indians, as a whole, receive equal if not preferential treatment in our state courts. I speak from 20 years of experience.

4. The few cases of discrimination which occur today are the result of economic conditions and not racial status.

December 11, 1969

5. Our relations with our white neighbors may have received a severe setback because of these unfair charges.

6. Jail conditions at White River, South Dakota, while bad, must be endured by both white and Indian prisoners.

I felt very uneasy that a cold-blooded killer like White Hawk should be selected to dramatize conditions on our reservations. The failure to properly treat and diagnose his mental troubles is a situation shared in this state by both white and Indian defendants. I would think that most of our Indian and white citizens in this great state would be perhaps indignant with your unfair report. Perhaps you can do better in the future.

On this same subject is a portion of a copy of a letter from Charles R. Hogue, news director of KWYR radio station in Winner, S. Dak.:

I am referring to a segment of the NBC program, "The First Tuesday in December", seen on December 2, 1969. The program dealt with the life of a convicted murderer, Thomas James White Hawk. The program, although acknowledging that the facts pointed to his guilt, was a play on the emotions of the nation for a boy brought up in poverty and neglect. Scenes in the program showed only the worst possible conditions which unfortunately do exist on the Rosebud Reservation. However, the program left the impression that nothing has been done to help the American Indian in the past 200 years.

Omitted from the program were any scenes of the 4.5 million dollar school complex at Mission, South Dakota. There were no shots of the modern Rosebud Public Health Service Hospital at Rosebud. There were no pictures of the hundreds of transitional or Rosebud "400" houses that have been built at a cost of from four to eight thousand dollars each. There was no mention of the industry that has been brought to the Rosebud Reservation to provide jobs for the Indian people. There was no mention of the legal services provided for members of the Sioux Tribe.

In essence what was left was the impression that the area and the nation is standing by and doing absolutely nothing to help these people. I would be the first to admit that many of the programs have not been handled properly and that much needs to be done. But wouldn't it have been fair for the program to have shown the people that programs are underway to see that the Thomas James White Hawk incident is not repeated.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would insert three paragraphs from a letter by attorney Don Bierle of Yankton addressed to the National Broadcasting Co. of which I was provided with a copy. The paragraphs are as follows:

However, the presentation above referred to was not based on fact and was so prejudiced and biased that it unfairly and most tragically misrepresented what is in fact the truth. In my opinion the National Broadcasting Company betrayed every principle of its responsibility to the American public and violated every reason why the news media should be given the right and privilege of non-censorship in the presentation of its material.

The personnel who produced this show, through the inaccuracy of the information presented and the spectacular manner in which it was done demonstrated their complete incompetence and utter lack of knowledge about the Indian problem. In using the Thomas White Hawk case, which in the first instance is not even a proper foundation upon which to base presentation of Indian problems, the National Broadcasting personnel were inept and presented a most distorted picture of South Dakota and in particular completely missed the point in its approach to the problem.

I personally wish to invite NBC to South Dakota to present another documentary on the Indian problem and we will be most happy to cooperate in every respect in giving you complete access to any area of the state you wish to investigate and to any people you might wish to interview. You may wish to spend more time here than most poli-

ticians who seem to uncover answers to most problems within a few hours of visitation.

#### INDEPENDENCE DAY IN TANZANIA

**HON. ADAM C. POWELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 11, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the United Republic of Tanzania celebrates the eighth anniversary of the independence of Tanganyika, one of its two constituent states. Tanganyika and the island of Zanzibar joined together to form Tanzania in 1964. Tanganyika—now Tanzania—since its independence has assumed a role of leadership among its sister African republics. The President of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, has been an outspoken African nationalist. Tanzania has also been a leader in promoting the cause of African unity.

Yet, although Tanzania has looked outward, more significantly it has looked inward and developed a realistic appraisal of its own problems and prospects. President Nyerere's Arusha Declaration in which he declared a policy of self-reliance as Tanzania's ideology for development has become a benchmark in the history of African development. Following President Nyerere's lead many African nations have adopted a policy of setting more realistic development goals in terms of their needs, assets, and prospects for external assistance.

Thus, I call upon my colleagues to join with me in wishing Tanzania a prosperous and peaceful future and in saluting that nation on this important national holiday.

