

H.R. 8729. A bill for the relief of John Sellars Lyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8730. A bill for the relief of Youssef Faraj Mann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8731. A bill for the relief of Esmeralda Antonia Ramirez y Pena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8732. A bill for the relief of Luigi Viekoslav Pirjavec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8733. A bill for the relief of John Alexander Staine and his wife, Georgiana Melba Staine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 8734. A bill for the relief of Herman F. LeDoyt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8735. A bill for the relief of Umberto Maccaroni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8736. A bill for the relief of Doris Isabelle Robotham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 8737. A bill for the relief of Carmela Toschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 8738. A bill for the relief of Mateo M. Arce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

75. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Art Brown, Flint, Mich., relative to religion in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

76. Also, petition of Mr. James K. Kelly, Lansing, Kans., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

77. Also, petition of Eugene Lynch, Oakland, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXPLOSIVE GROWTH OF THE AIRLINES

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps no other major industry in our country has the problems of explosive growth as those faced by the airlines. Consider, for example, that over the past 10 years—since the first U.S. jet flight—air travel has grown more than 16 times faster than the population and more than twice as fast as the gross national product. This exceptional growth has not been without serious problems, particularly airport-airways congestion which resulted in some massive air traffic jams last summer at several of our major airports.

I do not believe that any airline official is more concerned about this crisis in air transportation than Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., the distinguished president of TWA. Through his initial efforts, the airlines and the Government are moving toward a solution to this complex problem which involves varied interests.

Mr. Tillinghast talked about the overall problem on a recent evening in Chicago before members of the Economic Club of Chicago. I believe that Senators will find his analysis of the problem most informative and thought provoking. More important he has suggested steps for immediate action to relieve air congestion.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tillinghast's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

AIRWAYS OF THE FUTURE

(Address by Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr.)

For the invitation to address you this evening I am complimented and grateful. It is a pleasant experience to be here though it is an appearance not to be taken lightly. The distinguished traditions of the Chicago Economic Club and your position in our nation as a listening post and valuable source of opinions command the respect of any speaker. Also, no city has been more deeply involved in transportation, or benefited so much from it, as yours.

In the middle of the last century when your ancestors decided to make railroads available to Chicago, they didn't quibble. Ten thousand miles of track were laid in

nine short years. The benefits that accrued to Chicago from its fabulous railroad network are with you yet. Similarly from the beginnings of commercial aviation, Chicagoans have been air-minded. With the opening of Midway Airport in 1931, Chicago swiftly built a reputation in the air to match her reputation for primacy on the ground. You led with airport development in anticipation of the jet era, and with the advent of O'Hare in 1955 continued to perpetuate your distinction of having the world's busiest airport. Your municipal officials have developed a reputation for progressiveness and foresight in this area.

No city stands to gain more from its airways to the rest of the world in the Seventies and Eighties than does Chicago. And no city has greater reason to be concerned about the problems facing air transport today. So if I address myself to some of the current problems and opportunities of air transportation, we should, at least, find ourselves on a ground of common interest.

That the airline industry has a few problems should come as no surprise to you. The explosive growth that has seen U.S. air travel grow 16 and a half times faster than the population and two and a half times faster than the gross national product in the decade since the introduction of jets, has given us our share of problems—economic, financial and political. We have been alternately the hope and despair of the investment community, the sinew of commerce and industry and the frustrator of carefully laid plans, the symbol of romantic travel to exotic places, and the disturber of the peace.

One could talk at length to any of these subjects and occupy an evening—or at least so much thereof as would be meaningful after so bountiful a repast. But I propose this evening to focus on just two matters which are currently the subject of governmental consideration in Washington and with respect to which major policy decisions must be made in the coming months. These issues are first, the improvement of our airways and airports system, and second, the maintenance of the United States' position as a purveyor of advanced technology to the world, with special reference to supersonic transport.

Many of us fly between New York and Chicago where there are flights with ample capacity every half-hour from morn till night. Some of you undoubtedly fly on the hour, but, personally, I prefer to fly on the half-hour and therefore fly TWA. In any event, those who experience this abundant service under good conditions may wonder whether there are any very basic problems that a little better management could not solve. But those who have looked deeply into the situation know that things aren't that simple.

At the moment, 38 airlines are involved in the process of attempting to ration by agreement a maximum of 115 movements per hour at O'Hare. The agonies of this exercise

speak eloquently of the seriousness of the problem and the diversity of viewpoints. If there were any doubts as to this seriousness and diversity, they should be quickly dispelled by the loud cries of complaint from general aviation interests at the mere idea of controls on the use of airports.

The whole problem is confused somewhat by the multiplicity of voices in and about our industry. A great many interests are involved and most are aware that the stakes in 1969 are very high. Few of these voices are bashful. Most solutions that make sense involve disappointment to somebody, somewhere. It is an era when we understand the significance of the poet's words: "What you are shouts so loud I can't hear what you say." As President Nixon said in his inaugural address, "America has suffered from a fever of words." He couldn't have phrased it better for the aviation industry.

One who speaks for commercial aviation today, for example, has a hard time being heard by one who speaks for general aviation, or so-called private flying. One who speaks for a new airport site has a hard time being heard by the nearby landowner.

But let us move back a step or two this evening and see if we cannot look at the subject with some degree of objectivity:

Last summer we saw at Chicago, New York and Washington, and at times at other cities, a series of massive air traffic snarls that shook many people out of their complacency. Congestion drove home, as no one previously had been able to do, the realization that we have a major problem. The fact that the problem of 1968 was due in large measure to the culmination of what is basically a labor problem between the flight controllers and FAA is of relatively little moment, for had there not been a controller's slowdown the other factors bearing on this problem would have presented us with this gigantic traffic jam in 1969 or 1970 or 1971. And indeed, the failure of our federal government to provide a complement of controllers adequate to the demands of the system is quite symptomatic of the basic problem.

The basic problem is not one that has developed out of thin air. It has been quite apparent in the distance to any of us—commercial airlines, general aviation, federal government and local government—to any one who cared to stop and really listen. During the 10 years of the jet age, concerned elements in industry and government have been shouting warnings and appeals to each other, but few of the elements have really listened. And so we have found ourselves making extensive and expensive studies and calling out the results to the other fellow like characters in a dream, whispering for help in voices that no one hears.

I hardly need to labor the point that paralysis of our air transport system is economically and socially undesirable. From our standpoint, it has contributed to a sharp

increase in airline costs—helping to make current airline profits fit the phrase "Downstairs at the Upstairs." It has had its impact on the commerce of business centers like New York and Chicago. Business people simply are by-passing these cities where possible to avoid the congestion. And it should be emphasized that not all the congestion is in the air. At busy times, getting the traveler to and from the airport can be as frustrating as getting him out of the air. Those of you who have had to negotiate your way to O'Hare on a busy evening know whereof I speak.

What are the basic problems to which we should be directing our attention? What needs to be done to relieve the jam and permit air transportation to move ahead? Of course, the problems are diverse, and do not admit of a single answer. In my judgment developing a series of large new commercial airports does not represent the most important or immediate solution. To be sure, we are going to need new airports over the years—particularly to serve general aviation—but the development of new commercial airports is not as pressing as a number of other steps. Needs which strike me as equally or more immediate are:

First, provision of an adequate and well-trained corps of flight controllers;

Second, achievement of technological improvements to our airways system;

Third, increasing substantially the reliability of the present system;

Fourth, maximizing the capacity of existing commercial airports.

Fifth, achievement of a better separation of commercial and general aviation;

And sixth, provision of better means of ingress to and egress from our airports.

The need to beef up our corps of controllers has been obvious for some time. Unfortunately, adding adequate air controllers in good times lacked sufficient political sex appeal to obtain the necessary appropriations. By trying to stretch too far the limited staff in existence, the FAA generated a major labor problem of which it is not yet rid. There is growing acceptance of the fact that more people and more money are needed, and one must hope that this need will not again be lost sight of in the political jungles of Washington.

Although it will not come in time to eliminate the immediate need for more controllers, technology can, over a period of time, lighten the controllers' load and increase the capacity of the airways system. Relatively short-term improvements, such as improved radar now under contract, will help, but a more basic look at automating the system needs to be taken. Our present system was designed about 20 years ago, and a fundamental re-design unquestionably could yield important dividends within the next decade. With an energetic program, it is conceivable that the capacity of the air traffic control system in areas such as Chicago could be increased by 30 to 50 percent by 1975.

Of equal or greater importance in the short term is increasing the reliability of our present air traffic control system. Few people realize to what extent air traffic delays are due to breakdowns in the present system. Radars go out, Instrument Landing Systems fail, communications equipment breaks down. When this happens, controllers revert to procedures which will work without these vital aids, with the result that traffic flow is drastically reduced. In November 1967, under the auspices of the Air Transport Association of America, the airlines monitored delays in the New York area for the purpose of identifying their causes and of taking corrective action. One of the principal causes of delay was the failure of ATC equipment, such as radar. So one important task is to build redundancy and reliability into this equipment so that as a

whole the system will rarely fail. This is quite feasible and can be done quickly if we have sufficient resolve and money. To date these have not been forthcoming to the extent required.

Likewise, we have not done all that we might to maximize the capacity of the major airports of the country by adding or enlarging runways and providing better landing aids. If this were done, construction of large new commercial airports in many cities could be avoided or substantially delayed.

Of course, all these solutions take money, and lots of it. Where will this come from? Of the three major elements of aviation, only one—commercial aviation—today pays the share of airways costs fairly attributable to it. This comes from you, our customers, in the form of a five-percent excise tax on airline tickets. General aviation pays only a small portion of the costs attributable to it; and the military, of course, pays nothing. So the major part of airways costs comes out of the general revenues of the government.

I express no opinion as to whether general aviation's share of these costs should be borne by the general public or by general aviation. Suffice it to say that commercial aviation is quite prepared to pay its fair share of these costs and is prepared to see these costs increased. It is the only way that we can move ahead. And I would urge you as citizens to push for—indeed to demand—these improvements, for they are vital to us all.

Having touched on general aviation, let me digress briefly to say a few things about it. First, I regard general aviation not only as a fact of life but as a desirable fact of life. Most of us in commercial air transport would not wish to see it go away, even if somehow we could endow ourselves with the power to banish it.

General aviation is very diverse. It ranges all the way from the rancher flying over the plains in lonely solitude to the sophisticated corporate jet flying between New York and Chicago. What is applicable to one part of general aviation is not necessarily applicable to other parts. As a consequence, broad statements about general aviation are apt to be inaccurate with respect to some part of that group.

Despite the risks of partial inaccuracy, however, I would urge that, with respect to both our airways systems and our airports, we need to provide—if I may use a somewhat discredited term—separate but equal facilities insofar as it is feasible to do so. The highly sophisticated commercial airways of the future will require high skill and terribly expensive gear in the cockpit. Much of general aviation will be able to supply neither. Optimum use of our airways and our major airports will require disciplined and experienced pilots familiar with prescribed procedures. Major points of congestion are no place for Sunday fliers to be wandering around.

So an important objective should be to achieve, insofar as practical, a separation between commercial and general aviation, so that each can operate in an environment best adapted to its needs.

The controversy which revolves around general aviation use of our major airports, such as O'Hare, is of course a lively one. Commercial air transport, pointing out that it has assumed full responsibility for the net costs of operating the airport and, in fact, does pay 99 percent of the costs after concession income, feels that it should have first call on these expensive facilities. General aviation understandably resents any threat to exclude it. Voices become more strident, and nobody really hears what the other fellow is saying.

For myself, I strongly affirm general aviation's right to adequate and convenient facilities. I recognize that a part of general

aviation has special reasons to go to airports like O'Hare and the competence to do so. However, I would urge this community to be energetic in providing a string of general aviation airports designed to serve that segment of aviation well and to relieve the pressure on general aviation to use the major commercial airports.

Large commercial airports are frightfully expensive. It is estimated that a third Chicago airport would cost between 500 million and a billion dollars. A satisfactory general aviation airport could be built for a fraction of that cost—perhaps in the area of one-tenth as much. The land required, including buffer zones to protect against noise, would be only 10 to 15 percent of that needed for the third Chicago airport. Because of fewer noise and other political problems, general aviation airports can be located closer to concentrations of population and thus more nearly at points of maximum convenience.

Were we to take the steps I've outlined and, in addition, expand the runway capacity of some of them, the present network of commercial airports could be made to do quite satisfactorily for longer than many suppose. In this regard we will be helped by technological advances with respect to aircraft. For we are on the threshold of the era of the superjets—the Boeing 747, the Lockheed 1011 and the Douglas DC-10. This year, TWA will be flying the first of its 747s—bigger, faster, quieter and more comfortable than today's ships. With a capacity of more than 350 passengers, each of these new ships will move three times as many passengers as the standard domestic 707 or DC-8 of today. Two years later, the DC-10 and the 1011 will come along, each with a capacity of more than 250.

We can quite reasonably expect that much of the doubling of traffic expected in the next five or six years can be handled in congested areas by a sharp increase in the capacity of the average aircraft. In relation to traffic volume, there will be fewer aircraft for controllers to control, fewer landings and take-offs, fewer voices to and from the tower, and fewer gates needed at terminal buildings. Add to these larger aircraft some technical improvement in our airways system, added runway capacity on the ground, somewhat higher load factors than those being experienced today, and an adequate and adequately motivated staff of controllers, and one can see daylight for perhaps another 10 years.

This glimpse of daylight will disappear, however, if general aviation, which now numbers 50 times as many aircraft as the scheduled airlines and the movements of which are growing at a rate of about fourteen percent a year, has no choice but to press in on the major commercial airports. If this happens, there will be no alternative to a continuation of the distasteful rationing with which we are struggling today at O'Hare, the New York airports and Washington National. A number of other major airports are approaching this condition. One should not be surprised to see them rationed too if we do not have the resolve to lick these problems.

Nor should the chance of muddling through for another decade blind us to the need to be planning now for the decade of the Eighties. It is but a question of time when Chicago, like a number of other cities, will need another major commercial airport. Establishing such a facility—with its requirement for as many as 10-thousand acres—is a tremendous political, financial and logistical undertaking. A major city which postpones it runs the risk of finding itself in the position of my own community, New York, where the gravest doubt exists as to whether it is politically possible to establish an airport

close enough to centers of population meaningfully to be a fourth New York airport.

In the course of urging that we intensify our efforts to get more out of our present airports, I have omitted one very large problem—and that is how to get all these people to and from the airport to their homes, their hotels and their businesses. If the airlines can move two or three times as many passengers in and out of O'Hare, can your local transportation system handle them? Or will you get, as we are getting at Kennedy airport, to the point where saturation of the local traffic system is such that at peak traffic times a veritable paralysis occurs.

The problem of airport traffic is, of course, just one facet of the traffic problems of our cities. And traffic is but one of a number of serious municipal problems. The techniques for handling airport traffic exist; the hitch is that these are expensive and must compete with politically more urgent problems. But a city such as Chicago which aspires to remain a crossroads of industry and commerce, of science, education and culture, had better keep its arteries open to the flow of its life blood. I come from a city which is developing arteriosclerosis. I urge you not to let it happen here.

Now if I may shift into an even higher gear, I should like to talk briefly about another controversial subject—supersonic transportation. In the last year or so, the progress of supersonic transportation has not moved ahead smoothly. The first flight of the Concorde was roughly a year late. Although the Concorde has now taken to the air, the program is not without serious problems and its first commercial service is still years away.

The U.S. supersonic transport program appears to be lagging even more than the Concorde. The original program envisioned commercial services by mid-1974. Now, 1977 or later, seems more plausible. Having abandoned its original design, Boeing has come up with a new, more realistic approach and one which may well lead to the development of a fully suitable vehicle. But achievement of this goal will not be easy. Development of viable supersonic transportation requires advancing the state of the art in a number of significant areas, such as structure, propulsion and aerodynamics. And to accomplish this it is necessary that there be uninterrupted and well-conceived research and development efforts, because design state-of-the-art barriers will best yield to steady and unrelenting pressures.

Only the Russians appear to have been making conspicuous progress in the SST field, and how good their ship is we really do not know. Historically they have not excelled in producing efficient commercial transports, and their SST may prove to be no exception. But the Russians' ability to master areas to which they give priority, such as space technology, has been sufficiently proved that it would be folly to proceed on the assumption that they are destined to fail at the task. After all, it appears that the Russians will have years to perfect their design before we can hope to compete with them. In all probability our first commercial SST will have to compete with a second-generation Soviet product.

As you know, this country's supersonic program is the object of considerable criticism. It is denounced as a waste of money that would better be spent on socially more desirable projects. People decry the alleged nuisance and danger of supersonic travel and assert there is no real demand for it.

I do not propose this evening to debate these points in detail. Suffice it to say that there is no factual basis for characterizing supersonic travel either as dangerous or as lacking in popularity. It should be as safe

as ordinary flight, and I have not the slightest doubt of its popularity.

Every new and faster mode of transportation from the steamboat to the steam engine to the automobile to the airplane has been decried as dangerous and unwanted. Not too long ago, critics were insisting that there was no demand for the speed produced by today's jets. But without exception, the new, faster transportation has carried the day, and so it will when the supersonic commercial airplane is here. I would have not the slightest doubt that 95 percent of those here in this room tonight will, when it is available, select it for overseas business trips.

From a selfish airline point of view, we already have more than enough expensive capital projects, and the last thing we need is another. You probably could get the airlines to vote to banish SSTs if you could figure out how to accomplish this. We might prohibit any plane having the capability of flying at supersonic speeds from landing in the United States. But if we were to do this, we would have to find some means of sealing off Canada and Mexico, for we would be very unhappy to see our overseas traffic funneled through these countries to the benefit of their carriers and their economies. Even if we could get them to go along, what would we do about Africa, Asia, Europe and the far reaches of the Pacific? In the interests of our balance of payments and our own competitive postures as carriers, I doubt that we would wish to forfeit these markets.

Personally, I doubt that we can effectively decree that technological progress shall stand still. Rather, a more realistic philosophy is that what is technically and economically possible will be done, and we had better be prepared to do it.

One hardly needs to labor the point that the United States has a serious balance-of-payments problem. Despite figures designed to put our foot forward, we also have a most serious balance-of-trade problem. If one excludes the merchandise we have given away in our various aid programs, we had a net unfavorable balance of 3.4 billion dollars in 1968—this despite a favorable balance of 2.6 billion dollars with respect to aviation and aerospace products. Over the last decade, again excluding giveaways, our net favorable trade balance was 11.3 billion dollars. Net exports of aviation and aerospace products during this decade reached 16.4 billion dollars. Simple arithmetic shows that without America's enormous aviation export business, our total U. S. balance of trade would have suffered a 5:1 billion dollar deficit.

We have come to the point that our production costs are now so high that America has lost many of her export markets. We are losing more every day. We have become increasingly dependent on highly technical products like data processing equipment and aviation devices—and at the other extreme, on agricultural products produced by the world's most advanced agricultural technology. If we let these markets go, we will be in trouble, indeed. Our defenses of the dollar will crumble fast.

So as a concerned citizen, I come to the conclusion that we simply cannot afford to default the era of supersonics to other countries. We dare not give the Russians an exclusive instrument with which they can control and determine the trade routes of the future. While technology often does not progress smoothly and in accordance with some pre-determined schedule, as evidenced by the U.S. supersonic program to date, we must see to it that, when the day of extensive supersonic travel arrives, U.S. aircraft lead the way—just as the Boeings, the Douglasses and the Lockheeds have set the

pace in more than three decades of world aviation.

Both of the issues to which I have addressed myself obviously are essentially political in nature. As such they will respond to the concern—or lack of concern—of those affected by them. To my mind, a community such as this—with its great history of leadership in transportation and trade—cannot avoid involvement. After all, it is your future that's at stake. I have no doubt that what you have to say will be heard, whether you speak with the voice of positive assertion or the voice of silence. So I commend to you the most careful consideration of these issues, the better to enable you to discharge the high responsibility that attaches to those who comprise so august a body as the Economic Club in so great a city as Chicago.

A RESPONSIBLE NEW APPROACH TO EDUCATION

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the March 3 issue of the Washington Star contained a most enlightening article by the respected columnist, David Lawrence. In it, Mr. Lawrence summarized the key points made by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch, in a recent in-depth interview with the staff of a leading national news magazine.

As one of many Americans who has been concerned with the nature of the Federal Government's education policies over the past 8 years, I find Secretary Finch's intelligent, responsible approach to education refreshing and promising.

Judging from his statements, and from discussions held with him, Secretary Finch will concentrate on increasing educational opportunities for all through building more and better schools, attracting top-level talent, and cooperating with, rather than quarreling with, responsible State educators.

This is a welcome change from 8 years of Federal pressure for busing, cross-zoning, and other sociological schemes forced through at the expenses of orderly progress and improved education. Because of its importance and timeliness, I offer Mr. Lawrence's article for inclusion in the RECORD:

FINCH CLARIFIES SCHOOL GUIDELINES

(By David Lawrence)

The new Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, has just given the clearest and most informative comments available thus far from an authoritative source on the problems with which the superintendents of public school districts throughout the country have been struggling. He explains, for instance, the real difference between such words as "discrimination," "segregation" and "integration."

The "guidelines" issued by the previous administration caused much consternation because they apparently were somewhat in conflict with the warning laid down by Congress that federal funds must not be used "to correct racial imbalance." In a copyrighted interview, conducted by members of the staff of U.S. News & World Report and

published this week, comprehensive answers on many significant questions were given by Mr. Finch. He said in part:

"It is clear that when you withhold funds where there is a dual school system—with some all-white schools and some all-black—then it is the Negro schools that are going to suffer in the allocation of state and local funds. . . .

"I'm convinced that we just can't work with raw percentages and say: 'You've got to have the same percentage of blacks and whites in every school.' You go into parts of Chicago and Harlem and Pasadena, Calif., into Washington, D.C., and you find all-black situations. It's totally artificial to insist on busing school children if it may be detrimental to the level of education.

"The greatest problem we've got in the elementary and secondary schools in the country is not to get so hung up on these other struggles as to let the quality of education in the public school system erode and erode and erode. . . .

"The Supreme Court has never really said that segregation itself is unlawful—or at least de facto segregation. The court has said: If you commit deliberate acts of discrimination, then you are in violation of the law. . . .

"We're reviewing the guidelines now. We will still carry out the intent of Congress and whatever the interpretation of the Supreme Court is and will continue to be, so that we're more responsive and realistic in terms of what is happening to education. . . .

"I don't believe in a 50 percent figure, or 20 percent, or any other arbitrary figure. We have to look at each school district, with its own profile and its own 'chemistry.' We can't just take arbitrary percentages and still come out with quality education—however each of us may define 'quality education.' . . .

"If I were making a judgment as superintendent and I were convinced that the white faculty in that particular instance was capable of doing a better job of school teaching, well, then I—for one—would stay with the white faculty. And I don't think that, because the student body is overwhelmingly black, there has to be an arbitrary number of black faculty members."

Mr. Finch doesn't favor arbitrary percentages for the number of white or black faculty members in a school. He says that if 20 percent were insisted on, for example, it would be found in certain sections of the country that the best Negro teachers have gone elsewhere and hence an order to hire just any Negro teachers would hardly improve the quality of education.

"I intend," says Secretary Finch, "to put education first, in trying to maintain the quality of these school systems."

The secretary doesn't specifically criticize the "guidelines" and interpretations of these officials who handled these matters for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the preceding administration. But he indicates plainly that the confusion that has arisen is not confined just to one section of the country. He implies that there has been a widespread misinterpretation of what the federal government can do under existing law and Supreme Court decisions.

Many of the citizens in various school districts have been bewildered by the viewpoint of "compliance officers" sent out by government bureaus as contrasted with that of professional educators. What the new secretary has just discussed so frankly and at great length doubtless will be studied carefully by the citizens groups as well as school authorities in all parts of the country. For he has made a constructive start toward the solution of a difficult problem that is certainly not going to be solved overnight.

THE 119TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THOMAS MASARYK

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the spark of democracy and freedom in east-central Europe has not been extinguished. Czechoslovakia's hopes for achieving an ultimate goal of mutual cooperation with the West were snuffed out momentarily on August 20 of last year, when the Warsaw Pact troops, led by the Soviet Union, invaded Czechoslovakia in a surprise attack, and set out to crush Dubcek's reform regime. But the ideas and example of the nation's founder and first president, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, continue to inspire the Czechs as they fight to save something of their hard-won freedoms. March 7 marked the 119th anniversary of the birth of this philosopher, patriot, and first President of the republic.

Born out of serfdom, he learned the trade of village blacksmith. From this humble background, he later grew to be one of the finest intellects of the century, a graduate of the University of Vienna and then for a time a university professor.

His abilities as an educator were manifested in his open and fair treatment of pupils, as he analyzed their problems frankly and fearlessly. That was indeed revolutionary in 1880.

But his sense of duty drove him from the university campus to the public arena of politics in 1891, where he served 12 years in the Austrian Parliament, taking active part in its deliberations, contending for political improvement of his country, and vigorously advocating political autonomy for it. At that time the Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia were a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, as was Slovakia. But the hunger for their own national independence was strong.

With the collapse of Russia in 1917, Masaryk showed great courage and leadership in guiding the Czechoslovak legions 10,000 miles across Siberia to the Pacific, to join the fighting on the Franco-German front against Austria-Hungary and the Central Powers as a prelude to their claim for postwar independence.

At the beginning of World War I, Masaryk himself had escaped to Paris and in January 1916, formed the Czechoslovakian Council in conjunction with Dr. Eduard Benes. In 1918 he came to America to win the support of President Wilson. Recognition as Czechoslovakia's legitimate representative came from France, Britain, and the United States later that same year. At the age of 63, Thomas Masaryk, after a lifelong fight for independence, was elected the first President of the new republic. He served faithfully for 17 years.

Thus, on March 7, the anniversary of his birthday, we celebrate his eternal vigilance in the great cause of freedom.

SENATOR GOLDWATER IS BACK ON THE JOB

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the memorable events of the 91st Congress is the return to Capitol Hill of BARRY M. GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

After a distinguished career in the U.S. Senate, Senator GOLDWATER was the Republican presidential candidate in 1964.

After a 4-year absence from Capitol Hill, we are now fortunate to have this man of deep courage and conviction back to lend his abilities and experience to the Congress.

Veteran Capitol Hill correspondent Ben Cole, of the Indianapolis Star and the Arizona Republic, has written a story concerning the return of BARRY GOLDWATER, and Ben has done his usual fine job.

All of us who have been pleased by Senator GOLDWATER's return thoroughly enjoyed Ben's story and I offer it for the RECORD so that the entire Congress can read this wonderful tribute to a great Senator by Ben Cole.

The article follows:

INTERMISSION OVER IN WASHINGTON—GOLDWATER BACK ON JOB IN SENATE

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Coming back to the U.S. Senate after a four-year absence, says Sen. Barry M. Goldwater, was like returning to a place after the intermission.

"Some of the characters are different in a few places, but the scene is the same and the plot goes on," he grins from behind his big flat-top desk.

By general agreement of people who spend their lives watching senators, the gentleman from Arizona wears the toga more easily and naturally than just about anybody.

"He is one of the few people in history who truly loves being a senator," observes Richard Harkness, a long-time newsman.

Goldwater's staff is running smoothly, the way it used to do before he went away to make a try for the presidency.

He is four years older—60 now—and his famous gray hair is a little whiter and a trifle thinner, but otherwise he is the same; more relaxed, though.

He used to keep up a furious pace of speechmaking in the old days, "popping around the country," as he put it raising money for the Republican Party. He feels, now, that he has done his share—3,000 speeches and \$6.5 million—and he chooses speaking dates according to his own wishes. He likes talking with young people.

"Look at this schedule," he says, picking up a fat sheaf of Xerox sheets. "It looks formidable, but it's not," and he ticks off the time he has blocked out for going where he chooses and saying what he pleases. It's an old Goldwater custom.

His staff keeps busy with requests from Arizonans for help with this and that problem of government relations.

"None say they used to take their problems to Carl Hayden, but, of course, we get a lot of his old requests," he said.

Joe Gonzales, a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee staff, gets Goldwater's praise for helping out with back-

ground on some of the continuing problems of the state.

"Gonzales is a great guy," Goldwater says, "a good man." Joe came from Tucson as part of the Hayden patronage hierarchy and has remained to become a senior Democratic staffer on Hayden's old committee.

Reflecting on Hayden and the old-timers, Goldwater's recollection pauses briefly at the remembrance of the late Henry Fountain Ashurst.

"I have the only tape recording of his voice," Goldwater says, adding that he also has perhaps the best collection extant of flowery Ashurst speeches.

"If the central casting office had ever sent out looking for a guy who looked like a senator, it would have picked Ashurst first thing," Goldwater recalls with a smile. Ashurst was one of Arizona's first senators, serving from statehood in 1912 until his defeat in 1940.

Goldwater's legislative goals in this, his return engagement in the Senate, are concerned with Arizona affairs. He has a close eye on legislation to improve Indian education, pointing out that the Indians themselves should be consulted about their needs. He expects to put his shoulder to the wheel for the Central Arizona Project—"All of us will be working on that." And he is seeking to expand the Grand Canyon National Park's boundaries to take in Marble Canyon.

Arizona's delegation of four Republicans and one Democrat meets each Thursday. Goldwater thinks the arrangement for weekly meetings is great.

"Now we can exchange news and help each other with problems for the benefit of the state," he says.

In national legislation, Goldwater is concentrating on military affairs. His elation at being allowed to return to the Armed Services Committee is nearly indescribable. And he is enthusiastic about being placed on the preparedness subcommittee.

He expects to confer often with President Nixon.

"Nixon wants me to visit him regularly," Goldwater says, adding quickly that it is not simply because of his former presidential candidacy.

"I have no burning ambition," he says, "I've had all the honors given me that a man could have."

He is gratified at the decision of his son, Barry Jr., to run for Congress in California. Young Barry consulted with his dad beforehand and confided that the Goldwater name was some help but it was a handicap, too. "Change it to something else then," advised Barry Sr., with typical aplomb, but his son quickly protested that he couldn't do that—he would simply have to wear the Goldwater name and earn his own reputation.

The senior Goldwaters are settling into Washington life again. Barry is turning down invitations to many social events on grounds he wants to spend time with his wife.

But Peggy Goldwater, it turns out, likes embassy parties, and the senator finds himself squiring her to about one each week.

But Goldwater himself looks like a man at home. For him, the Senate is a wonderful place.

the world's largest collegiate service organization.

During this year, Circle K International has adopted a special emphasis program which is called Concern: Disadvantaged Youth. Through this program, Circle K, located on 750 college campuses, will be working in the communities in which they are located to enhance the lives of the communities' less fortunate young people.

Florida's 10th District is equally proud of the many Circle K clubs located there, with active and growing membership. I would like to take this opportunity to salute the work of these young people and to call to your attention again the constructive efforts made by individuals who refuse to turn over to the Government responsibility and concern for disadvantaged youth.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RELATIVE TO PROHIBITION OF ADVERTISING OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS ON RADIO AND TELEVISION

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the South Carolina House of Representatives has passed a resolution urging Congress to take such action as is necessary to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from prohibiting the advertising of tobacco products on radio and television. Tobacco is of tremendous importance to the economy of South Carolina, and it is the feeling of the members of the house of representatives that the prohibition of advertising of tobacco products involves a tremendous extension and possible misuse of governmental power.

Mr. President, many questions remain unanswered concerning tobacco and its possible effects on health. Until these questions are resolved, it would certainly be a mistake for an agency of the U.S. Government to take such extreme action.

Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLINGS) and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the South Carolina House of Representatives be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A HOUSE RESOLUTION TO MEMORIALIZE THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE NECESSARY ACTION TO PREVENT THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OR OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES FROM BANNING ADVERTISING OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS ON TELEVISION AND RADIO

Whereas, the Federal Communications Commission has threatened action to prohibit the advertisement of tobacco products on television and radio; and

Whereas, the publicly-owned airways should be protected from such arbitrary and unnecessary restrictions; and

Whereas, the tobacco industry so vital to the economy of South Carolina would be

seriously damaged by this proposed prohibition.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina:

That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to prevent the Federal Communications Commission or any other administrative agency from prohibiting the use of the public airways to advertise tobacco products on radio and television.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution passed in the S.C. House of Representatives.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

MEADER SPOTLIGHTS THE CENTRAL ISSUE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the suit of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL against the U.S. House of Representatives is currently scheduled to go before the U.S. Supreme Court on or about April 21. As many of my colleagues are aware, a former Member of this body has, because of his concern over the unique and fundamental constitutional questions involved, joined this suit as amicus curiae. In a recent editorial dated Thursday, March 6, 1969, the Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot discusses points raised by former Congressman George Meader, of Michigan, and hails his efforts. Due to the importance of this legal issue, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

MEADER SPOTLIGHTS THE CENTRAL ISSUE

George Meader, former congressman from a district which included Jackson County in his time, has raised pertinent points in the legal controversy involving Harlem Congressman Adam Clayton Powell and the House of Representatives.

Mr. Meader now is in private practice in Washington but retains his lifelong interest in government and the prerogatives of the legislative branch of which he was a part. Accordingly, he has filed a brief, as a "friend of the court," challenging the right of the courts to take jurisdiction in a case involving Congress and one of its members.

Briefly, Powell has sued to have set aside the House's refusal to seat him in the 90th Congress, to regain his seniority and to avoid paying a fine imposed on him as he was admitted to the 91st Congress after his election last November. Lower courts have granted Powell no relief but have held that they have jurisdiction.

Meader's fight to clarify the status of the suit is one which needs to be made. Involved here are the principles of separation of the branches of government, the constitutional right of the houses of Congress to judge the qualifications of their own members, and the right, also granted by the Constitution, of lawmakers to be free from legal harassment in the conduct of their duties.

In an earlier day, the points would not have been raised. The doctrine of separation of powers has been respected by the

PROUD OF CIRCLE K CLUBS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week my friend and colleague, Mr. BUCHANAN, of Alabama, spoke of the achievements of Circle K International,

courts since the beginnings of the Republic and a few precedent-setting showdowns.

Today's Supreme Court, however, has been shedding precedents by the dozens. Its interpretation of the Constitution has been liberal to say the least. No legal expert would dare say that the court would not find, somewhere in its current philosophy on individual rights, grounds for a decision favoring Powell and holding the House to be in error.

Mr. Meader contends, and the Constitution seems to bear him out, that no one has the legal power to sue Congress—not even one of its own members.

That, for the practical purpose of retaining the balance of powers in the government, is the way it has to be.

Far more than Powell's seat in the House, his seniority and the \$25,000 the House wants him to restore to the federal treasury is involved here. The frightening thought is that nine men who hold lifetime jobs possibly will try to make themselves the supreme authority over representatives periodically elected by the people.

As Mr. Meader points out, a court decree probably could not be enforced against the House. That provides a measure of comfort for the people, but would not be nearly as reassuring as a clear ruling by the Supreme Court that it has no jurisdiction in cases in which a branch of Congress is the defendant.

SERMON BY THE REVEREND
BRYANT M. KIRKLAND, MINISTER
OF FIFTH AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, many of the time-honored traditions of America seem lost and forgotten amidst the tide of technological innovations. It seems that Mother Nature is being replaced by manmade environment, that computers are reducing our humanity, and that values constantly change to adjust to a changing society. Religious traditions are attacked as irrelevant in the context of modern life.

In the midst of such turmoil Dr. Bryant M. Kirkland, the senior minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City provides many with spiritual stability. Dr. Kirkland began his service with the Presbyterian Church as a pastor of a small parish in Pennsylvania. He then served as chaplain in the U.S. Army for soldiers soon to be involved in the D-Day landing at Normandy. His missionary work has taken him from Point Barrow, Alaska, to Panama, and recently to India. He has also published several books, the most recent of which is "Home Before Dark."

Thousands of people listen to Dr. Kirkland each week at his church or on radio. He has made religion a vital part of their lives and a comfort in finding solutions to daily problems.

His recent sermon, "Find a New Style for Your Life," is a fine example of Dr. Kirkland's moral leadership. In the hope that it will prove valuable to others, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FIND A NEW STYLE FOR YOUR LIFE

(Sermon by the Reverend Bryant M. Kirkland, D.D., LL.D., S.T.D.)

"So that you will be able to choose what is best."—Philippians 1:10 (TEV)

We need a new style in our religious life. I was thinking all week how many of you are engaged in style-making and style-setting for clothes, perfumes, and stocks and bonds. Religiously, God's people have been trying to set styles over the centuries. Moses changed the style when his people had been slaves for 400 years and he led them into the path of freedom. It was a most arduous undertaking. Joshua and Caleb spied out the Promised Land, but ten others of their committee said, "We can't do it. The people in there are like giants and we are but grasshoppers in their eyes."

Caleb and Joshua retorted, "God being our helper, we can set a new style and go in and possess the land," which they did after the fearful generation died away.

Our Lord, too, set a new style of life. A Roman legionnaire had the legal right to compel anyone to carry his military pack for a mile. Rather than be galled by such difficulty, the Lord made a new style for it. He said, "Go two miles and leave him wondering why you did it. If a man takes your overcoat, give him your jacket also. Be not overcome of evil. Have a style: Overcome evil with good."

St. Paul had a new style which he caught from the Lord. He was in jail. His wrists were chafed with the handcuffs, but he managed to write the letter I read to you (Philippians) in which he said, "I pray for the rest of you that you may have style in life, that you may see that these hard things are working out for the good of God in me."

Through the years in America and England, we too have had religious style. John Wesley grew up in the Church of England in its period of low style, rigidity, and dullness. He was quickened by the Holy Spirit and started what we recognize as world Methodism.

I have been very close to Quaker people all my years. They had a style. They came out of the same English background. They were plain people. Instead of lace ruffles and fancy neckbands, they wore plain beaver hats and simple brown clothes. But the word got out in the marketplace, "Take your work to a Quaker. You can count on his yes being yes and his no being no." This is what the Lord said, "Have a style where yes is yea and no is nay."

Among the many immigrants of Europe who came to this country through the Pennsylvania gateway were the Mennonites and the Dunkards, people of great traditions. They wore uniforms without buttons, plain brimmed hats and grew beards. These were outward symbols of an inward spiritual style.

One of the problems today in finding a style of life is that people think if they were to wear a broad-brimmed hat, grow a beard, and have buttonless coats they would have the same dynamic style within. But it only reflects itself in the badges and instruments outside. We all have to struggle to find an adequate style of life because the world tries to impose its style on us. St. Paul in his letter to the Romans writes, "Don't be overcome by the style of the world but be transformed and set a new style." The Lord met this problem frankly when He said, "Be salt. Be light."

I want to ask you a question: Do you think we are setting much of a religious style in New York City? Most of us are too timid to let our uniqueness shine. We do not confront the world to the point of risk, or jail, as St. Paul did, or as Christ did in going

to the cross. Most of us bury ourselves in our turbulent society and try to maintain our secret personal identity as Christians.

For a moment let me release your sense of failure and bondage to show you the excitement of trying to find a new style for your Christian life. Many people insist that we must keep the old style. I can understand that. I have watched a harness and buggy shop for 30 years. It was finally torn down this summer. I have in mind a church in Pittsburgh which is now a garage. Life has a way of changing. We have to find our own style, a new language, new ways. Once I lived for a short period on the coast of the Arctic Ocean and had a wonderful snow parka. Wouldn't it be peculiar if I insisted on wearing my parka down here when the temperature gets hot, simply because it was the style which I used in Alaska? There is a proper style of Christian living for every age and place. As a Christian, what are you doing with your style of life in an oppressive society that says, "Just keep quiet quiet?"

Here are some guide points we need to make our creative style felt. First of all, we need to realize that this is an open world that God made and created. It is open to new experiences. By Christmas, somebody will have gone around the moon ten times and come back. (Apollo 8 did in December 1968). We need to be open to God's new disclosures. God isn't sitting with His hands folded. He has new things to show and give us.

Of course, someone will say, "I don't like to be open. It is too difficult." But to be open means that you find out how much you do trust God as the Sustainer of the universe and how much you do trust people. Today this world calls for more trust. We ride the subways that speed and hurtle through the tunnels, yet we don't know who the engineers are. We put ourselves gladly in the hands of an airplane pilot and settle for the smile of the hostess, but we don't know anything about the credentials of the man up front. We call our broker on the telephone. We may never have seen him face to face, and yet he executes our orders. If we become ill in a hotel, we call for a physician and he comes with a placid manner, black bag in hand, to take care of us. And we learn to trust him.

In this expanding universe of God's providence, we need to be open to new truth. We need to learn how to trust Him and other people much more.

Another thing, in this technological age we have learned to do things; for example, change the courses of rivers in the Midwest to eliminate the annual floods. In the field of therapeutics we have been able to use God's gift of drugs to wipe out diseases. We have learned that our religious style of life is not just to say, "In good time God will take care of it." We realize in the providence of God that He expects His people to do something about now and not wait for rivers to change their courses by erosion, but rather for men working under night-lights to put in concrete and steel webbing and change the course of a flooding river.

God wants to work through you today. God works through you in your industry, in your business. You are God's instrument. We cite nurses, physicians, explorers and researchers as God's men. But I would also like those of you who work in the back rooms of stock brokerage houses to know you are doing God's work. You who work in fashion design, perfumery and cosmetics, in law and school teaching—you are God's person right on the job. Did it ever occur to you that this is your style of life or say, "Lord, what do you want me to do? I am listening."

First, be open and trust. Second, realize that God is working through you. Third, realize that there are power structures in every generation. Recall the Medieval period when the lord of the castle controlled the whole valley and the people were his serfs. Then,

lords and ladies, slaves and serfs knew where their power structure was. But some of our ancestors broke out of that with the *Magna Carta* and we have had freedom since. With the American Revolution came democracy, Congress and the Senate. Today we also have labor unions and actors' equity. We have the insurance industry, the legal profession, the medical profession, the National Association of Manufacturers. We live amid all these structures of power but, as Christians, we seem to have lost our style. We have let large organizations contradict the fact that you and I are unique as persons. Primarily, we are followers of Christ and we are to impart salty taste and light to these useful groups. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Philippians from his power structure, which was a jail, that we are supposed to be witnesses of God in the power structure where we live. We are supposed to mold the policy of the company. We are supposed to influence the policy of the country club or even the bridge club. We are supposed to influence the policy of the people who are actually controlling our lives.

We have surrendered that because we don't follow the spiritual style of life to the point of confrontation. Paul said, "I thank God that these chains are making the Gospel known throughout the whole Roman Empire." Nobody is going to persecute the Christian Church today. It has lost its style. However, it can recover it.

The San Diego basketball team have recovered a new lease on life because they have one new player who has a real style. He thinks, eats and sleeps basketball and he has turned on the whole team because of the radiance of his personality. I am referring to Mr. Hayes.

New York City is just ripe for some stylistic Christians who will speak up in the Board meetings of their companies and associations when the issues are under debate. They will speak as Christian businessmen and professionals. You may say, "That is too idealistic." Yes, of course, unless you are willing to go all the way with it, and then you turn things around when you are willing to go all the way to the cross with it.

We need to influence our power structures, unions, associations and races. We can't operate as individuals. We have to operate within the normal power structures. This is our God-given style of life in modern times. This is why Christ said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." St. Paul tells us to pray for all men and to pay our taxes.

Now we move on to another style. In this world of simultaneous fulfillment and destruction, the Christian should have as his style of life a concern for others. Now this refers to our Lord's parable of the Good Samaritan. We are still supposed to be Good Samaritans who care about people, who care about nameless older men and women shuffling along the cold pavements of New York. We are to care, too, about the rich, the triumphant who live protected lives but inwardly are wistful, restless and hoping that life adds up to something significant.

Our style of life is that we are open. Our style of life is that we are God's man and woman on the job where we do our work. Our style of life is that we influence the power structures where we are. In this world of ambiguity and destruction, our style of life is to be the one who is sensitive to the people near us, to sense their needs and be kind.

In this computerized world, have a style of creative imagination. Isn't it a dreadful thing to get caught in the grip of a computer that won't talk to you as a reasonable person? You argue back and forth with it. In this kind of a mechanical world which we have arranged in order for economics to prosper, we need, as Christians, more than ever to stress the intuitive, the creative, the organic. We need to promulgate dreams in people and not say, "That is impossible. You are foolish to try to do it." The dreams usually precede the creative movement of life. Encourage peo-

ple to dream dreams. The Scriptures say that someday the kingdoms of this warring world will be the kingdoms of our Lord and of our God. Don't give up that dream!

In one of the psychedelic style shops on Madison Avenue there is this sign: "Nothing is real." That is blatant secular theology: "Nothing is real." We have the exact opposite in Christian theology. We believe this is the Lord's earth. It is a good one. He made it. It works. It brings forth seed in the harvest for the spring to come, and the winter makes the way for the richness of the summer yet to be. A young child is baptized in a church that he may grow up and suffer, bleed and mature. At the end, white-haired with bent shoulders, he may say, "Despite it all, God has been good and all things have worked together for good to those who love Him."

The world needs stylistic Christians who have a dream, who have a hope, who believe in themselves, who believe in other people, who believe that God is the Lord, that Christ is the Saviour of sin. We have ourselves all mixed up in modern negativism. We have a resultant fear complex. We are a religious minority and we don't know how to handle it. We don't know how to operate as Christians outside of a spotlight. Therefore, a new style of Christian is needed, as Jesus said—salty, tangy, luminous as a candle.

What is your style? You won't find it by putting on a broad-brimmed hat, an Edwardian coat or even a Nehru jacket. One doesn't become a Gandhi by wearing a white sheet. You can be a stylistic person without the outward badge, and people will begin to say, "There is something different about you." Or a little more admirably they might ask, "How is it you are not upset about everything today?" The French word in the Beatitudes for blessed is *debonair*. A disciple today needs to be a little more *debonair* because the earth is the Lord's. We are in His hands. We have a big job to do.

We can't be as super-idealistic Christians as we might wish. We are afraid to admit that we are not able to do everything we have dreamed. But we need to come down a little bit more toward reality. The Lord said, "There are twenty-four hours in a day, enough to do each day's work and rest. Just keep moving in life, even against difficulty and opposition. When you come to a village that will not receive you, don't get angry and wish to burn it down with fire called from Heaven, as the sons of Zebedee wanted to do. Just pass by *debonairly* on the other side and keep your face toward the cross."

How is your style? Of all people in the world, the Christian should be the most stylistic. The style of Jesus is to take that ramrod ego and cross it out with a minus sign of self-denial, which leaves you with a cross. St. Paul said, "I am crucified daily with Christ and yet I live." He added, "For me to live is Christ and to die is gain, so that in everything I do (where I work, where I play) God may be glorified."

So, friends, live it up a little more by faith. Be open and trusting. Witness for Christ in the power structures. Be tender and careful toward the weak. Be creative and imaginative in your job because we are here to celebrate the goodness of God in the 20th century. Keep your Christian style up.

A BILL TO CLOSE THE TAX LOOPHOLES FAVORING NATIONAL BANKS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would remove the privileged status enjoyed by

national banks in their immunity from all forms of State taxation, other than what is specifically forbidden by the National Bank Act, for which State-chartered banks are liable. The bill would close the loophole favoring national banks and thus foster competitive equality between National and State banks within our dual system. It is estimated that the loophole costs the States about \$50,000,000 annually.

As a result of the 1864 National Bank Act, which made national banks subject to income and real property taxes only, a patchwork quilt of systems grew up in the various States. Thus, national banks in some States have voluntarily paid State and local sales and use taxes, despite the act. On the other hand, in some States, both National and State banks have enjoyed exemptions from such forms of taxation as a matter of competitive equality. The result has been diminished State funds and confusion as to the States' ability to levy such taxes as use and sales taxes.

Since the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, the role of the national banks has changed markedly. National banks now perform essentially the same function as State banks. Similarly to their State-chartered counterparts, national banks are privately owned, privately managed, and operated for private profit. Not only do national banks perform no significant Federal governmental function not performed equally by State-chartered banks, but they also receive a myriad of State and local services.

Need for this legislation heightened as a result of the Supreme Court decision in *First Agricultural National Bank v. Tax Commissioner* (392 U.S. 339 (June 17, 1968)). In that case, Justice Black, writing for the majority in a 5-to-3 decision, found that the National Bank Act permitted States to tax national banks only in the areas specified; that is, income and real property taxes. He stated that the legislative history made it clear that the National Bank Act "was intended to proscribe the only ways in which the States can tax national banks and if a change is to be made in State taxation of national banks, it must come from the Congress which has established the present limits."

I am convinced that such change is necessary to remedy the existing inequities. In response to this clear need, the executive State and National bank committees of the American Bankers Association unanimously recommended legislation which would make national banks subject to the State sales and use taxes. Frank Willie, the New York superintendent of banks, has gone even further, as does this bill. He said:

I consider it contrary to public policy, in the face of rising revenue needs on the part of State and local governments throughout the country, that national banks as a class should be exempted from non-discriminatory state and local taxes of any kind.

He warned that unless Congress removes this inequity, there may be "an increasing number of conversions by commercial banks from State to national charter." This would leave the States with even less revenue in this time of great State need.

RETURNING 90 PERCENT FAIR FOR STATES

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the various States and particularly the States with large amounts of public lands are faced with the ever-growing problem of raising adequate money to meet the social needs of their citizens.

There have been a number of proposals that would rectify the weakness of the States in generating income. In the meantime, my distinguished colleague from the State of Wyoming has introduced a bill that would alleviate some of the financial burdens of the land-grant States by returning 90 percent of Federal oil royalties to the States.

A succinct analysis of the proposal is contained in an editorial published in the February 27 issue of the Casper Star-Tribune. Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE STAR-TRIBUNE THINKS 90 PER CENT FAIR FOR STATES

When Alaska became a state it was with the provision that it should reserve for itself 90 per cent of the federal mineral royalties. This was an objective long discussed by the 11 other public lands states.

When the late Senator Frank Barrett of Wyoming wrote an amendment to give Alaska 90 per cent of its oil royalties upon gaining statehood, it was with the idea of setting the pattern for all public lands states in future legislation.

More than a decade has elapsed, and the Western states still batter the doors of Congress.

Now, John Wold, Wyoming's representative in Congress, wants to do something about it. If he can garner the support—and there is no reason why he should not—Wyoming, Colorado, Montana, and the other public lands states should have economic equality with Alaska on a fair-share basis.

Federal Government takes a 12½ per cent royalty from production. Out of this, there is returned to Wyoming 37½ per cent and another 52½ per cent goes to the Bureau of Reclamation. There can be no question but that Wyoming has benefited from these reclamation funds, although there have been agonizing times when Washington seemed to have forgotten the fact of this state's contribution to the fund. For many years, Wyoming has argued that it contributed through federal royalties much more than it ever received in return.

There has been considerable argument over the years that the states should receive the 90 per cent, with the other 10 per cent going to the federal government for administrative purposes. This is only fair, and it is a reasonable alternative to the complete return of the public lands to the states. This latter movement was popular in the '20's and '30's. It is basically sound, but the time does not appear opportune. The structure which has been built up is such that it would be impracticable today to give all this acreage back to the states in fee simple. Unless all state lines are erased, the time will come when that would be feasible.

In the meantime, there is the dominant question of a share in petroleum and other mineral royalties. In northern Alaska there is an oil field which is reported to have potential staggering the imagination. The reserve is estimated from 10 to 20 billion

barrels. Yet Alaska will not have to take a back seat in federal allocations. It already has it made. It has all the federal royalties, minus a 10 per cent for federal administration.

This is not true in Wyoming. It is not true in any of the other states which came earlier into the federal structure. They were given full patents to their public lands. It was only the states of the West that were made wards and provinces.

Perhaps we ought to go with tin cup in hand and be grateful for the largesse. We ought not to question the 37½ per cent out of the 12½ per cent, or the 52½ per cent which we may share in, but over which we have no control.

If these comments seem caustic, it is not that we reject what has been done in the last few decades. The point is that there is a new picture on the horizon and that we cannot continue to conform to old patterns.

We are hopeful that Congressman Wold will receive the support to which he is entitled in his effort to achieve a better balance of royalty distribution.

NEW WEAPON IN WAR ON HUNGER

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the accomplishments of the Krause Milling Co. of Milwaukee, Wis., in the development of a high protein food—CSM—which is helping to fight malnutrition in more than 90 countries.

The development of CSM is an outstanding advance in food technology and in the economics of human nutrition. It is something of which I believe my colleagues will welcome additional information. Accordingly, I insert herewith a statement about this product and its utilization:

CSM: HIGH PROTEIN FOOD—NEW WEAPON IN WAR ON HUNGER

We have learned a good deal about practical nutrition in the American food aid programs around the world.

The key product that has been developed and used successfully in recent years to fight malnutrition in more than 90 countries is "CSM" High Protein Food. It is a blend of precooked corn meal, soy flour, non-fat dry milk and vitamin-mineral supplements that has been accepted by millions of consumers. It is a highly nutritious, high protein food, uniquely suited to correct malnutrition.

But it is more than that. As any home-maker knows, it is not enough to provide food that is merely "good for you." It must be appetizing and appealing as well. As the old saying goes, "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." CSM has been accepted and relished by millions of consumers in scores of countries. It is appetizing and palatable and readily adaptable to a wide variety of ethnic tastes. CSM makes an excellent soup, breakfast cereal, or cold drink. It possesses unique dough-forming properties that produce delicious empanadas, tamales, and tortillas for the Latin American diet. It can also be used to make chapatti, a staple in India and Pakistan. In country after country we hear of new ways that CSM has been adapted to local feeding habits. The versatility of the product is limited only by the imagination of the cook.

The Krause Milling Company began acceptability studies on pre-cooked or processed corn meal, which is the primary ingre-

redient of CSM, in 1963. This product is familiar to the food industry as an ingredient in many kinds of manufactured foods, but its use directly by household consumers was a totally new concept. Krause felt that its taste and suitability for use in a wide variety of ways made it an ideal product for distribution under the foreign food aid programs.

In August 1963, Krause Milling Company donated 10,000 pounds of pre-cooked corn meal for the first testing in food aid programs overseas by voluntary agencies. These earliest tests were conducted in 16 countries. The response was most enthusiastic. In mid-1965, Krause and two other corn millers donated an additional 90,000 pounds to voluntary agencies in 25 countries. The responses to questionnaires showed, without exception, great enthusiasm for the taste, adaptability, and convenience of pre-cooked corn meal. All of this testing was conducted at industry expense. More than \$1,500,000 was spent for research, equipment and technology prior to any sale of CSM.

WORLD NUTRITION CRISIS ARISES

Just as these tests were getting underway, the Department of Agriculture challenged American food manufacturers to develop a blended food aimed at meeting the nutritional needs of vulnerable groups in the hunger populations of developing countries overseas—children of school and preschool age, nursing mothers, and pregnant women. The guidelines were prepared by scientists in the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture. Cereal was specified as the primary ingredient. The protein content of the mix was to approximate 20 per cent, and the extra protein was to be provided by the addition of soy flour and non-fat dry milk. Vitamin and mineral fortification, a bland flavor, low-bran content, and smooth texture were also specified. The guidelines further stated that the product was to be partially cooked and ready for serving after boiling for one to two minutes.

The pre-cooked corn meal product which the industry had developed fully satisfied these standards for primary product qualities. Testing quickly confirmed that mixing 25 per cent soy flour and 5 per cent non-fat dry milk with pre-cooked corn meal produced an excellent food. Tests conducted at the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation showed that the "protein efficiency ratio" of CSM was 2.5, which is equal in protein quality to casein, the protein in milk.

CSM GETS WORLDWIDE USE

With the cooperation of AID Missions and Voluntary Relief Agencies around the world, the excellent acceptability of the product, which had been indicated by our earlier testing of processed corn meal, was proved. Final specifications were developed by the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture, working cooperatively with the industry. In September 1966, only 28 months ago, the first purchase of 9¼ million pounds was made. Today the total purchases of CSM have passed the 821 million pound mark. Acceptability of the product seems to grow steadily, as consumers around the world gain familiarity with its versatility, convenience, palatability and nutritional properties.

The consumers asked for more because they liked it, and it fits into the way they regularly prepare their meals. Those who are responsible for the nutrition of the vulnerable population approve its superior nutritional quality, based on its content of 20 per cent protein, 6 per cent minimum fat, high protein efficiency ratio, and good essential amino acid balance.

The development of CSM is certainly an outstanding advance in food technology and in the economics of human nutrition. The food and nutrition scientists both in the government and in industry deserve appreciation for this achievement.

Usually less appreciated, but equally as

commendable, is the sense of responsibility, decisiveness, and courage displayed by the government administrators in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development, both in Washington and overseas. Their prompt action in testing, then quickly approving distribution of this new food for worldwide use, saved many human beings from death or physical or mental retardation. The world is a happier place today as a result of their competence.

TESTS FIND CSM EFFECTIVE

An impressive body of technical information has been gathered on the nutritional benefits of CSM since shipments began. Dr. Fred R. Senti, Deputy Administrator of ARS, reported favorably on tests by Dr. George Graham at the British American Hospital in Peru on how successfully the nitrogen balance was maintained in children 1 to 3 years old when they consumed CSM as the primary source of protein. He also reviewed the three tests conducted by the World Health Organization in Taiwan and Algeria, which show the nutritional effectiveness of CSM

when fed to undernourished and malnourished children.

All of us who participated in the development of CSM felt a glow of real pride when we learned of the health improvement of young people in Bihar, India, who had been fed CSM for 30 days during the famine two years ago, compared to those who were not participants in CSM feeding programs.

RESEARCH AND PRODUCTION

The Krause Milling Company research staff and production technicians maintain active contact with administrators in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Agency for International Development, the Voluntary Agencies and others. Information is exchanged that results in improvements in the CSM program. Through such cooperative efforts, we are making progress in our "War on Hunger."

In addition to the vitamins and minerals naturally present in the corn, soy and milk ingredients, CSM is fortified with vitamin and mineral supplements. Under ASCS Announcement CSM-1 dated 2/7/69, the following supplements must be included in CSM:

Mineral supplement	Pounds per ton, CSM	Milligrams per 100 g., CSM
Calcium carbonate, precipitated, FCC grade	12.0	600
Zinc sulfate, hydrated, FCC (ZnSO ₄ ·7H ₂ O)	.08	4
Ferrous fumarate, purified food grade	.92	46
Iodized salt (.007 percent I ₂), food grade	13.0	650

Vitamin supplement	Per ton, CSM	Per 100 g., CSM
Thiamine mononitrate	2.5 g.	0.28 mg.
Riboflavin	3.5 g.	.39 mg.
Pyridoxine hydrochloride	1.5 g.	.17 mg.
Niacin	45.0 g.	5.0 mg.
Ca D-pantothenate	25.0 g.	2.8 mg.
Folic acid	1.8 g.	.2 mg.
Vitamin B ₁₂	36.0 mg.	4.0 mcg.
Ascorbic acid	364.0 g.	40.0 mg.
Vitamin A (stabilized retinyl palmitate)	15,000,000 U.S.P. units	1,670 U.S.P. units.
Vitamin D (stabilized)	1,800,000 U.S.P. units	200 U.S.P. units.
Alpha tocopherol acetate	68,000 IU	7.6 IU.

AVAILABLE DATA RELATIVE TO SEVERAL OF THE ESSENTIAL AMINO ACIDS IN CSM

Essential amino acids	USDA guideline min. g/100 g. ¹	CSM g/100 g. ¹
Lysine	0.95	1.0
Methionine	.3	.4
Total S-containing	.6	.6
Tryptophan	.22	.22
Threonine	.65	.75

¹ Dry basis.

Composition:	Percent
Processed corn meal	64.0
Defatted soy flour	24.0
Nonfat dried milk	5.0
Mineral-vitamin premix	2.0
Typical analysis:	
Moisture	9.0
Protein, dry basis	20.0
Fat, dry basis	6.5
Crude, fiber, dry basis	1.5

SIKES KEYNOTES ROA CONFERENCE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Reserve Officers Association of the United States assembled here in Washington its leaders from all over the world for the association's annual mid-winter conference.

The keynote to this gathering of citi-

zen-reservists was delivered by the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, who is known to the Members of this House and throughout the Nation, not only as an outstanding Member of this body but as an outstanding citizen-soldier who has achieved high rank in the Reserves.

We in Florida are proud of BOB SIKES. Nobody in the country has done more for national defense than he has.

BOB SIKES' address to ROA on this day, the 21st of February 1969—the eve of George Washington's birth anniversary—was a significant one and I am pleased to invite attention to it. The text of this speech follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN BOB SIKES BEFORE THE ROA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 21, 1969

Mr. President and members of the National Council, I am always privileged when it is my opportunity to appear before you, and I am especially pleased to be introduced by my very good friend of many years, Don Dawson. He is indeed a distinguished leader among Reservists and in all groups in which he moves. I am glad to attest to the truth of all the nice things he said about me. Your organization has been very good to me indeed. When I was chosen for the Minute Man of the Year Award, I counted it one of the outstanding events of my life. I assure you I recognize the importance of any invitation to speak to this able and distinguished and clear-thinking group.

These have been busy years, and there is no reason to anticipate that the future will bring a change. We have gone through a period when it was extremely important that all friends of ROA stay alert at the Capitol in order to insure that the Reserves not be destroyed. I hope that particular necessity

for alertness is no longer with us, but only time will tell. We should never relax our vigilance. More immediately, there will be other needs which require our constant interest—none greater than to insure the modernization of our defense forces. Because of the tremendous costs of the war in Vietnam, there has been serious slippage in the program of modernization which should have been maintained for weapons and equipment. Particularly is this true of planes, submarines, and other Navy ships. If it continues, we shall find that we have a second-rate force despite the best efforts of those who wear the uniform, and we cannot afford to have the second-best defense if we are going to maintain our freedom and our responsibilities to our own nation and to the free world.

I am reminded that great things have been happening in the field of surgery. For instance, examples of heart transplants have attracted the attention of the entire world. But one such bit of surgery has escaped general notice, even though we in ROA circles have been fully aware of it. We have watched the process of transplanting a heart into the Pentagon. There was a time when no heart-beat could be heard there insofar as Reserves were concerned. I hope this new heart, which has been transplanted with the aid of a team of surgeons on Capitol Hill who are close to you, will prove to be a strong and healthy transplant responsive to the needs of a strong Reserve. It is not necessary to tell you that ROA's heart continues to beat strong on Capitol Hill. No transplant is needed there. In Congress your friends are legion, and they are willing. And in Washington you have assembled an extremely effective staff headed by an outstanding Executive Director in Jake Carlton.

In a different sense it could be said that ROA itself has a new heart, and that it beats in the form of the new Minute Man Memorial Building on Capitol Hill—that living, working memorial that General Hershey and so many other great leaders helped to make possible.

Just a year ago tomorrow, on Washington's birthday, I had the privilege of helping to dedicate that building and then to deliver, before ROA representatives from all over the world, the famous George Washington Farewell Address. It was a real privilege for me—and I think it was a real tribute to ROA that the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tem of the Senate, and the entire Congress joined forces to give ROA the recognition that you received on that day—George Washington's birthday of 1968. On that date, you made me very proud of ROA and its members for that was the day you filled the galleries of the House Chamber. Regretfully, it is a rare thing when more than casual attention is given to the delivery of this famous message. You made it an outstanding occasion, and this patriotic service is typical of the works of ROA. Incidentally, I might relate to you the comment of one listener who, when leaving the gallery, was overheard to say, "That Congressman Sikes sure wrote a good speech, didn't he?" I am sure he was a casual visitor and not a member of ROA.

Rather than present to you this morning a report of your legislative committee, let me talk to you very briefly about ROA's opportunities and challenges on today. My remarks are non-partisan, or at least as non-partisan as remarks can be from a man who has run 20 times for office on the Democratic ticket—Southern Democratic, that is. As you know, ROA by nature and by law is non-partisan, and in a broad sense, so is the Congress—most of the time.

We meet during troubled, uncertain, and in a sense, directionless times. Which way is our country going? We obviously are living in a time of great social change; we face unprecedented crises from day to day; those who administer the law do not seem to know how to respond to strange and querulous pro-

tests of minorities of our citizens. Established institutions are under attack, and accepted principles of morality, law and order seem to be in question. We hear strange proposals—and strange talk of appeasement from the most unexpected sources.

It requires no great profundity, or intellectual capacity, to be aware that our society is in danger. It is in danger because vested authority does not seem to have the courage, the resolution, or the conviction to resist disorder, chaos, or anarchy. Somehow, the great majority of our citizens seem unable or unwilling to prompt or inspire the sort of action which will insure for us an orderly society, moving forward to greater things with minimum damage to old institutions, most of which most assuredly deserve saving.

This situation cannot continue. We cannot permit rioting in our cities, senseless demonstrations on college campuses, or young people or minorities thumbing their noses at society by profane and antisocial acts. President Abraham Lincoln observed in 1864 that "The world has never had a good definition of the word 'liberty' and the American people, just now, are very much in want of one." That comment is very apt today. What is really needed may not be so much a definition of freedom as guidelines for its proper use. Freedom also means the exercise of rights and franchises under restraints and protections which are justly imposed by law. Freedom implies the presence of reasonable rules for the protection of the community and for the promotion of public health, safety, morals, and welfare. Daniel Webster said, "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint." If the objectives of freedom are honorable, as I believe them to be, then the uses of freedom must be no less honorable. There has never been a time when freedom was gained, held or enjoyed through the irreverence, immorality, or irresponsibility of citizens. Freedom requires individual responsibility, and each man must be a guardian of responsible freedom. When the element of personal responsibility is added, freedom becomes a prevailing force, exerting its influence on men and governments—protected by courage, fortified by wisdom, and nourished by the roots of private morality.

Now if that isn't plain enough, let me say it this way. It is time to discipline the nut fringe, to enforce the law, and to stand up for the things America stands for—at home and abroad. We cannot afford to be directionless. We cannot afford any more *Pueblitos*. There must be purpose and direction and determination.

Let me add this one indispensable fact, and that is our association—and the other associations who will work with us—must remain strong. Because you as good Americans can contribute to a secure and progressive tomorrow, you have great tasks before you, and they are tasks which will test your strength, and your character, and your unity. For this you will need strength.

I believe in my country—in its people—and in its God, and I think I can pierce the mists of the future and predict for you that we will emerge from the miasma of the moment a strong, viable nation, worthy of a place in history as a free people. I cannot believe that there is real strength in the idiots who assail our institutions and disrupt our processes of government, or learning, and of living today. Even should they by chance and apathy of their fellow citizens somehow temporarily gain policy control—God forbid—their aims are doomed even before they could be activated—because their aims are based upon the weakest of reeds.

"There are eternal truths,
There are constant rules of morals.
Society does demand order.
Nations, to be free, must be strong."

I have not mentioned Vietnam. I have only this brief comment. The negotiations in Paris have been in progress for months. They have accomplished nothing. The Communists simply are waiting for concessions. They extracted concessions from the Johnson Administration, which was trying so hard to show substantial progress toward peace. Now the Communists are waiting to see what concessions they can extract from the new Nixon negotiations team.

The United States has never won a victory through negotiations. For some strange reason, those who represent us at the conference table never can be as tough in their quest for victory as those who wear the uniform. There is a way to get these negotiations on the right track, and that is to let our fighting men in Vietnam fight the war there for victory. We are in control and we can win the war at any time our fighting men are permitted to do so. We have too much invested in American lives and treasure for victory to be squandered or compromised at the conference table.

Let me remind you of one other thing, and of this I am proud as a member of ROA. Your Association—our Association—is today living in a great period of solid respect in the middle of the soul of world freedom—on Capitol Hill of the United States. You belong there, because you are a part of it.

Be proud of it—but let your pride in it prompt you to work to make it stronger. Your building itself, literally, is built upon rock. Be certain that your character as an organization is always the same.

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO REGULATE DRUG ADVERTISEMENTS ON TELEVISION

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island on March 5, 1969, and entitled "Resolution memorializing Congress to regulate drug advertisements on television":

RESOLUTION, STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Memorializing Congress to regulate drug advertisements on television

Whereas, Some drug advertisement commercials seek to appeal to the public by portraying the medication as candy; and

Whereas, Children are oftentimes influenced by what they view on television; and

Whereas, Congress should enact proper legislation to omit such drug commercials when programs for the entertainment of children are being aired; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the state of Rhode Island through its general assembly, now requests the congress of the United States to enact such appropriate legislation to ban airing of drug commercials when children's programs are being aired; and be it further

Resolved, That the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to enact such appropriate legislation to protect children from harmful drug advertisement commercials; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress.

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Rhode Island, this sixth day of March, A.D. 1969.

PRIMO IACOBUCCI,
First Deputy, Secretary of State.

TENTH DISTRICT VFW WINNER DENNIS JONES' SPEECH: "FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE"

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge."

The winning speech for Georgia was prepared by Mr. Dennis E. Jones, Route 1, Augusta, Ga., a resident of my district.

I think this speech will be of interest to all of the Members of Congress. Attending the VFW convention in Washington when Dennis was honored were VFW members, Judge Grady Pittford, Commander George Pugh, Bill Shiver, and Veterans Services Director Pete Wheeler, all from the 10th District. The speech of Dennis Jones follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Look at me. I am scarred and I am ragged, yet I stand as a beacon to all who are oppressed. Who am I? I am a thousand, no, a billion men. My name is freedom. You know me; yet you pass me with only a glance; believing I shall always be with you. And indeed I shall; for no matter who you are I am buried within you; in that part of you that can never be erased—the human soul.

How old am I? As old as man himself. I have conquered kings and emperors, and been oppressed by them. Caesar was crushed by me and Hitler shook before me.

Where am I? I am in the heart of the druggist, the town mayor, and the Chinese farmer. You will see me in Africa, America, and Russia. Yes; in Russia, though my figure there is rather dim. I am not bound by race, creed, or color. You will find me in the black, white, or yellow man. I've fought with Germans, British, and Arabs. I have been in every country in every age.

I stand behind you in the voting booths of the free world. My words are printed in the books and magazines of those nations. I cry out with every war and every death.

But I am weakening. Once again my head is being forced into the yoke of slavery. Around the world the tyrant is leading you to the slaughterhouse. Strike now; I beg you; for, although I cannot die, I will be distorted by false statements, false hopes, and villainous propaganda into a thing you yourself will reject. Furthermore, I am not being oppressed by my enemies, but by my followers. "How?" you may ask. I will answer, "Through ignorance, lawlessness, and corruption."

In recent years, you my guardians, have ripped and torn at my fortress, America. Your students have threatened my training camps, the schools and colleges. What these students do not realize is that they are my future armies and they must not desert me through the use of violence.

"How," you may ask, "can I save you?"

And I will answer, "In the same way you gave me birth. By fighting for me, by using me, and by correcting me; for I am not grown yet, and, like any child need correcting."

In the past I have helped you and you have praised me for it. Am I right? Am I worth fighting for? Look to the evidence before you. For thousands of years I lay an infant in the secret, dark hollows of your mind; and then in the middle 1300's I arose in the heart of a poor yeoman to overthrow the feudal system you slaved under. I have been thrown in darkness again and again and have always found the light of hope and will. I am precious. You have fought for me diligently through thousands of battles in just as many nations, giving the blood of your fathers, brothers, and sons willingly in order to possess me. Do not let me be oppressed now, for I am your destiny.

A CANDID DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENTIAL PROSPECTS

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, most political columnists who have been on the Washington scene for a number of years tend to adopt a rather dispassionate view of the political process. Perhaps this is an occupational requirement of their profession. Occasionally, however, a political leader emerges who attracts the genuine enthusiasm of those writers who come into contact with him. Maine's Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE is such a leader.

Maine's citizens have long recognized Ed MUSKIE's remarkable qualities as an individual, as well as an outstanding Governor and Senator. During the past year, Senator MUSKIE was able to appear before a much larger segment of the Nation, and the Nation's press. The experience was a rewarding one for all concerned.

Mr. Stewart Alsop has written a most interesting column about the Senator's reaction to this exposure. As the column points out, the national campaign experience has not deprived Senator MUSKIE of what Alsop terms his "refreshing candor." In Mr. Alsop's words, Senator MUSKIE "is the very rare kind of man who is, quite simply, what he is, without concealment or apology."

Senator MUSKIE's willingness to talk openly about his interest in seeking the Presidency is not only a welcome source of material for the media. It is also a source of inspiration to the many, many Americans who believe that Ed MUSKIE possesses the qualities which could make him a great national leader in that office. I would like, therefore, to insert into the RECORD Stewart Alsop's column entitled "Can a Poor Man Get To Be President?" which appeared in the March 17, 1969, issue of Newsweek magazine. Perhaps the future will reveal that this question can be answered in the affirmative.

The article follows:

CAN A POOR MAN GET TO BE PRESIDENT?

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Teddy's got it locked up, anyway, or just about," says Sen. Ed Muskie of Maine, sitting back relaxed in a leather chair, with his long legs stretched out in

front of him. "There's the money, and the mystique, and Teddy's an able, charming guy too. When everybody begins saying this early it's going to be Teddy, why, it's going to be Teddy—almost sure to be."

Even after being warned that he will be quoted, Senator Muskie talks with a refreshing candor for a major politician—and especially for a politician who candidly regards himself as a potential Presidential candidate. Even John F. Kennedy, who never bothered much to conceal his Presidential ambitions, never talked quite so candidly so long before an election.

If before the next election Edward M. Kennedy is anywhere near as far ahead of any other Democratic candidate as he is now, Muskie says, he'll be nominated on the first ballot. Even so, a lot can happen in four years. "It will depend on what happens, and on the issues, and on what I say about them, and on whether people will listen. By luck, I reached a national audience in the campaign, but my problem now is to stay alive for four years."

One of the problems of staying alive is money. To reach a national audience and to do all the necessary political spadework for a serious shot at the Presidency, Muskie figures that he needs about \$200,000 a year in the first two years or so. This, he thinks, would "cover a hard-core staff" for research and advance work, as well as a skeleton national organization, and the necessary trips abroad. But where is the money to come from?

ON WITH THE JOB

Muskie himself has no serious capital. He is presently getting about the country a great deal by accepting lecture fees—\$2,000 a talk, plus expenses for himself and an aide, is the usual deal. He is so much in demand that he could speak once or twice a day at that rate if he wanted to. But he has his Senate duties to think about—by April he means to cut down sharply on his present rather frenetic speaking schedule in order to get on with the job of being a senator. So where is he to get the \$200,000 to pay for that "hard-core staff" he needs to "stay alive"?

"There'd be no problem getting that much money, but the question is how. I'm not going to set up some sort of secret fund—I don't want to be accused of setting up a slush fund. If we set up a Muskie-for-President committee, people would say, 'Look who's trying to buy him.' If we set up a committee just to get my views across, not a Presidential commission, people would say, 'Who's he trying to fool?'"

For awhile, Muskie admits, the money problem worried him a lot. "You know," he says, "it was a strange experience. For the first time in my life I was beginning to think of political success for the sake of political success. Always before, I was relaxed. I enjoyed the contest—if I won, fine, if I lost, too bad."

"Of course," he says, with a small smile, "I'd never felt the stirrings of Presidential ambition before, and for awhile it bothered me. It bothered me terribly. Maybe it even warped my judgment. Now I've sort of settled down, I think, and I'm beginning to get some fun out of it again. After all, here I am, a senator from Maine of all places, son of a Polish immigrant, and I'm one of the top two, I guess, for the time being anyway. It's a great feeling."

STRIKING PHENOMENON

Muskie is undoubtedly "one of the top two." At least for the present, political Washington does not rate Humphrey a serious contender. A widespread attitude was expressed by one former colleague: "Good old Hubert, everybody loves him, but for President, he's through."

As for Eugene McCarthy, he has performed an eccentric act of political self-immolation, and no one takes him seriously either. Other than some such cloud no longer than a man's

hand on the horizon as Sen. Fred Harris of Oklahoma, that leaves only two at the starting gate—Kennedy and Muskie. But Kennedy is a favorite by such a margin that there are few Muskie takers. A striking phenomenon of this post-election period is that already, almost four years in advance, "everybody is saying it's going to be Teddy."

There are very good reasons why everybody is so saying. As Muskie says, "there's the money, and the mystique." Muskie's money problem is not confined to the \$200,000-a-year problem of "staying alive" in the immediate future. Eventually, if he is to become a serious candidate, he must raise, without any resources of his own, enormous sums.

How enormous is suggested by a study now being conducted by the leading expert on campaign spending, Dr. Herbert E. Alexander of The Citizens' Research Foundation. Alexander, who has been doing exhaustive research on the subject, estimates that Richard Nixon spent \$8.5 million before his nomination; Nelson Rockefeller \$6 million in the same period; Hubert Humphrey more than \$4 million before his nomination; Eugene McCarthy an amazing \$7 million to \$8 million; and Robert Kennedy "at least" \$6 million in his 85 days of campaigning.

READYMADE APPARATUS

This list suggests that to become a serious contender a candidate either has to be very rich in his own right, like Rockefeller or Robert Kennedy; or close to the party apparatus, like Nixon or Humphrey; or the symbol of a pocketbook-emptying cause, like McCarthy. Muskie qualifies on none of these three scores. Edward Kennedy not only qualifies on the first, but he has inherited a ready-made apparatus of his own. As for causes, there is no visible difference at all on basic issues between Kennedy and Muskie.

And yet it might be foolish, all the same, to count out Ed Muskie. There is a remarkable quality about the man, and this quality, whatever it is, came over very strongly to the American voters in last fall's campaign.

One of the odd things about Muskie is that, without a single New England antecedent—he is straight Polish on both sides—he looks like a casting director's dream of the dour-but-honest Yankee of the old school. He recognizes this himself—he jokes about "this Saltonstall jaw of mine"—and the Maine twang completes the illusion.

In fact, of course, a lot of old-school Yankees were pretty sneaky fellows below the surface layer of the laconic speech and the granitic jaw. Muskie, unless he has deceived everybody who knows him, is not a sneaky fellow at all. He is the very rare kind of man who is, quite simply, what he is, without concealment or apology. This quality—Marshall McLuhan calls it "coolness"—comes across very clearly on the television screen, and in modern politics it is a pearl beyond price. So perhaps Teddy Kennedy hasn't got it quite locked up after all.

DECENNIAL CENSUS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year hence Americans will be told to stand up and be counted—counted and much more. They will be harassed and bombarded with some 120 questions in 67 categories with refusal to answer any one of these questions imposing criminal penalties of \$100 fine, 60 days in jail, or both. I speak, of course,

of the forthcoming decennial census beginning April 1, 1970.

The very personal nature of some of these questions will most certainly expose some sensitive nerves and have an abrasive effect on an already indignant public. Simply asking people to respond to questions relating to their economic status, living conditions, and personal habits is one thing, but mandatory compliance with this extensive quizzing can only be construed as an invasion of personal privacy.

The statutory intent of the census under the Constitution is to provide an accurate population count for an equitable apportionment of the House of Representatives. Today we have drifted so far away from this original purpose that the Census Bureau is more easily recognized as a statistic gathering agency with a misplaced accent.

Today I join a number of my colleagues by introducing a bill which abolishes the 60-day jail sentence entirely and removes the \$100 fine from all but six of the categories necessary for a population count in the 1970 census.

I am hopeful that Congress will press for early hearings and floor consideration on census reform bills that we may spare the American people this forcible extraction of impertinent data and restore to the individual some vestige of personal privacy.

CULTURE AND THE GOVERNMENT

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, those interested in the humanities and the arts will be very much interested in the editorial which appeared in the Plain Dealer on March 3:

The Ford Foundation's vice president for the humanities and the arts, W. McNeill Lowry, makes a strong pitch for a Department of Cultural Affairs in the federal government in an essay published yesterday in the Foundation's 1968 annual report.

He believes that private patronage of the arts is strained and not much help really comes from business sources. His solution? A new national policy, accompanied by substantial funding, which should not be deferred because of domestic and international problems faced by the nation.

This is the philosophy brought into the White House by the late President John F. Kennedy and seconded by former President Lyndon B. Johnson. Mr. Johnson signed the bill creating the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities in September 1965.

But since then Congress has put the National Foundation on a low-dollar diet, citing pressures of war and other crises. Lowry concludes that there is no reason to believe any significant federal program in the arts can be effectively argued in Congress or in public if its priority always must be justified. Hence the call for a department of culture to provide, at least, a "proper battleground."

Interesting statistics in this battle are these: In the fiscal year ended Sept. 30, 1968, Lowry's division made grants totaling \$14,251,223 to the arts and humanities while

the National Foundation's allotment for its fiscal year ending July 1969, is \$5.9 million for the arts.

Lowry warns that except for a few new foundations, little private contribution is being gained for promoting art in all its forms in the United States. Congress, meanwhile, takes a dim view of the arts, even as a means of providing expression for Americans who have been culturally, as well as economically, deprived. Last year it trimmed its own committee's recommendation of \$135 million for the National Foundation down to \$11.2 million and took away its power to make grants to individuals. President Nixon, in pre-election talks, pledged support of the National Foundation but tempered it with a warning against a "state-directed culture."

This doesn't promise much sympathy in Washington for many art outlets. Regional theaters, for example, exist largely through support of private foundations but these grants have no permanency. Such theaters and art museums may not be "commercial" in the show business concept but are vital to a progressive American art culture.

Lowry has performed a necessary service in calling attention to the dark side of the nation's cultural future while at the same time explaining, through the Ford Foundation's report, what private sources are trying to accomplish.

LAND USE CONCEPTS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, I had the privilege of addressing the Western Regional Conference of the National Association of Counties at Disneyland in California.

My assigned subject was "Land Use Concepts: Past, Present and Future." Since the speech, I have had a number of requests for its content and further been encouraged to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House and Senate. Therefore, I take this means of doing so, by placing the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as requested by NACO and others interested in advancing these concepts:

LAND USE CONCEPTS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

(Address by the Honorable DON H. CLAUSEN, First Congressional District, California)

As one who was born and raised on a farm up in Humboldt County, and who served on the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors for 7 years, and who now represents a predominantly rural area in the Congress—this matter of land use is no stranger to me. I have lived with it all of my life—as have most, if not all, of you.

It is a subject for which I have great personal enthusiasm—and, as Ralph Waldo Emerson once said: "Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm."

If that is true, and I believe it is, then certainly the prospects for greatness in developing a dynamic, realistic and effective land use policy for the future—may be just around the corner!

I say this because I personally view our present land use patterns in this country as one of America's most serious and complex domestic problems facing us today.

What we as a Nation and we, as county-oriented officials and planners, come up with

in the way of concepts and program recommendations in the immediate future—may well depend on the well-being of our people and the ultimate fate of our Nation in the long run.

In my judgment, land use transcends every materialistic value held by man—because it affects people! As a matter of fact, it affects all people whether they live in the high-rise apartments of Manhattan—a small potato farm in Idaho, or the tree farm of California, Oregon and Washington.

By way of an example, let's take a look at 1968 from a slightly different perspective than that most often used to assess a given calendar year.

As far as I'm concerned, 1968 was a bad year for cities—and it was a bad year for the countryside.

Mounting problems in every aspect of urban life crowded the front pages and highlighted the growing paradox of space age accomplishments and domestic failures.

City congestion, monumental airport and traffic tie-ups—while only part of the overall story—herald the compelling and urgent need for further in-depth analysis of our entire system of land use.

In non-metropolitan areas, the problems are different to be sure, but equally as serious.

Like all problem areas, any discussion of land use in this country should have a "point of departure." Essentially, I believe there are four such points regarding land use on which we can all agree:

1. First, is the shocking and totally unrealistic fact—that 70% of our total population in America now resides on only 1% of the land.

2. Second, there is the plain and simple truth—that our major metropolitan centers in this country have grown too overcrowded, too overly centralized and totally unmanageable.

3. Third, that rural economies and rural communities alike—are in desperate need of revitalization.

4. Fourth and most challenging and exciting of all, we have the technological capability to completely re-direct the future economic and population growth patterns in the up-coming decade—all that is required is the properly coordinated and enlightened leadership of organizations like NACO.

We who are most vitally and directly concerned with county government, know only too well what effect the mass migration to the big cities has had on Rural America over the past 20 years.

We have seen the vast authority and rich resources that once resided at county level, slowly fade away to the State capitals and to Washington. We have witnessed an erosion also of our rural economies with too many small communities turned into virtual "ghost towns," too many farms fold, too many small businesses fail, and too many young people head for the big cities in search of "greener pastures," thus creating a "brain drain" from Rural America.

Regrettably, however, many of those who left Rural America for the big cities, found no "pastures" at all. Instead, they found a scarcity of jobs, polluted air, strange tasting water, and terrible overcrowding in their newly-found "concrete jungles."

By and large these people were totally unprepared for big city life—yet financially unable to get out. These are the victims of what we now call the "urban crisis."

As you know, we have heard much about urban decay and urban renewal—but I'm a little perplexed and disturbed over the lack of any equivalent concern for rural decay and rural renewal.

For nearly 6 years now, I have attempted to serve as a "sounding board" in the Congress for the problems of Rural America. As such, I have continually, and in the loudest voice possible, tried to get this message across:

1. First, that nearly half of the poor people

and fully half of the inadequate housing in this country are to be found in non-metropolitan areas.

2. Second, that Federal "money programs" of the past have failed to cope with either the urban or rural problems effectively.

3. Third, that "Countryside USA" offers the best hope and the most solid promise of resolving nearly 75% of America's domestic problems.

4. And fourth, that the time has arrived to unleash a positive program of fiscal and institutional decentralization in this country before it is too late.

You know what the situation is on our campuses today. Many of our college and university educational institutions have simply grown too large. As a result, the individual student becomes lost in a "sea of humanity."

Young people today, I contend, are seeking identity—they want to be recognized. And the struggle to be recognized as an individual is becoming almost unbearable.

Whether we wish to accept it or not, people are now rebelling against bigness, against overcrowding, and against becoming a faceless computerized society.

So, what are we talking about in terms of land use patterns for the future? In the final analysis, proper land use planning is the only way we can guarantee a quality of environment for future living in America.

One of the problems that we are all paying the price for today, has been the lack of sufficient attention to sound land use planning in the past.

In my judgment, land use planning is nothing more or less than creating the atmosphere for economic growth. I believe we in the West must now move in the direction of establishing the kind of land use pattern that will guarantee, through proper zoning, sufficient "open space" to advance the "country living" environment that is so traditionally imbedded in Western values.

A student of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville said that "the sufferings that are endured patiently as being inevitable, become intolerable the moment it appears there might be an escape."

I believe that "moment" is rapidly arriving in the big cities and I submit that it's time we start planning and moving toward providing an "escape route" for these people—back to Rural America!

Once again, however, a familiar pattern has developed regarding land use—a pattern that has become all too common in this century. I refer, of course, to the practice of waiting until a problem becomes an emergency before seriously trying to resolve it.

The urban and rural crises in America have, indeed, reached emergency proportions!

The challenge now, as I see it, is to correct the mistakes of the past and move forward together to create what I call a "total environment for future living!"

To do this, many coordinated efforts will be required to reverse and redirect the imbalance in our population distribution and to create in this country a balanced, coordinated, and integrated transportation system that will promote and enhance economic growth.

In addition, we must intensify our efforts to balance the formula that now exists for revenue allocations through comprehensive tax revisions at every level of government—Federal, state and local! A system that, in my judgment, has become grossly inadequate, unfair, and unsound.

We must have a more realistic and more effective method of finance in this country if we ever hope to solve the many staggering domestic problems that now face us.

As some of you know, I try to deal in "concepts" at the Federal level because I believe the "nuts and bolts" of any Federal

program in your behalf should be put together out here where government is much closer to the people.

One of the concepts I have advanced in the Congress is a plan that has become known as the "Clausen Reverse Migration Bill". Without belaboring you with the details, let me summarize this concept briefly.

Many Federal programs and legislative proposals have been advanced to "revitalize Rural America" and to ease pressures in the big cities. Most of these are highly commendable and laudable initiatives, except that, too often, the results have been either disappointing failures or total disasters.

Too often, as you well know, the Federal government has relied on dumping taxpayers' money directly on so-called "citizens' organizations" having no relationship or connection at all with local government or the electorate of a given area.

And too often, funds needed to satisfy program goals have either been held back or squandered on administration, staff salaries, or public relations projects.

In addition, too many of these programs were implemented on the basis of Congressional or Departmental studies and hearings—rather than the findings and recommendations of local government relating to local needs.

The bill that I introduced late in the 90th and the first introduced by me in the 91st Congress has as its purpose a new approach with maximum emphasis on coordination between the various political sub-divisions at all levels of government.

Basically, the intent of the bill is "to provide for a study of the need for increased expenditures for public works in smaller urban areas as a means of reversing the migratory trend toward large metropolitan areas".

Key provisions of this legislation are:

1. It calls for a coordinated effort between the Secretary of Commerce and the governors of each state to determine local needs for increased public projects.

2. It recognizes that the "problems and needs of various regions, States, areas and places within the Nation vary widely."

3. And third, it calls for an extensive survey of rural areas by local authorities to determine those "urban places within the State whose economic growth would best be promoted by increased expenditures for public projects."

Hopefully, this legislation and similar legislation will represent a "new dawn" in Federal program planning. Quite frankly, we in the Congress need your help in calling a halt to National programs that apply to only a few locations or to only specific problems that exist.

Domestic Federal programs, of the future especially those effecting land use, can and must be "tailored" and flexible to meet specific needs in specific places—not the sweeping, all-inclusive variety of the past that only tend to squander taxpayers' hard-earned money, and disillusion those who need help the most.

In addition, you people are going to have to be brought more into the planning and coordination of these programs if they are ever going to be responsive to the people's needs.

No discussion of land use (or more specifically—multiple land use) would be complete, in my judgment, without mentioning transportation and the role it is playing and will yet play in regard to land use.

We all know that historically, the Growth of the West—depends on transportation and with proper advanced planning and coordination, we can, avoid some of the transportation pitfalls that are now plaguing the East.

A balanced and coordinated, land, sea, and air transportation system will open up new economic horizons, once these vast open spaced areas are made more accessible. This

will set in motion the kinds of reverse migration that will permit a building-up and revitalizing of those smaller communities with a larger capacity for growth.

This will broaden both your economic and your tax base and at the same time, provide some semblance of relief from the enormous problems and pressures so prevalent in metropolitan areas. This is what prompts me to suggest "the key to our urban ills is to Build Rural America". We, in the West, must take the lead. We have the opportunity and indeed, the responsibility to "show the way".

In addition to transportation system development, the same long-range planning of Regional Water Resource development must take place.

Gentlemen, with the Jumbo jets scheduled for operations in 1970 and Super-Sonic Transports a few years thereafter, we must face up to the shocking fact that our surface transportation routings of today may well be obsolete for the '70s.

Air buses of both the rotary and fixed wing configuration will be unloading from 300 to 700 passengers into your airport terminals every day. Yet, today's airports are totally unprepared to handle either the present load or the influx that we know is coming.

In 1967, I delivered a speech to my colleagues on the floor of the House entitled "The Growing Crisis of the Lack of Airports". I said at that time: "The National airport plan is outdated before it is completed" and went on to outline a basic blueprint to meet the crisis that I have labeled "A Coordinated National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems".

One of the points I suggested in that speech was that "every State and county should develop an intrastate system of airports for aircraft flying principally between cities within a given State."

How, you may be asking, does this tie-in with land use? For many years I have advocated locating airstrips and air commuter centers contiguous to highways. Lands for these facilities should be acquired at the same time lands are acquired for highway purposes.

I cannot stress too strongly the vital importance of including airport site selection criteria in your future planning. I'm sure you have all heard of the current controversy involving general aviation. But, don't let anyone kid you—what this country really needs is more runways, not more regulations!

All of us here today are vitally concerned about what is going to be required to meet future transportation demands. And, while many believe that high-speed trains may be the ultimate solution, I believe we just have to think bigger. And again, I look to aviation and new innovations in helicopters and STOL-type aircraft to play a vital future role in short range commuter transportation.

SUMMARY

It's virtually impossible for anyone to outline a specific, detailed guide or handbook on land use that will apply to all of our counties. The multitude of diverse factors that govern land use criteria are not conducive to being stereotyped or catalogued.

We do believe, however, that there are certain guidelines and standards that can be made to apply to land use and I have attempted to outline a few of them here today.

While we do, in fact, have many complex problems regarding land use and have made some pretty costly mistakes in the past—I cannot help but believe that working together, we can and must change direction.

You people know better than anyone else what the problems are that plague county government. America desperately needs your knowledge and your expertise in getting this Nation back on the right track again.

We in the Congress are prepared to do everything possible to assist you but I'm personally convinced that no one is better qualified to deal with county problems than

you who are directly involved in county government.

And, I just happen to believe that if the Federal government will give you the tools and the authority—you can do a far better job of solving county problems than Washington has thus far been able to do!

Today, America stands at the cross-roads. We, as a Nation, can either continue down the time-worn path of centralization that has given us most of the domestic problems we face today—or, we can choose the fork in the road that will lead toward the kind of balance that I have been talking about here today.

New cities and "satellite cities" can and must be built. And, I believe far more attention must be devoted to the human needs that exist and now threaten to erode the entire social fabric on which all nations depend.

Human resources, after all, are still the mainspring to progress and greatness in this troubled world and we cannot afford to lose sight of this fact.

America became the richest, the most advanced, and the best governed country on earth because of its people. And, land use planning, in a large sense, can greatly help people develop their own personal plans for the future.

This reminds me of a story I once heard about a fellow who was trying to put a jigsaw puzzle together. All he knew about the puzzle was that on one side was an unknown foreign country and on the other side the picture of a man. After studying the puzzle for some time, he wisely concluded that if he could properly put the man together—he could thereby put the country together.

As NACO has already so eloquently stated: "We need to put America back together again at the local government level, and the county structure which encompasses all the people of the area is the logical place to accomplish this".

Needless to say, as a member of the "County Government Fraternity", I find myself in complete agreement with the stated purpose and goals of what the National Association of Counties is working so hard to accomplish and you can count on my continued support in the Congress.

In closing, may I once again commend you on this outstanding Regional Land Use Conference. I feel highly honored to have been asked to address you here today and perhaps, in some small way, contribute to strengthening county government in America.

A balanced population pattern, a balanced method of finance, a balanced transportation system, a balance in revenue allocations, and a more balanced distribution of responsibility and authority within each of our political subdivisions of our Federal system of Government in America, and, a balanced multiple land use policy that will enhance economic growth and create a total environment for future living.

CONCLUSION

If we are going to meet the ultimate goal of making America more livable, there must be more attention paid to land use in the immediate future. To create that "total environment for living" that I spoke of, then we are going to have to take advantage of some of that unused "open space" that still abounds in Rural America.

All that is required is comprehensive and coordinated land use planning and financing. All of us serving as partners in the Federal system must continually communicate and coordinate on our respective efforts as it applies to land use. In addition, we must be flexible and not hesitate to reevaluate and update our land use policies and patterns as future trends dictate.

Make no mistake about it! Countryside USA is still the "great backbone of America." Country living, as I see it, is that "escape"

to which de Toqueville alluded and I believe that millions of big-city dwellers would literally give their "eye teeth" to get out where the air is clean, where there is no serious over-crowding, and where people are still people—not so many robots mechanically going about the daily routine of merely surviving.

A PROPOSAL ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Representative PAUL FINDLEY, I wish to commend the administration, faculty, and students of MacMurray College in Jacksonville, Ill.

The problem of unrest on the college and university campuses of this Nation is a subject of concern to every American. The Director of the FBI has made a statement on the problem, the Attorney General has made a statement on the problem, and the President has made a statement on the problem. No one, it seems has looked to see whether there are college administrators who have met and overcome the problems of student unrest on their own campuses. Too few have emphasized that part of the answer to many student disturbances is identifying and redressing the legitimate grievances of the students.

Recently I received a letter from W. F. Starkey, director of public relations at MacMurray College. He described a program through which the administration of MacMurray College makes an honest effort to communicate with the students, to listen to their ideas and grievances, and to take action to utilize those ideas and redress those grievances. Granted the problems of running a huge, multicampus educational institution such as the University of Illinois or the University of California are greater than those of running a relatively smaller campus, nevertheless I believe that we can all benefit from the example of democracy in action which MacMurray College presents. Noted educators have often argued that academic pursuits cannot be democratically organized. The answer, I believe, is that today's colleges and universities are more than academic institutions. While the academic aspects of university life may not be fully susceptible to the democratic approach, I think we may well conclude that the overall organization of university life must be more democratic than it has heretofore been. Whether the MacMurray approach can be applied across-the-board or not is not the point. The point is that the administration and the student body at MacMurray are talking to each other; even more important, they are listening to each other.

The letter referred to follows:

MACMURRAY COLLEGE,
February 26, 1969.

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Not all news from college campuses is bad . . . but good news is almost rare enough to fall into the man-bites-dog category!

MacMurray College in Jacksonville, Illinois, is involved in an unusual experiment that we feel would be of interest to you. The experiment is optimistic, and it's unique.

The project is one of communication. But communication before the confrontation. We haven't had any demonstrations at MacMurray, but it would be naive to expect that we are an entirely untroubled campus. Instead of waiting for the explosion, however, we have done something to solve the problems before they reach the explosive stage.

Outlined briefly, this has been the progress of our Campus Conference:

In the fall of 1968, MacMurray's new president, Dr. John J. Wittich, proposed a campus-wide conference to discuss the State of the College—its problems, its future.

A committee composed of faculty, students and administrators set to work to devise a conference that is, as far as we have been able to determine, unique.

On December 4, 5 and 6 (originally planned for 2 days, but due to the enthusiastic response, it was expanded to 3 days) all classes were suspended, all meetings and assignments were cancelled, and the entire community met for three days of intensive talk, brain-storming, gripe-venting and evaluation. We met in one large group, we broke up into 64 small face-to-face talk sessions, we gathered into various combinations of groups. Our activist student groups (SDS, Black Students Union, etc.) were in attendance. But so was the "silent majority", that large body of students who are patently ignored in most situations of college crisis. They came, and they broke their silence. Every facet of the campus community was represented . . . all varieties of students, all factions of the faculty, the administration, the trustees. Topics for discussion ranged from curriculum to social restrictions to guaranteed tuition to problems of identity of black students to food served in the dining hall to Quaker counseling on the draft to re-evaluation of the functions of student deans . . . in short, to almost every facet of the life and function of the small, liberal arts college today.

The Conference culminated in a series of proposals, drafted out of the various discussions, being presented to the entire community in a Town Hall Meeting. The proposals were voted on by secret ballot. Each person . . . student, faculty, administrator, trustee . . . had one vote on each proposal.

Those proposals which were voted on favorably are now being dealt with in a variety of ways. Some have already been put into practice. Some, such as guaranteed tuition, will obviously require considerable examination and study.

A great many exciting things happened at our Conference. A number of original, creative ideas came out of the discussions. But perhaps even more importantly, an atmosphere of trust and understanding was established that continues to pervade our campus. In short, our Campus Conference was successful far beyond our fondest hopes.

We think we have come upon a technique that may be useful to other college campuses around the country . . . and we think we have something encouraging to say about the future of our young college generation.

Sincerely,

W. F. STARKEY,
Director of Public Relations.

TVA MUSHROOMING INTO BUREAUCRATIC GIANT

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during its years of existence, the Tennes-

see Valley Authority has done a great deal of good for many people and achieved considerable success. But let us face the facts as they are today and that is, the TVA is mushrooming into a giant bureaucracy, far greater than its original intent. Its activities now include land development, fertilizer research and production, timber sales, and recreation development, not only in our country but in many areas outside the continental limits of the United States.

TVA has taken on the trappings of a multiheaded conglomerate in the Tennessee Valley area and is spreading its activities to many other places. For instance, the TVA owns 4,800 acres of land in the State of Florida—land which, from all appearance, has not been put to any good use and is located miles from any TVA installation.

It is further interesting to note that while the agency is supposed to be self-sustaining under its corporate status, American taxpayers are still called upon to pump millions of dollars annually into the TVA coffers for many of these non-power activities.

A look at the various administrative costs and the ever-increasing number of employees that have been added to the TVA payroll over the years makes one aware of just how far afield TVA has gone, and makes one further wonder how far it intends to wander.

There is no question that the TVA has done a good job in harnessing the rivers of the Tennessee Valley to produce power for this region, but even good can be followed by bad; and the good of this agency cannot hide the dangers of its now expanding tentacles stretching far afield from its original purpose.

Mr. Tom Vinciguerra of the Fort Lauderdale News has written a series of articles that I believe are worthy of reading in regard to the TVA. He points out how the TVA has branched out from its power activities into numerous nonpower activities.

I commend these articles and ask my colleagues in the Congress to read them. I believe they will give further insight into the extent this Government giant has projected itself beyond its original intent:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Oct. 8, 1968]

THE TVA STORY: ITS BRANCHES GROW OVER INTO FLORIDA

(NOTE.—The Tennessee Valley Authority was created by Congress in 1933 to develop the natural resources of the Tennessee Valley and to harness the Tennessee River. But the TVA has branched out and is even involved in Florida. This is the first in a series of four articles based on an investigation by award-winning reporter Tom Vinciguerra on the TVA, its functions, its practices and how it is contributing to the national debt.)

(By Tom Vinciguerra)

WASHINGTON.—The Tennessee Valley Authority, sacrosanct, depression-born, multi-billion dollar U.S. government-owned business, is a giant real estate owner in Florida.

The TVA holds title to 4,800 acres in Marion and Citrus Counties in North Florida, oak and pine lands the TVA lists cryptically as "phosphate reserves" for its "chemical and munitions" operations.

The term reads almost like a cover-up for the TVA's \$69 million a year fertilizer re-

search-production plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala., which last year sold \$16 million in fertilizer commercially, but not in competition; the TVA contends, with private enterprise.

The TVA has never mined its Florida phosphate reserves, purchased in the 1950s for about \$1 million, and another million dollars or more spent on prospecting.

John Putz, mining engineer who supervised the TVA prospecting, says the ore supplies are under water because of a high water table in the area.

He estimates it would cost the TVA more than a half million dollars to start mining. The TVA retired Putz in 1961, convincing him the reserves probably will never be mined.

Moreover, the TVA has gone into a reforestation program on about 3,000 acres of its holdings. And on a 400-acre tract secluded in the slash pine lands south of Ocala, the TVA is trying to find the right fertilizer that will make trees grow faster.

The cost of that operation last year was \$26,836 for overhead and salaries of two men.

The TVA's total expenditure in Florida last year was \$226,187, including \$114,728 paid to the W. R. Grace Co. in Bartow for phosphate mined in the shadow of the TVA's dormant mines.

These funds are noteworthy to taxpayers because they are tax dollars appropriated by Congress.

In order to stave off a staggering \$25 billion deficit this year, Congress and President Johnson put over the 10 per cent income tax hike and promised in return to shave \$6 billion from the cost of federal government.

Already, the \$6 billion cut prospect has been shattered by increased costs of programs protected from the cutback.

The TVA this year asked for \$50.2 million for its non-power activities (including fertilizer) and got every penny of it from Congress. Last year the agency tapped taxpayers for \$61 million.

It uses the appropriations to keep up a \$250.9 million navigation program; \$191 million for flood control activities; \$4.8 million for tributary area development; \$26.6 million for recreation land development and for the \$69 million fertilizer program.

The agency justifies expenditures of these federal funds on the "unified development" theory for the Tennessee Valley, touching seven states (not Florida).

The TVA was created in 1933 to provide electricity to the valley. Today, the TVA is a 2.8 billion operation, clothed by Congress with unusual powers of a private corporation. More about this later.

The TVA launched the fertilizer business almost immediately after it was created in 1933, taking over a couple of old World War I government-owned nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals that were supposed to help produce munitions, but produced only federal debt.

Already developing a savior complex, the TVA dramatically entered the fertilizer business with congressional approval to help farmers grow more food during the depression.

The agency's success in research and development became so successful that private fertilizer producers screamed to Congress in the 1940s that the TVA was putting them out of business.

The TVA has received many tongue lashings in Congress, but the agency has managed to go its merry way without serious legislative curtailment of its non-power functions.

Momentarily, at least, a truce exists between the TVA and the private sector of the fertilizer business, the National Plant Food Institute, which is a recent amalgamation of the former American Plant Food Council and the scrappy National Fertilizer Assn., which fought the TVA tooth and nail to no avail.

The scars of battle are still there. "When the TVA wants funds, Congress usu-

ally rolls over and gives them to it," said Paul Truett, outgoing president of the big fertilizer organization.

He listed pro-TVA forces as the TVA-area congressmen, supported fiercely by the many rural electric cooperatives that purchase power from the TVA, and liberal congressmen from the North who support the philosophy of government-owned utilities.

The TVA says now it produces only .7 of 1 per cent of the nation's \$2.4 billion fertilizer output.

The future of the TVA Florida holdings is uncertain. George Bengstrom, TVA research forester in charge of the Florida reforestation program, says he doesn't believe the TVA will ever mine the phosphate reserves "unless there's another war."

But even in war there won't be a need for the TVA's Florida phosphate, said Larry Miller, geologist for the Occidental Corp., big phosphate mine operator near Lake City.

Miller said phosphate producers are currently struggling to stay alive with a massive over supply. The industry is shutting down mines and cutting back employment, Miller said. "There won't be a shortage of phosphate," he added.

Even using its Florida lands for reforestation, the TVA finds a crowded field, too. Other governmental agencies including the U.S. Forestry Service, the University of Florida and the state of Florida, are active in the Sunshine State.

This may explain why the TVA's tree fertilizer experiment station south of Ocala would win no prize for promotion. A fenced-in, strongly-built, unpretentious shed—partly air conditioned for offices—marks the 400-acre experiment station.

There are no signs pointing to the layout. And on the tax records of Marion and Citrus Counties the TVA land is listed merely as "U.S. government owned."

The TVA pays no taxes.

Next: The TVA's Florida Land Holdings.

MILLIONS SPENT ON MINED-OUT AREA BUT IT NETS NOTHING EXCEPT TAX LOSS

WASHINGTON.—About 30 years ago, the Old Dunnellon Phosphate Co. shut down in Citrus and Marion counties.

"The area was mined out," old timers thought.

The local folks had forgotten about the once-promising phosphate industry in their midst—until the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) came to Florida and bought up much of old Dunnellon Phosphate Co. holdings from heirs in the 1950s.

TVA spent millions buying and prospecting for phosphate before shutting down the search in 1961.

But still today, local folks wonder why TVA bought the land. It has never been mined.

"I don't know why they've got it," said bewildered Ed Tole, Citrus County tax assessor. "There's a whole lot of land in this county. If it's as valuable as they (TVA) think it is, there'd be a whole lot of phosphate mining in this county."

Tole figures TVA's dormant "phosphate reserves" in Citrus County, being government owned and tax free, cost the county about \$4,000 a year in tax revenues. Citrus County, with a \$1.9 million tax yield annually, "of course could always use the money," said Tole.

Citrus County's big brother, adjacent Marion County, is Central Florida's big growth area.

And Deputy Tax Assessor Charles Flemming says the TVA lands are right smack in the middle of one of the biggest potential tax income areas in the county.

He, too, wondered what the TVA is going to do with its "phosphate reserves." Said Flemming, "This area was supposed to have been mined out long ago. I wish they'd go ahead and mine if that's what they got the land for."

He estimated TVA costs the county about \$3,200 a year in taxes that the land would yield if privately owned in its present undeveloped state.

Development all around—a huge senior citizen retirement village to the south and Cross State Barge Canal to the north, a new veterans hospital in nearby Gainesville—are making land scarce in that area," said Fleming.

"We're sensitive to these (real estate) influences on our holdings," said R. B. Burt, chief of technical staff for TVA's fertilizer operation at Wilson Dam, Ala.

But he made it clear: "We bought those reserves to mine." He said he did not know when TVA would start mining.

The federal agency hasn't turned a spade yet.

FERTILIZER PLANT LOSES \$10 MILLION A YEAR

TVA operates a \$69 million fertilizer research, development and production plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala., at a net loss of about \$10 million a year which Congress comes up with.

Most of TVA's Florida real estate holdings—which total about 4,800 acres—are tree planted. On about 400 acres TVA experiments with fertilizers to make trees grow faster.

TVA calls this reforestation, a program that temporarily at least has taken the place of trying to mine phosphate in Florida.

The phosphate TVA gets from Florida TVA purchases from a firm in Bartow. Last year, TVA paid some \$115,000 for phosphate not including freight costs to the Muscle Shoals fertilizer plant.

To hear the folks around Citrus and Marion counties talk, you get the impression TVA has on its hands ore deposits that may be financially prohibitive to mine.

Asked about that, TVA's Burt hedged.

But not long-time Hernando County real estate man Norvell Byrant. He said it is no economic secret locally that the mines shut down because "no private individual or corporation can make a profit mining phosphate in Marion or Citrus counties."

ONLY GOVERNMENT CAN AFFORD IT

Said Byrant: "I guess the government can afford it because they get all the money they want from me and you."

Some of the land TVA prospected at Dunnellon in the 1950s but did not buy is now owned by the Rainbow Springs Corp., which is building a big tourist attraction in Central Florida, featuring among other things, a monorail.

Wondering recently about the phosphate mining potential on its 3,600 acres, Rainbow Springs Corp. wrote and asked TVA for its report on the phosphate hunt.

TVA, quoting from its prospecting findings, said the ore was too thin and too thick to mine profitably.

This may be the type of ore deposits TVA tenaciously holds on to. But TVA's Burt says the agency is not concerned. He says TVA reports show its reserves to contain "high grade ore."

Burt says TVA knows, however, the ore is under water.

As pressure mounts to get TVA to let go of the land, the agency merely tightens its fist.

Some of the TVA land, near highways and the scenic Withlacoochee River, is sought by other governmental agencies for right of way, or individuals seeking vacation cabin sites.

WON'T LET GO OF ANY OF ITS LAND

Real estate man Bryant is right-of-way agent now for his county, trying to get land for a county road between Hernando and Crystal River.

This transaction between two governmental agencies, both dependent on tax dollars, isn't as cut and dried as it would seem. TVA wants three times the appraisal value of the tract, Bryant says.

"They won't let go of a foot of their land," complained the real estate man.

Even congressmen get cooled off as they attempt unsuccessfully to intercede for constituents trying to buy some of the dormant reserves.

TVA, a \$2.8 billion power operation in the Tennessee Valley, got into the fertilizer business after taking over a couple old World War I nitrate plants the government owned to produce munitions. The plants became obsolete and TVA started in the fertilizer business.

The Hoover Commission, which took a searching look at government businesses in competition with private enterprise back in the 1950s, had a lot to say about TVA's fertilizer activities.

HUGE SUMS PLOWED INTO ARID FERTILIZER PROGRAM

WASHINGTON.—The Hoover Commission looked into the federal bureaucracy more than a decade ago and found about 2,500 government businesses "engaged in useless and costly competition" with private enterprise.

The commission found 30 bakeries, 186 laundries, 11 dry cleaning plants, factories making paint, eyeglasses, ice cream, rope—and fertilizer.

According to latest figures available at the Library of Congress, only about 700 of the government businesses in direct competition with private enterprise have been shut down.

Among those that escaped the Hoover Commission probe was the \$69 million fertilizer operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Both Hoover Commissions, in 1947-49 and 1953-55, are only a memory now, their recommendations for overhauling the federal bureaucracy largely unfulfilled.

Of the 273 overhaul recommendations of the 1947-49 Hoover Commission, 31 per cent were implemented by legislation. A bare 17.2 per cent of the later commission's suggestions were enacted.

In its May, 1955, report to the Congress, the Hoover Commission recommended:

1. That the TVA discontinue all chemical research.

2. That the TVA's fertilizer program be turned over to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

3. That the comptroller general audit the TVA's fertilizer program. The TVA, being tax exempt, "does not in its cost reports say whether they include depreciation, interest on the investment, amortization and fringe benefits to staff."

This year, Congress gave the TVA about \$50 million for its non-power activities, such as fertilizer. The TVA's 1967 financial statement showed a net expense of \$10 million for the program.

Last year, the agency sold \$16 million in fertilizer.

The 1955 Hoover report made it clear it thought the TVA should be put out of the fertilizer business.

"There is no longer justification for the research activities as these may be more appropriately conducted by the Department of Agriculture and Industry," the report asserted.

Astonishingly, even as the Hoover Commission was taking its stand, the TVA launched a multi-million dollar adventure in Florida to prospect and mine phosphate for fertilizer production.

The federal agency purchased some old phosphate mines in Marion and Citrus Counties, where local officials today say the area was mined out long ago. And they say, the ore supplies that are underground are financially prohibitive to mine.

The TVA has never mined its phosphate holdings in Florida. It owns about 4,800 acres, on most of which it is growing trees. On 400 acres, the agency is trying to find a fertilizer

that will make trees grow faster. In this endeavor, the TVA employs two persons and spends about \$30,000 a year.

Last year, the TVA spent about \$115,000, not including freight, for phosphate from a private firm in Bartow, not far from the TVA's dormant mines. The material was shipped to the TVA big fertilizer research and development center at Muscle Shoals, Ala., where the TVA employs about 1,000 people in the program.

The 1955 Hoover report noted: "... The Department of Agriculture had commenced fertilizer research many years before the TVA was created."

PROJECT SHIFTED

Gradually, over the past several years, the Department of Agriculture has shifted most of its research work on fertilizer to the TVA. However, the Department of Agriculture still runs experiment stations in the very same program the TVA now carries out in Florida—trees and reforestation.

The Hoover report stated: "There is a strong feeling . . . that there should be a national laboratory dedicated to research in this field (fertilizer), but the general attitude is that this laboratory should be under the Department of Agriculture, a national organization, rather than a regional valley authority."

The report pointed out that the TVA's justification for getting into the fertilizer business in the first place—a shortage of nitrate and phosphorus—no longer exists, with both those minerals in adequate supply.

Florida phosphate mines are cutting back production today because of a massive over supply.

REAPPRAISAL URGED

The Hoover report said (back in the 1950s) "The present time, therefore, seems particularly opportune for a reappraisal of the TVA fertilizer program, since the TVA had sought to justify the post-war production of fertilizer primarily because of shortage."

There was no appraisal. The Hoover reports give no indication that their investigatory staffs delved in detail into the TVA's strange Florida venture.

The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report of 1955 has been dissolved; the Senate subcommittee on reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations no longer attempts to keep a tally on Hoover Commission recommendations, implemented or forgotten.

One of the reasons for the death of the Hoover reports and their unfinished business is that some of the suggestions were "almost immediately rejected" when a new administration took over.

IKE STARTED IT

Former President Dwight Eisenhower cranked up the Hoover Commission in the 1950s. Now the United States Chamber of Commerce has launched a drive for another Hoover Commission.

Major accomplishments of the Hoover Commissions were in reorganization of the Defense and State Departments and unification of some military and agency duplication.

The TVA escaped. For an agency skilled in self defense, the Hoover Commission clash was no contest for the TVA.

This year the agency received about \$50 million for non-power activities—the basic reason for its existence—even as the nation faced a \$25 billion budget deficit and took an income tax increase to try to stave off more red ink. Congress' promise to clip \$6 billion from agencies had little or no effect on the TVA.

For in Congress, not to know the TVA intimately is to love it for providing cheap electricity and elevating the standard of living of the Tennessee Valley.

"THIN" AUDIT GIVES TVA FREE REIN

WASHINGTON.—Congress doesn't get a close look at how the Tennessee Valley Authority, a \$3.3 billion federal business, spends its money.

The TVA employs its own auditors, Lybrand, Ross Brothers & Montgomery, New York certified public accountants.

The private audit, however, "is primarily for the financial community—the man on Wall Street who wants to see the balance sheets," said Robert Egner, spokesman for the accountant firm.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) in Washington, watchdog of tax money appropriated by Congress, departs from its usual dollar-watching role in the case of the TVA.

Under law, the GAO can go through TVA spending with a fine-tooth comb, but does not.

In reviewing the TVA's private audit for fiscal 1967, the GAO reported: "... In view of the fact that a firm of certified public accountants was employed by the authority, our audit included observations and tests of the firm's audit work."

The TVA, clothed by Congress with unusual corporate powers and with authority to sell revenue bonds, spends funds in two main categories—power and non-power activities.

The power activities are self-supporting and the TVA annually makes payments to the U.S. Treasury on the \$1 billion investment of taxpayers. As of last year, the agency restored \$370.7 million to the Treasury.

Apart from that fiscal picture, however, the TVA annually asks for and receives from Congress tax money to pay for its non-power activities. Total assets of the non-power activities are more than a half billion dollars.

This year the TVA got a \$50 million appropriation from Congress to finance its non-power activities. Last year the appropriation was \$61 million.

The non-power functions are navigation, flood control, fertilizer research-production, recreation land improvement and cooperative valley development.

BREAKDOWN OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Total administrative expenses of power and non-power activities, as reported in the TVA's 1967 certified public accountants' audit, were \$7.7 million. Here's how that breaks down:

The TVA's three-member board of directors, \$178,566; general manager, \$198,990; budget staff, \$172,958; finance, \$2.3 million; regional studies staff, \$348,860; division of personnel, \$348,860; personnel, \$1.6 million; law, \$534,998; property and supply, \$1,022,478; medical and safety services, \$683,775.

In addition, the TVA spent \$560,712 for an information office (TVA propaganda materials pour out); \$49,358 for a Washington office and \$93,281 for "other" expenses.

Included in the \$7.7 million administrative expenses are \$818,832, for the TVA's controversial fertilizer program—production, demonstrations, farm tests, research and investigations.

Justification, for instance, for the TVA's Washington office, or \$93,281 for "other" expenses, or \$560,712 for an information office, is not the private auditor's responsibility to evaluate.

Only the GAO would snoop that deeply into TVA books—in behalf of the taxpayers.

According to Charles P. McAuley, GAO auditor, the GAO doesn't make a routine government audit of the TVA unless, for instance, it hears reports of hanky panky.

If the TVA is run with the efficiency of General Motors, or the abandonment of some of the federal poverty programs, Congress has no way of knowing.

The TVA has grown accustomed to special treatment. Most recently was when Congress, faced with a staggering \$25 billion budget deficit, ordered a federal employment roll-

back, but exempted TVA power operations along with three other agencies, the Post-office, Federal Bureau of Investigation and Federal Aviation Agency.

The TVA was created in 1933 to dam the 650-mile Tennessee River from Knoxville, Tenn., to Paducah, Ky., with hydro-electricity a "paying partner."

The Tennessee, the most dammed river in the world, long ago reached water capacity to generate power, but the TVA built steam plants to expand and now is putting up nuclear plants.

POWER OPERATIONS HAVE BOUNDARY LINES

Congress, however, has strapped boundary lines beyond which the TVA cannot huckster its power. That's about the only victory the TVA's historic enemies, private power companies, have to brag about.

But even with its market confined, the TVA keeps itself busy expanding its non-power activities in such questionable fields as tributary area development; recreation land improvement; water quality management; wildlife development; fertilizer research and production—and forestry.

The TVA calls this "unified development." Birds use the trees, but so far as is known, the TVA has not yet gone into ornithology.

Knoxville is the TVA administrative headquarters; the power center is at Chattanooga, Tenn., and the fertilizer operation is at Muscle Shoals, Ala.

SOME 19,000 PEOPLE LIVE OFF ITS PAYROLL

The TVA payroll supports 19,000 people.

The three members of the board of directors serve nine-year staggered terms, the members being appointed by the president, who also sets their salary scale. The chairman, Aubrey J. Wagner, receives \$29,500 a year, and the other members, Don McBride and Frank E. Smith, \$28,750 each. McBride is a former Senate aide.

The TVA general manager is L. J. Van Mol.

The federal agency's die-hard friends are the rural electric cooperatives in the valley that purchase power wholesale and retail it.

Besides the anathema of the private electric industry, an armed truce exists now between the TVA and the nation's fertilizer industry.

"They are like a mountain. You can't move them," reflected Paul Truett, long-time leader of the private fertilizer industry, recently retired as president of the National Food Plant Institute.

LABOR'S COMMITMENT TO THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, organized labor's clear and solid commitment to the full success of the model cities program, which it supported vigorously, was reemphasized in an article by AFL-CIO Vice President Joseph D. Keenan, who is also secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and chairman of the AFL-CIO Housing Committee, which appears in the 1968 Housing Yearbook. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Keenan's article, as follows, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ORGANIZED LABOR'S VITAL STAKE IN MODEL CITIES

(By Joseph D. Keenan)

Labor's foremost concern in housing—and in all of the problems of our cities—is people.

For it is people who are homemakers in the house; it is people who are neighbors in the neighborhood; it is people who are citizens in the city.

A home, a neighborhood, a city are living things. They grow, they change, they age, they all and they recover from their ailments.

This growth and these changes reflect the well-being of the people who inhabit them, the drive of their inhabitants for better life, the plans people make—and carry out—for orderly growth and development of their household and their community.

What gives the Model Cities program historic importance in American life is that, in responding to President Johnson's call, the Congress recognized for the first time, as a matter of national policy, that physical and human elements of the city must be treated together, not separately and independently, if the city's ills are to be cured.

Jobs, acquisition of skills necessary to obtain jobs, schooling for one's own life, and schooling for educated citizenship are ingredients just as important as shelter in the make-up of good city life. And community awareness on the part of citizens and townspeople is important to sound city planning and to equitable and realistic execution of plans for urban redevelopment and growth.

As the champion of human betterment, the driving force for a higher standard of living, organized labor has a keen interest in the Model Cities program as the key to better life for all urban dwellers.

Our labor movement has taken an active part in the Model Cities program from the very start. In fact, labor's participation in President Johnson's Task Force which blueprinted this program has helped in its formulation as a combined physical-human redevelopment package.

When the program was dramatically presented by President Johnson in his historic message to Congress and formulated in legislative detail in the Administration-sponsored Demonstration Cities Act, it was the AFL-CIO and the National Housing Conference which jointly spearheaded the public interest drive for its Congressional enactment.

Last November, immediately upon the approval by the Department of Housing and Urban Development of applications from the first group of cities for Federal grants for planning funds, the AFL-CIO called for "the fullest participation" of its local central labor councils "in this strategically important program" in each community.

There were the words of AFL-CIO President George Meany's special message regarding Model Cities, sent by him on Nov. 29, 1967, to all the central labor councils in the 63 cities with approved programs.

Mr. Meany asked that, "to this end" each Council "establish a working and consultative relationship with its city officials responsible for this program."

"I hope you will find it possible," President Meany went on, "to have your Council's Committees on Housing, Education and Community Services to devote their special and urgent attention to this task, with special emphasis on housing and planning, education and training, and social services in their respective fields."

Local labor organizations responded promptly and fully to this call. In most cities, union representatives took an active part in the planning of specific model neighborhoods on which the program is to focus. Many were able to pledge active assistance from local union members, serving as volunteers, in training, education and community service efforts in these neighborhoods. In some cities, professionally trained welfare workers on the AFL-CIO Community Services field staff were available for assignment to help deal with the neighborhood human problem.

Local labor housing committees, reinforced by the guidance provided by the Housing

Committee of the national AFL-CIO, are able to take an active part in sound planning of local efforts to meet the housing and urban development needs in these neighborhoods.

Labor's emphasis in all these efforts is on the fact that the deeper roots of the urban crisis are poverty and privation resulting from the persistent denial of opportunity to minorities—opportunity for education, for training, for self-improvement.

Labor, therefore, believes that remedies must provide more than better housing and more than slum clearance. They must go beyond urban development to provide opportunities and means for human redevelopment. They must go beyond rehabilitation of housing to include rehabilitation of people concentrated in our city slums.

Although the building trades unions have often been assailed for "restrictive" practices which purport to discriminate against minority groups, the fact is that building and construction trades today actively support "outreach" projects designed to recruit minority applicants according to the requirements of the apprenticeship programs and to help prepare them to meet these requirements.

From Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant in New York City, to Los Angeles, from Cleveland to Atlanta, there is a network of 48 cities where such "outreach" projects have been undertaken by building unions to enlist local disadvantaged youths in apprenticeship training. Between January and the end of June 1968, more than 12,000 young people have been sought out, screened and tested and more than 1,500 actually placed as apprentices.

Similar projects are being mounted in a number of other cities. In many cases these efforts are undertaken by labor in the neighborhoods of model cities.

The latest example of such an effort is the program called Justice—Journeyman Under Specific Training in Construction Employment—launched by the AFL-CIO Building and Construction Trades Council in Buffalo, N.Y., in July 1968. Workers enrolling in this program, mostly Negroes, will concentrate for three weeks on classroom instruction in mathematical and blueprint reading after general orientation courses. Five weeks will be devoted to vocational training in the classroom by union journeymen. This is followed by 20 weeks of on-the-job training, the trainees working when possible with the same union members who gave them classroom instruction. This "outreach" program has been developed under an agreement with a non-profit group called the Opportunities Development Corporation of Buffalo in cooperation with the Workers' Defense League and the A. Philip Randolph Education Fund, with the U.S. Department of Labor helping meet part of the cost.

A like project, called Project Build, is already in operation in the District of Columbia under the sponsorship of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, and the local Building and Construction Trades Council, it provides a six-month cycle of both instruction and work experience for youths between 17½ and 23 years of age to prepare them for apprenticeship in the building trades.

In Newark, N.J., a local painters union has underway a project called New Careers. The brainchild of Peter Yablonsky, president of the New Jersey Painters District Council No. 10, AFL-CIO, this project was realized with the active help of Lou Danzig, Executive Director of the Newark Housing Authority and Board member of the National Housing Conference. It employs unskilled young men—largely drawn from ghetto areas—as union-trained apprentice painters in public agency jobs. After they complete their apprenticeship, the trainees are eligible to become journeymen and to attain annual earnings of around \$10,000.

My own union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, has worked out an agreement with the National Electrical Contractors Association on a program using a completely new approach in teaching craftsmanship in junior high schools. Introduced in a number of junior high schools in September 1967 after three years of preparation, this is a construction technology teacher-training program which is, to my knowledge, the first of its kind in the history of education. It provides support to 20 students per year over four years, each student receiving a four-year, \$4,000 scholarship to cover tuition, fees and other expenses.

IBEW and NECA not only have helped to plan the electrical training program but are contributing \$80,000 to provide scholarships to train the teachers. Other building trades unions have announced that they plan to cooperate in the program for their particular jurisdictions.

These and similar programs to provide skill training and quality education for the disadvantaged young people are but one example of labor's concern in human reconstruction in our rundown urban areas. And labor finds the Model Cities program to be the best vehicle for this effort.

Good shelter is indispensable to a person's well being. But, as has been said, man does not live by shelter alone.

That is why organized labor is wholeheartedly committed to the successful realization of the Model Cities program.

It is this program's "total attack" on the social, economic, and physical problems in slum and blighted areas, designed to turn them into "model" neighborhoods, that labor overwhelmingly supports.

In the success of this program, labor has a vital stake.

DO WE KNOW WHAT FREEDOM REALLY IS?

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, some of the best comments on freedom come from those who are not philosophers but who experience it in action.

I am glad to enclose a letter written by Rev. Bob Minnis, a Graham, N.C., resident, which has been given the top award in the letters to the editor division of Freedoms Foundation. Reverend Minnis is an ordained Pentecostal Holiness Church minister and is an instructor at the Technical Institute of Alabama.

He is the second person in 2 years from Graham, N.C., which is in my congressional district, to receive a significant Freedoms Foundation award. Mr. and Mrs. D. A. Strickland of route 2, Graham, received the award for their son, Pfc. Hiram "Butch" Strickland, who was killed in Vietnam. His letter, written the day before his death, was given the Freedoms Foundation's highest honor—the George Washington Medallion Award.

Reverend Minnis' letter, which appeared in one of North Carolina's finest newspapers—the Daily Times-News of Burlington—follows:

Today's ever echoing cry is freedom. We hear it so often, and called for so loosely, that the question is prompted: "Do we know

what freedom really is?" Much is going on under the banner (disguise) of freedom, but freedom is not found in resentment or lust or hatred. By its very nature freedom is incompatible with such attitudes and actions.

In America we pride ourselves in a heritage of freedom that is unknown in many parts of the world. The opportunity for individual achievement and the level of that achievement have been magnets that have drawn people from many parts of the world to our shores. But if our understanding of freedom does not rise above the desire for personal gain at the loss of others, there is grave danger that the freedom which we enjoy will not long endure.

Freedom is a two-sided coin involving two concepts: liberty and equality. And the real foundation for this freedom is law. Freedom has always come through the establishment of law. Indeed, there is no liberty nor equality in anything without law.

A man may wish to become a master piano player, but with becoming a master of the keyboard comes a great deal of bondage (law, if you please)—a disciplined learning process, practicing. No legislative act can decree a man a good piano player. He must earn this right by facing up to the requirements.

Today, rights and privileges are demanded on the basis of justice, and genuine freedom includes justice (fairness); this we can't deny. But some rights and privileges can't be ordered. Again, they must be earned. Everyone has the right to go out for the team, but everyone doesn't have a right to play in the game. You have to be good enough. Measuring up to certain requirements (laws, if you please) warrant this.

One of the verses of "America, The Beautiful," ends with these words, "Confirm thy soul in self-control, Thy liberty is law." These words aptly bring together the principle of liberty through law and the individual responsibility we have for freedom.

Freedom will never be found through lawlessness, since the very basis of liberty is law. Today's disorder and chaos, resulting from extremists activities, retards rather than advances freedom. In the cry for freedom the chains of requirements have been discarded, thus in place of a free for all policy we have a free-for-all.

To expect the privileges of freedom without the responsibilities is folly, because responsible freedom is the only kind that can endure. Freedom is earned, not bestowed. The crusaders of the past put their "cause" above self; today the reverse is true. Self comes first. Crusading (protesting) has become a luxurious game of self-indulgence.

If we can understand something of what freedom really is, then we can work together for the development of the sharing of both responsibilities and privileges that accompany it.

BOB MINNIS.

PRESS ACCLAIM FOR PRESIDENTIAL TRIP

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I submit for your attention an editorial which states, far more eloquently than I could, the response of most Americans to President Nixon's recent trip. It was published in the March 3 issue of the Nashville Banner, and is encouraging reading for those of us who have witnessed the decline in America's prestige abroad during the past few years.

The editorial follows:

WELL DONE, PRESIDENT NIXON—AND WELCOME HOME

President Nixon's working trip to Europe was a plus for the United States all the way—restorative of national prestige, introductive of policy views firm and coherent, and productive of respect and confidence. He imparted the qualities for these at every stop, and his home-coming is to a nation proud of a mission magnificently performed.

It was historic, in magnitude and achievement; and to the host countries abroad must have been the more remarkable for the fact that it was a newly-inaugurated Chief Executive thus measuring to unsurpassed dimensions of maturity in leadership.

To the President it was a self-assigned responsibility—beyond the call of immediate duty; but assumed with initiative addressed to solution of international problems high on the priority list.

As a realist, Mr. Nixon was and is aware that these will not be solved overnight. But as a man of reason, he also knows the essential factor of mutual confidence for unity and understanding prefatory to meaningful clasp of hands across the sea. He clasped those hands, at Brussels, London, Bonn, Rome, and Paris—and, unquestionably, the sincerity of his message was transmitted.

The handshake was with more than Heads of State, with whom he consulted, to listen and discuss questions of policy moment. To the populace of those lands he personified, in words and contact, a President of the people—an image of friendship neither fawning nor patronizing, but with respect of a human being for other human beings.

He is that, with no affectations of infallibility; but with the sobering realization of awesome responsibility—and determination to fulfill, both in domestic and in foreign affairs, a covenant of trust. Thus his language gets down to cases, whether confronting a problem at home, or issues vital to Free World security . . . and it registered all over Europe. The tone of his message, for strength and judgment along any avenue to honorable peace, could not have failed a hearing even through the Iron Curtain—where the question of meaningful summit negotiations is pending.

No man could have carried more superbly the burden of such a mission; nor wrought of it a better total accomplishment.

There are areas of individual national responsibility—the internal political and economic affairs that are sovereign to teach—and on these he did not trespass. On the other hand, there are multilateral interests requiring maximum attention by the community of Free World powers, and in behalf of these he sought the full measure of enlightened action in concert.

Notably, he did not re-embark his nation on the futile course either of banker to the world, or of universal policeman. He did not seek to acquit the United States of shared obligations for peace-making and peace-keeping; but he underscored the fact that difficulties or crises confronting civilized society were for the components of that society to solve together.

Where reason goes hand-in-hand with courage, it gains an audience—of men or nations of good will. It gains respect, and can unify. It identifies its possessor with the highest qualities of statesmanship; and cements friendship predicated on understanding and trust. It is addressed by President Nixon—not to secret covenants, but to open accord openly arrived at.

He adhered to that on a working trip whose signs of success vastly outweigh needling aspects of Communist-begotten resentment and opposition.

The United States takes due note of the substantial plus side—the distinguished record of its chief spokesman who, at any point, did not falter or default. The nation welcomes him home.

RESOURCES, CONSERVATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT OF 1969

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to coordinate the Nation's natural resource conservation and environmental quality activities. This aim would be effectuated by the establishment of a Council of Advisers on Resources, Conservation, and the Environment in the Executive Office of the President and by the creation of Select Committees of Congress on Resources, Conservation, and the Environment.

It is a major function of the Congress to propose and consider policies to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States. Due to the rapid deterioration of the environmental base, natural and manmade, we today face a threat to the very foundation of American security, welfare, and prosperity.

This environmental crisis is, as pointed out by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs' report on "A National Policy for the Environment," largely the result of the unprecedented impact of a dual explosion of population and technology upon limited resources of air, water, land, and living space. We are thus faced with a challenge that has never occurred before in the history of mankind.

While we have been exploiting our environment, it in turn has been subtly undermining us. On the one hand we have rapidly completed the occupation of the easily inhabitable areas of the earth while the population has increased at an exponential and explosive rate. Thus, whereas the total population of present-day continental United States did not exceed 3 million people at the time of the American Revolution, the same space will raise 300 million people by the year 2000.

With the increase in population there has been a concomitant explosion in technology. While the technology has alleviated some forms of stress—for example, on forests for fuel or on wildlife for food—it has on the other hand resulted in enormously increased demands upon the environment in addition to the increase in population.

Utilizing our vast natural resources, we have achieved the world's highest standard of living. However, our production technology has been accompanied by unforeseen side effects. The history of soil exhaustion and erosion, of cut-over forest lands, and of slaughtered wildlife document a few of our early failures to maintain the restorative capacities of our natural resources.

Recently we have become acutely aware of polluted air and water, of the devastation of strip mining which has impoverished mining communities, and of the refuse of the machine age which lines our dying Great Lakes and is piled up in manmade mountains of junk.

These problems, along with the

psychophysical stress of crowding, noise, and interpersonal tension on urban populations, may infinitely degrade the existence of civilized man before the end of this century. It is abundantly clear that we cannot continue to enjoy the benefits of our productive economy unless we bring its harmful side effects under control.

At the same time, grave problems of national security, poverty, health, education, and urban decay have just and appropriate claims for priority in national attention and for public expenditure. Yet it is evident that many aspects of these selfsame problems involve questions of environmental policy. For example, the slums and ghettos of the great cities, the increased disability and death from diseases nurtured by the environment—such as cancer, emphysema, mental disorders—and the decline and decay of our once great rural areas—such as Appalachia—all have significant environmental components. If the area of environmental quality encompassed no more than these three problems, I think the case for a Council would still be made. That these three areas represent only a small portion of the whole environmental question shows the great need for a Council.

We can no longer ask the question, can we afford it? It is now graphically clear that there is no way in the long run to avoid the costs of using our environment. The deferral of charges by letting them accumulate in slow attrition of the environment, or debiting them as loss of amenities will soon be no longer possible. If we continue to wait, specific effects of imperfectly understood technology may prove to be irreversible or prohibitively costly. We must recognize immediately the hard necessity and start paying to obtain such things as air and water of at least minimal standards of health and comfort.

Further, if we fail to preserve the U.S. coastline and coastal waters, lobster, shrimp, and shellfish may become archaic words. Even the great salmon of Washington might be gathered off the top of the waters rather than caught in them. And, most importantly, who can measure the cost of illness and general physical and psychological discomfort that even now may be destroying 15 percent of our people.

It is clear that there are many agencies now dealing with some of these problems. In fact, there are so many that they often work at cross purposes and duplicate efforts—at great cost to our citizenry. None of these bodies as presently constituted are equipped to look at man-environmental relations as a whole. This fragmentation has been well documented on many occasions including the fine statement on January 13 by our colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. REUSS.

To make policy effective through action in this area, a comprehensive system is required to assemble and report relevant knowledge and to place alternative courses of action that this knowledge suggests before the President, the Congress, and the people for public decision.

The legislation I introduce is designed to meet the problems that I have

sketched. First, it sets up a high-level three-man Council of Advisers on Resources, Conservation, and the Environment. The Council would have the job of gathering information concerning natural resource conservation and environmental quality trends; of appraising the various programs of the Federal, State, and local governments and of developing and recommending national policies to the President.

Each January the President would transmit to Congress the Commission's report setting forth the condition of the environment and of natural resources, current and foreseeable trends in environmental quality and in management and utilization of natural resources, the adequacy of available natural resources for fulfilling human and economic requirements of the Nation, a review of the programs and activities of the Federal Government, the State and local governments and nongovernmental entities and individuals with particular reference to their effect on the environment and full conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and a program for carrying out the declared policy of the act.

Second, the bill establishes select committees of Congress to consider the Resources and Conservation report. They would be made up of the chairman and the ranking majority and minority members of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, Agriculture and Forestry, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The duties of the select committees would be to review the annual report and make such reports on resources and conservation matters and on studies undertaken by it to its respective House as it deems advisable.

Mr. Speaker, we have already waited too long to control the quality of our environment. Nature has warned us in many ways—frightening ways—of our laxness. Death-dealing smog, black lung and emphysema, contaminated and dying lakes, rivers, and streams, dead fish, and other water life, overcrowded cities with intolerable living conditions, stripped forests, dying birds and animals—many now extinct for all times. These are some of the warnings we have had.

I submit that the situation is too serious to continue to treat on a piecemeal basis—that we must look at the situation as a whole. To accomplish this I urge adoption of the Resources, Conservation, and Environmental Quality Act of 1969 as quickly as possible.

STUDENT "RIGHTS" RULING BODES NEW CAMPUS WOE

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newsletter we expressed concern about the latest Supreme Court ruling which appears to open the door wide for student revolutionaries to wreak havoc with impunity in public schools.

A lot of the Nation's troubles can be

traced to the Supreme Court and this latest bit of judicial idiocy is no exception.

Knowledgeable editors around the country are examining the ramifications of the decision and none that I have seen does a better job than William A. Mullen, the editor of the Pompano Beach (Fla.) Sun-Sentinel.

Editor Mullen is one of the country's outstanding editorialists and he has interpreted the dangers of the Court decision with a clarity and foresight that we wish to bring to the attention of the entire Congress.

The editorial follows:

STUDENT "RIGHTS" RULING BODES NEW CAMPUS WOE

(By William A. Mullen)

Any time it appears that the Warren Supreme Court has settled back to some rational decisions, a majority of the learned justices manages to snatch folly from the jaws of reality and an entire new generation of problems is rescued from deserved oblivion.

The court did it again this week with its 7-2 ruling that grammar and high school students have the right to demonstrate over the objections of public school officials.

Associate Justice Abe Fortas, who holds impeccable credentials as a liberal's liberal, wrote the majority opinion, contending that public school officials do not possess absolute authority over their pupils. He likened disciplined schools to "totalitarian enclaves," adding:

"Students in schools as well as out of school are 'persons' under our Constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the state must respect, just as they themselves must respect the obligations to the state..."

These are teenagers he's talking about, not college level students who have emerged from a state of adolescence—physically, if not mentally, in too many cases.

The Fortas concept is as alarming as it is amazing.

As a "person" with constitutional rights, it must be recognized that a youngster may sass back his parents under the right of free speech. The child may hang around the pool room, dance hall or "pot" den under the right to peaceably assemble.

The right to worship grants a still wet behind the ears "constitutional person" permission to join sex sects and to engage in erotic rites as a spiritual pursuit.

Police may not agree with the spiritual experiences resulting therefrom. But if they are not sufficiently intimidated by past court decisions to have the temerity to make arrests, they probably will be dragged into the Supreme Court for violation of civil rights.

And parents, watch out. Junior must be treated as a person with all attendant privileges. Otherwise, law suit with the Civil Liberties Union as amicus curiae, if not counsel of record.

Don't rely on the Fifth Commandment. It could be declared unconstitutional as a violation of the 13th Amendment prohibiting involuntary servitude.

If these remarks appear facetious in tone, they are deadly serious in portent. For in the climate of our times there are corrupting Fagins who will manipulate children to further the anarchy now engulfing campuses from coast to coast.

This is not beyond the realm of possibility. As ludicrous as it may seem, a high school freshman or a junior high pupil can organize a "peaceful demonstration" that Justice Fortas rules is constitutionally proper, over the objections of teachers and principal.

In fact, there already have been protests and outbursts in Dade County public schools

over the playing of "Dixie" and the use of the Stars and Bars at school sports events.

Justice Fortas equates a state's responsibility to youngsters and their responsibility to the state. How, we ask, does a teenage full of spirit and natural tendency to rebel against authority recognize such individual responsibilities when youthful ebullience hasn't felt the first touch of mature common sense?

He might better understand the problem besetting parents and the constant testing they endure from children who instinctively find security in discipline if he were not childless.

The real import of the Fortas opinion is that it gives a green light to the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), organizers and perpetrators of campus violence, to invade the secondary and elementary public schools to recruit and train the college anarchists of tomorrow.

The court would have been more sensible by ordering firemen to douse blazes with gasoline.

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been given a statement entitled "What America Means to Me." It was written by Albert J. Crispell, who is the principal of the Mary W. Devine School in Croydon, Pa. I would like to include the full text of the statement in the Record at this point:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Albert J. Crispell)

1. It is a nation that permits me to help choose the people who will govern.
2. It is a nation with laws that limit the powers of those who govern.
3. It is a nation of fixed terms for those who govern and where elections are set for choosing new leaders.
4. It is a nation that permits me to choose in secret those of my choice.
5. It is a nation with many qualified and willing to serve in positions of leadership.
6. It is a nation where many who govern desire to return to private life after a reasonable length of time.
7. It is a nation where men of good-will can unite even though of opposing views.
8. It is a nation, proud of its achievements, with a sense of world responsibility.
9. It is a nation of many natural resources.
10. It is a nation much concerned about improving the standards of life, liberty, and happiness.
11. It is a nation concerned about religion and Man's freedom in worship.
12. It is a nation interested in education for all regardless of their station in life.
13. It is a nation that has problems that its citizens can seek to identify and can openly seek ways of solving in a peaceful manner.
14. It is a nation that gives protection to its citizens and their property.
15. It is a nation where fear does not rule the heart of man.
16. It is a nation with faith in its future and the future of the world.
17. It is a nation troubled by a war of long duration when victory is not in sight.
18. It is a nation concerned about its young people, its children, and its aged.
19. It is a nation that can endure in a world where other ideologies exist and can be tolerant to permit other peoples to choose

their own leaders and their own form of government.

20. It is a nation that has friends in the "World of Nations."

21. It is a nation that can stand alone or stand among friendly nations for a cause in which it continues to see as right, and for as long as it sees this cause to be right.

22. It is a nation willing to seek peace, and willing to seek friends among former foes.

23. It is a nation which continues to prosper, and give hope to its own people and be an inspiration to peoples of other nations that would seek a better way of life.

24. It is a nation made up of the union of citizens by birth and citizens by choice who find here opportunities for service, sacrifice, and success.

25. It is a nation which finds power for union where powers are separated in branches of government and where powers are divided between levels of government in which the State is sovereign, the Nation is indivisible and local government is strong.

TAX REFORMS OR TAX REVOLT

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, tax reform is of major concern to every taxpayer. Ed Wimmer, president of Forward America and public relations director for the National Federation of Independent Business, discussed "Tax Reforms or Tax Revolt" on a recent radio program. I commend this broadcast to my colleagues:

Regular or periodic listeners to these weekly broadcasts ought to be familiar with our continued insistence that Congress does not dare delay major tax reforms without risking a further liquidation of the earnings of millions of middle class citizens, and near-total monopolization and bureaucratization of the American economy.

Congressman Wilbur Mills (Ark.), Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, seems to accept this view, and in ordering a sweeping investigation of the entire tax structure, expressed the opinion that reforms could result earlier than is expected.

Republican John Byrnes, Wisconsin member of the Committee, has sought tax changes that would help the family farm, independent business and lower income families. He is a vigorous proponent of a reduction in oil depletion allowances, and has recommended that a tax reform study of the Treasury Department, begun under the Johnson Administration, be a part of the Ways and Means Committee Hearings.

Joseph W. Barr, retiring Secretary of the Treasury, predicted a "Taxpayers Revolt" if early reforms were not forthcoming under the Nixon Administration. He declared that the Treasury Study revealed billions of dollars in tax evasions by huge corporations and super-rich individuals, and particularly in the growing rash of conglomerate mergers.

During 1967, another 100,000 farm families became migrants, making a total of 5,300,000 families driven from their land since 1950, and either directly or indirectly, this was due to the failure of Congress to use taxing power to prevent the monopolistic power that is basic to the farm problem.

It was the tax structure that, either di-

rectly or indirectly, permitted monopoly practices which liquidated 50% of the independent ice cream plants in less than 10 years; over 75% of independent dairy plants; 40% of the wholesale grocers; up to 85% of all the independent druggists, hardware dealers and grocers in large communities, and caused nearly every independent department store in the nation to sell out to the big chains.

Consider in this light the attempt in the early thirties, led by Congressman Wright Patman (Texas) and our office, to get a graduated chain store tax on from one to 51 stores at a scale that would have made unattractive the operation of more than 50 stores by any one corporation. If this battle had been won, hundreds of thousands of manufacturers, brokers, wholesalers, retailers and small businesses of all kinds would have been preserved and probably 10,000 more independent banks would be in operation, creating billions in additional taxes and millions of job opportunities. The family farm, the products of which have suffered rigged-buying by the big chains and other monopolistic combines, would not have had to turn to subsidies and outlandish farm programs costing the consumer billions of tax dollars, and robbing the youth of the agricultural opportunities so basic to our American way of life.

A proposal was made by John K. Jessup, Chairman of the Board of Editors of Life, Time and Fortune, that ALL corporations should be called before a Court of Corporate Inquiry, and be made to prove that they needed to be as big as they were. In Life, Mr. Jessup declared:

"The best friend and exemplar of economic freedom in America is the independent, competitive enterpriser who wants to be in business for himself. Such a man should be the favorite of a truly liberal government, for the reason (and please listen to Mr. Jessup) that small business keeps the market active, the economy expanding because small business creates more jobs for others to choose from. He controls his own livelihood which represents a stage of freedom to which so many Americans aspire. The more the independent enterprisers the freer the nation."

Now why shouldn't graduated taxes on the number of stores—on corporations put together in violation of the spirit of the antitrust laws—have been the best possible approach to preserving our free enterprise system?

Mr. Jackson Martindell, Chairman of the Board, American Institute of Management, wrote me, Sept. 5, 1962 that he was reproducing my column on this subject to send out to his 30,000 clients and members. In his letter Mr. Martindell said:

"As an individual becomes richer and more powerful, he is taxed (or supposed to be) at a higher and higher bracket. . . . I believe that all corporations with net income of \$100 millions a year before taxes, should continue to pay at the present rate, but that taxes (and listen, please) should be progressively reduced as the business becomes smaller in size."

In other words, why not a 'proprietorship' tax deduction to discourage mergers and encourage proprietorship?

Congressman Patman, whom I mentioned earlier, has led an investigation of the big Foundations that control billions of dollars in corporate assets, vast acreage in the U.S. and other countries, huge holdings in apartment buildings, trust funds, et cetera, and pay no Federal income taxes on much of this accumulated wealth and power. These Foundations will be fully investigated this year, and there is almost a certainty that big oil will have its depletion allowances reduced by at least 50%. When you stop to think that big oil is buying up insurance companies, opening thousands of unwanted,

uneconomic service stations to destroy their own dealers and other small businesses, and going into vast operations of motels, restaurants, vending operations, et cetera, partly paid out of tax evasions, it all adds up to a pretty shameful situation. For Example:

Twenty giant oil companies with fantastic earnings, paid less than an 8% rate in federal income taxes, against 50% for other corporations with nowhere near such earnings. And while we are talking about Mr. Patman, he has stated his belief (along with our own) that many smaller foundations, easily managed, have been a source of great good to the nation, and this commentator for one would not support a move to end their work, even though some abuses are unquestionably evident.

Mr. Patman recently asked Congress to consider raising income tax exemption to the first \$2,000 of earnings, while Paul Fisher, Fisher Pen Co., who wants all private enterprises owned by foundations, churches and other tax-exempt institutions, to pay the same rate of tax as other businesses, and Mr. Fisher has carried on a national campaign to repeal federal income taxes on all earnings under ten thousand dollars.

Continuing this week's treatment of tax reform, I would like to express my personal opposition to present proposals to offer tax inducements to corporations locating in rural communities or ghetto areas, on the grounds that already established businesses would be placed at a great competitive disadvantage. In the case of the rural communities, we are in a sad way when factories are needed to give farmers jobs so they can stay on the farm—instead of driving monopoly practices out of the market and thus ending corporate take-over of farm lands and huge subsidies paid corporate farm owners.

We agree with Congressman Gene Snyder (Ky.) that the surtax helps no one but big business, and like any other tax, the surtax increases rather than reduces the inflationary threat because all are added to the cost of living—which is now blowing through the ceiling. This is a middle-class liquidating tax and should be repealed at the earliest possible date.

A move is underfoot to repeal the 7% investment credit, which has helped thousands of small businesses to modernize. It applied to all businesses, big and little, and so long as it has a ceiling of 7% on expenditures no bigger than from \$25,000 to \$50,000, it is not adding to the inflation danger, and with profits and taxes what they are today, repeal of this 7% could have a devastating affect on present modernization plans of independent business.

We need millionaires in this country; in every community, to invest, contribute, lead, buy boats, fine homes, train horses, and build fine resorts. We do not need billionaires—a class of super-rich tax evaders—monopolists—who contribute too little that is good for their community or country, but who spend most of their time working against it. It is too bad that the more foresighted, patriotic rich couldn't see that what we should be building is an economic ladder with strong rungs at the bottom for all to take hold of; long rungs in the middle for an expanding middle class, with the rungs tapering down in length as they end toward the top of the ladder.

This is the only kind of economic structure that supports political liberty, and if we do not return to building such an economy, we will lose every freedom we possess—and I would say, within the next ten years.

For 36 years we have spent billions of taxpayers' money to establish inefficient, goal-less federal agencies and committees to treat effects—seldom causes.

How far the present investigation of tax abuses will go, and how many reforms we

will get this year, are uncertain, but reforms there will be, and they will be as good as we can convince Congress they ought to be.

Even Charles Y. Lazarus, Vice President of the giant Federated Department Store Chain, has said again that absentee ownership is sterilizing our society. This is true whether it is conglomerates, holding companies, chain stores, big foundations, abuse of union pension funds, Security Exchange Commission upheavals now being witnessed, the breakdown of local government or the destruction of the family farm—there is a tax reform need and it cannot come to soon.

ABM

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one day this week the President will announce whether or not he will ask the Congress to continue the appropriations for the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system.

As one of those who has been strongly opposed to the ABM deployment for a long time, I have urged that the logic of halting deployment is overwhelming. For reasons of cost, effectiveness of the defense, escalation of the arms race, and simple lack of necessity, I have argued that we should not build the ABM.

In today's New York Times, Washington bureau chief and columnist, Mr. Tom Wicker writes:

In fact, the case against ABM deployment is so overwhelming that it is hard to see how the President could decide for it.

I would like to say for the record that I strongly agree with this conclusion of Mr. Wicker. I only hope that the President would see it the same way.

I place Mr. Wicker's article at this point in the RECORD:

A DECISION THAT MAKES ITSELF

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Mr. Nixon's interesting custom of setting dates upon which he will deliver major policy pronouncements has this capital positively quivering in anticipation or dread of his promised decision on the antiballistic missile system. In fact, the case against ABM deployment is so overwhelming that it is hard to see how the President could decide for it.

Even the technical feasibility of the system is in doubt, particularly if deployment is to be justified by placing Sprint missiles to protect ICBM sites; and the Defense Department's research director, Dr. John S. Foster, warned two years ago that the whole Nike-X system—now known as Sentinel—would soon be obsolete.

The rationale first advanced by the Johnson Administration, that Sentinel some day would protect the nation against a Chinese missile attack, has been discredited by no less a hawk than Senator Richard Russell, a pillar of the armed forces establishment in Congress. "The Chinese are not completely crazy," he has said. "They are not going to attack us with four or five missiles when they know we have the capability of virtually destroying their entire country."

Now the ABM defenders have virtually abandoned the Chinese rationale and talk of deploying Sentinel to protect ICBM sites

from new Soviet multiple-warhead weapons. But Senator Cooper of Kentucky has pointed out that no one has produced evidence that the state of Russian weaponry makes it imperative for the United States to deploy such defenses; and two authorities, Dr. Hans Bethe and Dr. J. P. Ruina, told a Congressional hearing last week that they knew of no such evidence.

The cost estimate attached to Sentinel—about \$5 billion—is conservative at best and Senator Stuart Symington has effectively demonstrated that defense hardware costs always mushroom beyond Pentagon estimates. Moreover, the out-of-pocket cost to taxpayers is the least of it, while the worst is that these same dollars could be and should be used for all those domestic social needs so long starved for funds by the devouring demands of the military.

INSURING MILITARY EMBRACE

Politically, for the President to opt for Sentinel against these social needs, or even to insist, Johnson-like, that we can have missiles and social programs, would throw his Administration into the arms of the military-industrial complex and its servants in Congress, insuring for another four years the preeminence of generals and militarists; because a decision would repudiate the most progressive forces in Congress, now gathered in bipartisan opposition to the ABM system, and further alienate all those voters who already question Mr. Nixon's concern for the poor and the black, and doubt his interest in the quality of American life.

STEP TO COMPLETE SYSTEM

The deployment of any ABM system, moreover, however "thin," ineffective or near obsolescence, will be regarded by its victorious proponents as a "building block" in a vastly more expensive ABM defense against Soviet missiles. "It is the first step," Senator Russell said of Sentinel, "toward the deployment of the complete system that I think is required."

But the estimated \$40-billion cost of the "complete system" that Russell and others really want to develop from Sentinel deployment is not much better than an arbitrary guess; and former Defense Secretary McNamara has pointed out persuasively that even the "complete system" would be penetrable by the sophisticated Soviet weaponry its deployment would force them to build.

Above all, a decision to deploy an ABM system now might well trigger what McNamara called an "action-reaction phenomenon that fuels an arms race." The Soviets might and probably would step up their offensive or defensive missile armaments, or both, in response; they might recoil from the nuclear arms control talks Mr. Nixon has said he desires; and military hardliners in Moscow might well picture themselves as vindicated and find their influence enhanced for years to come.

If these arguments, all of which are being made to Mr. Nixon not only by Democratic liberals but by such Republicans as Cooper, Javits, Percy, Brooke and Hatfield (even Everett Dirksen and John Stennis, the Armed Forces Committee chairman, have expressed reservations), should persuade the President, he even has at hand a sound political explanation just waiting to be made.

He could say that the proposed ABM system needs more study and further development, which it does. He could add that this need dovetailed with his desire as a peacemaker to defer deployment at least until he had determined whether the Soviets would negotiate in good faith on arms control. And he could play on the disenchantment on Congress and the public by pointing out that deploying the Sentinel was Lyndon Johnson's idea, anyway. After all, this is a new Administration, isn't it?

NIXON AND VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in his New York Post column on March 6 James Wechsler reported upon his conversation with Ambassador Averell Harriman, President Johnson's chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks. The recent increase in military activity by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong was foreseen by Ambassador Harriman when the United States intensified its military pressure after the bombing halt was ordered by President Johnson last fall. In fact, Ambassador Harriman warned that a step-up in U.S. military actions would produce a counter military reaction.

Ambassador Harriman said that the latest offensive action by North Vietnam and the Vietcong "were essentially a response to our actions rather than a deliberate, reckless attempt to dictate the peace terms or torpedo the talks." It is important to keep this in mind as the Nixon administration contemplates "an appropriate response." The only appropriate response is a political settlement.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include James Wechsler's column in the RECORD:

[From the New York Post, Mar. 6, 1969]

NIXON AND VIETNAM

(By James A. Wechsler)

It is a matter of record that, in the aftermath of the bombing halt over North Vietnam decreed by President Johnson last Oct. 31, Commanding Gen. Creighton W. Abrams issued an order calling for "all-out pressure on the enemy" on other levels.

What is not in the published reports is that Averell Harriman, then our chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks, somberly warned the outgoing Administration that this step would inevitably invite the military reaction that we have been facing in recent days.

Reached by telephone at his vacation refuge in Hobe Sound, Fla., Harriman acknowledged yesterday that he had advanced this forecast during the debate that preceded the escalation of our military effort. He said it was important for the country to understand that the headlined new offensives of the Viet Cong were essentially a response to our actions rather than a deliberate, reckless attempt to dictate the peace terms or torpedo the talks.

Beyond that contribution to the historical archives, he declined to offer either critical appraisal or prediction.

"I want to be as helpful as I can be in bringing this war to an end," he said. "I don't want to say anything that could be regarded as a hostile judgment of the way Mr. Nixon is handling things. The big decisions are still to be made."

Even Harriman's limited comment, however, assumes crucial significance at a moment when Defense Secretary Laird is on his way to Vietnam and the question of resuming the bombing exercises is in the balance. In his Tuesday night telecast President Nixon took pains to point out that most of the recent targets were military; he appeared determined to avoid provocative rhetoric.

But he left wide open the possibility of a bombing renewal, and that remark received

the biggest press-notice. That is why Harriman's testimony is so vital at this juncture. He is hardly a man who can be accused of innocence or "softness" about dealings with the Communists. But he has also displayed rare sophistication and sensitivity, based on many years of diplomatic experience, in evaluating Communist moods and methods.

Despite his reluctance to assume a controversial posture, it seems clear that he is convinced that Mr. Nixon is confronting a fateful decision in which the Pentagon and its political allies—with the enthusiastic cheers of the Thieu-Ky regime—are once again pressing the delusion of military "victory" and using the latest Viet Cong assaults as a cover for their campaign.

It should be reported in this context that Harriman has high regard for Gen. Abrams, viewing him as a military figure with an unusual awareness of the complexities of the Vietnam conflict. But he has no comparable esteem for many chieftain strategists now conducting their annual exercise in the propaganda of promise; "We can clean this up if we get one more chance."

He is also persuaded that each new foolish journalistic communique heralding imminent victory is a further incitement to a show of strength by the Communists, and reduces the effectiveness of the Russians in what he sees as their authentic effort to promote the peace negotiations.

Between the lines of Harriman's discreet observations, the message was unmistakable; we are approaching that crucial turning point in which the chance for any serious private negotiations (the only kind that he has ever deemed meaningful) can be destroyed by a reversion to the futile formula of air power against the North.

In this crisis, as in the ABM dispute, Richard Nixon faces his first momentous tests of strength with what Dwight Eisenhower described in his farewell address as the "military-industrial complex." His responses may determine the fate of his Administration.

For a sudden expansion of the war, flimsily camouflaged by charges that Hanoi has violated the "understanding" of October when in fact the "all-out pressure" order first came from our side, will instantly recreate, on a larger scale, the discords that haunted the Johnson era. Neither Ellsworth Bunker nor Joseph Alsop nor all the generals who have so often proclaimed that we are on the enemy's one-yard line will be able to smother the storm. Mr. Nixon has enjoyed several weeks of meditation, and skillfully exploited that interval. But the holiday is nearing an end.

LARGER CITIES URGENTLY NEED HELP FOR POLICE BUILDUP

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our larger cities urgently need more Federal help in dealing with the mounting incidence of crime.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act is fine as far as it goes, but it does not provide the help which is needed for our major cities.

I am today introducing a bill which would combat crime by providing assistance for those communities where crime is rampant. It will enable them to hire more policemen and to pay larger salaries.

The legislation specifies that 90 percent of each year's appropriation be reserved for grants to cities with 100,000 and more population. The balance would be made available to smaller cities upon a finding by the Attorney General that the city has an unusual need for a Federal grant.

An appropriation of \$100 million is proposed for the first fiscal year.

The cost of police protection is increasing equally if not faster than the urgent need. And our large cities are in a critical fiscal bind—unable either to hire enough policemen or to pay them adequate salaries to encourage them to remain on the police forces.

The report of the President's Crime Commission in 1967 pointed up the plight of the larger cities and the need for special help.

I am hopeful that the Committee on the Judiciary will give special attention in this Congress to the law-enforcement needs of our larger cities.

DISC EMPLOYEES ENDORSE NEW PROGRAM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, a seemingly never-ending battle is being waged by educational authorities to eliminate the school dropout problem. Militating against success in this endeavor are many factors. The young student is devoid of hope, usually left to his own resources, he is friendless and ever present is the fear and anxiety that he is not wanted. Experience has proven that somewhere between junior high school and high school, the decision "to drop out" or "not to drop out" is made.

Concerned with this national problem, Rear Adm. G. C. Heffner, U.S. Navy, commander of the Defense Industrial Supply Center—DISC—in northeast Philadelphia, my district, has begun an experiment in his Defense installation designed to give hope, lend encouragement, provide a friend, and to show the junior high school student that he is needed in our society and also to demonstrate the opportunities available in our society and community.

In concert with his equal employment opportunity officer, Mr. Al Dorsey, and a civic organization called IN for "interested Negroes" the admiral has opened up his organization to visits by junior high school students of the inner city schools.

Groups consisting of 30 to 35 youngsters are bused to the center periodically where they spend a day with an employee sponsor. They spend the entire day on the job, working together and eating together. The student is indoctrinated into various work operations, hopefully to spark interest in the many professions and work categories at the center. Insofar as possible, the sponsor is from the same general locality where the youngster resides.

The first 30 youngsters who participated in the program were from the Fitzsimons Junior High School, 26th and Cumberland Streets. The students, along with their coordinator, Mrs. Beatrice Pope, were picked up in a Government vehicle and transported to DISC where they received a welcome from Admiral Heffner and then met with their sponsor for a full workday.

DISC employees and specifically those who acted as sponsors, have endorsed the program with great enthusiasm.

DISC is responsible for the purchase of over \$1 million a day of industrial items from American industry for use by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Employing more than 2,300 people, with a payroll of over \$21 million, DISC is a responsible and concerned member of the Philadelphia community.

HAWAII'S CHINN HO TRANSFORMS ISLAND VALLEY INTO PACIFIC TOURIST PARADISE

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of our country finds its strongest base on men who dream dreams and work to make these dreams come true. Nearly 4 years ago, one of such dreamers, Honolulu financier Chinn Ho, disclosed his plans to develop arid Makaha Valley in rustic leeward Oahu, Hawaii, into a tourist's paradise. Many thought it was a beautiful but unrealistic and fanciful dream. Today, as Honolulu Star-Bulletin writer Harold Morse recently reported, "a \$33-million, man-made miracle is transforming what was the desolate underbrush of an isolated valley into one of the recreational wonders of the Pacific."

On February 26, Mr. Ho celebrated his 65th birthday with the dedication of the Makaha Inn and Country Club and the initial 200-room hotel—the first unit in a planned major development of Makaha Valley. The simple birthday-dedication celebration for Mr. Ho was perhaps the "grandest birthday party of all." It was attended by a host of his associates and friends, including Hawaii's Governor, John A. Burns. The Rev. Abraham Akaka, pastor of Kawaiahao Church in Honolulu, using a wooden bowl that belonged to Kamehameha the Great, blessed the occasion and untied a maile lei opening the entrance to the club.

In developing Makaha Valley as a major tourist destination area, Mr. Ho pledged that the emphasis would be on quality and on the restoration and maintenance of the valley's historic Hawaiian sites. As a means to achieve the latter, Mr. Ho and his partners, the Weyerhaeuser Family Associates, have spearheaded the organization of the Makaha Historical Society which commissioned the Bishop Museum to undertake a \$100,000 project to advance the historical and archaeological knowledge of Makaha and Leeward Oahu.

But the development is still in its infant stage in Makaha Valley, for the Makaha Inn and Country Club, with its two 18-hole golf courses, is just the beginning of a 20-year development plan. Projected costs for the first 5 years could reach 10 times that amount.

Included in the new Makaha Valley of the future will be a 325-room hotel tower, construction on which is scheduled to begin next month; a proposed central resort complex; 584 condominium units on either side of the valley and scheduled for occupancy in the spring of 1970; a beach club overlooking the famed Makaha Surfing Beach; and a luxury mountaintop restaurant with access by a cable car.

The lush greens of the 18-hole Makaha-West Golf Course will be the site of the \$200,000 1970 Hawaiian Open which will be beamed live from Hawaii via the Lani Bird Satellite to mainland television viewers next fall.

I commend Mr. Ho for conceiving and developing this recreational paradise which in a few years promises to become as world renowned as Waikiki. Mr. Morse's article is a fine description of the philosophy of financier Ho in planning his dream—"second homes for islanders who want to vacation there, golf courses and apartments for mainlanders who wish to visit for lengthy stays and luxury resort cottages." It is with a deep sense of admiration for Hawaii's miracle worker that I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article entitled, "From Desolate Valley to Playground in Pacific," from the February 22, 1969, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

MAKAHA INN AND COUNTRY CLUB OPENS MARCH 1—FROM DESOLATE VALLEY TO PLAYGROUND IN PACIFIC

(By Harold Morse)

A thousand cattle grazed there just a few years ago.

Today a \$33-million, man-made miracle is transforming what was the desolate underbrush of an isolated valley into one of the recreational wonders of the Pacific.

Makaha Valley in rustic Leeward Oahu has become a land of milk and honey, and its two 18-hole courses are a golfer's dream.

A 200-room hotel facility, the Makaha Inn and Country Club, is scheduled to open there just one week from today.

It is anticipated by the developers that the Valley under a 20-year plan eventually may boast about 2,500 hotel rooms and 7,000 apartment units—with 25,000 people visiting, living, working and playing there.

The Hawaii Hotel Association and the Hawaii Visitors Bureau generally agree that Waikiki now has somewhat more than 10,500 hotel-type units and about 3,000 hotel apartments for visitor use.

Clearly then, Makaha Valley promises to be another vacation mecca on Oahu that could become as world-renowned as Waikiki.

SITE OF HAWAIIAN OPEN

It is already the first Oahu vacation area outside of Waikiki.

The pride of Honolulu financier Chinn Ho, his firm, Capital Investment of Hawaii, and the Weyerhaeuser Family Associates, partners in the resort development, Makaha next year will be the scene of the Hawaiian Open golf tournament.

Nestled between fairways of the tranquil valley's two 18-hole golf courses—Makaha-West (site of the \$200,000 1970 Hawaiian Open) and Makaha-East—stands the just

completed Makaha Inn and Country Club, scheduled to open March 1.

The precedent-setting, 200-room hotel has been designed as a series of pavilions and bungalows blending with the green tropical countryside and oriented to take full advantage of the panoramic views of the ocean and towering mountain peaks surrounding the Valley.

Within a month construction will begin on 584 condominium apartments. It is envisioned that these units will be ready for occupancy in the spring of 1970.

A 325-ROOM TOWER IN APRIL

An additional 325-room hotel tower, along with restaurant and lounge facilities, is planned, with construction to begin in April.

This, along with the 200-room Makaha Inn and Country Club, will bring the number of hotel rooms to 525.

The tower hotel addition will be ready in time for the 1970 Hawaiian Open.

The 525 total hotel units are the first phase of six planned hotel sites.

Located in the heart of the valley, the Inn and Country Club are only minutes away from the white sands of the magnificent Makaha Surfing Beach.

Shuttle service from the hotel area to the beach will be provided for hotel guests.

The architectural style of the new hotel was inspired by the hand-hewn structures of the original Polynesian settlers of Mahaka Valley. Umbrella roofs, wide lanais and the extensive use of wood convey the air of an idyllic native village of Old Hawaii.

The 200 air-conditioned hotel rooms, each with their own lanai, occupy low rambling one- and two-story cottages.

The complex is under the management of Western International Hotels.

A 60-foot-by-60-foot swimming pool is surrounded by an open deck for sunbathing, and a "Sunset Bar" for cocktails and poolside snacks is near at hand.

Locker rooms for golfers and the pro-shop occupy the lower level of the main hotel pavilion. The lower level also is shared with a shopping area where sundries, gifts and other items may be purchased.

Another pavilion-like structure, the Makaha Terrace, contains banquet facilities for groups up to 300 in size. The outdoor terrace is complemented by a bar, orchestra stand and dance floor to be used for luaus, informal entertainment and other evening activities.

The Makaha Inn and Country Club began almost four years ago when Chinn Ho, president of what was then Capital Investment Co., announced that William L. Pereira and Associates, Los Angeles planners and architects, had been retained.

(Capital Investment Co. became Capital Investment of Hawaii last July 31.)

A 5,200-ACRE VALLEY

The task before the Los Angeles planners was to blueprint an entire major residential and resort community in the vast, empty 5,200-acre valley.

Pereira and Associates—planners for Hawaii Loa College, Catalina Island off the California coast, Los Angeles Airport, and the Irvine Ranch which includes a branch of the University of California—took the Makaha task in hand.

"Their master plan for the valley envisioned a wide range of housing, an international hotel complex, shopping and community centers and elaborate recreational facilities, including the two 18-hole golf courses, tennis and volley ball courts and provisions for hiking, hunting and horseback riding.

Pereira disclosed in 1965 that more than half the entire property would be maintained in its natural state, with every effort made to preserve the valley's scenic beauty.

The championship golf courses were designed by William F. Bell, noted golf course architect from Pasadena, Calif.

The Makaha Valley developers see the evolutionary transition of the valley as a "long-range planned community development program."

VALLEY TO GROW WITH PRECISION

Where Waikiki has grown like Topsy, so to speak, Makaha Valley will grow in a precise, carefully thought-out esthetic progression.

Chinn Ho put it this way:

"The principal feature of this valley will be proper planning, designing and security service—maintenance of very tight security, privacy for the owners and the hotel guests."

When Ho showed a few visitors around the valley recently, one man remarked:

"This is just like going to the Neighbor Islands without leaving Oahu."

Ho pointed to the land in the rear of the valley which will remain in its natural state. Hiking and horseback riding will be among the recreation diversions this undeveloped valley land will offer.

Ho spoke of the "most spectacular trails" there.

HEIAU LOCATED IN BACK

"You can go all the way to Kolekole Pass," he said.

He mentioned a heiau back in the valley, an old Hawaiian burial ground.

Ho and his partners, the Weyerhaeuser Family Associates, spearheaded organization of the Makaha Historical Society, which commissioned the Bishop Museum to undertake a \$100,000 project to advance historical and archaeological knowledge of Makaha and Leeward Oahu.

Among future projects of the historical society are the establishment of a Hawaiian museum at the valley resort.

Ho noted that helicopter service is now in operation between Honolulu and Makaha Valley.

The helicopter service is provided by Vernon L. Lofstedt in his Bell Jet Ranger. Lofstedt founded Kenai Air Service in Alaska in 1951 and recently set up a "branch" here.

JAPANESE INN PLANNED

Ho disclosed that a "Japanese Inn of about 40 rooms" will be added to the resort complex, to be operated by Japanese interests.

And he pointed out a nursery area where 3,000 coconut trees are growing, eventually to be transplanted throughout the development, along with many Hawaiian flowering trees.

Before the development began, Ho said, the entire valley was kiawe trees and grazing land.

The quiet valley now has nine man-made lakes and a water system capable of producing more than three-million gallons a day.

A sewage treatment plant and access road have been built.

A second clubhouse to service the second 18-hole golf course is under construction.

The master plan provides uncluttered vistas from practically every spot in the development, dramatic views of the ocean and towering ridges which surround the Valley.

The two golf courses form an oasis of greenery that covers more than 300 acres.

MASSIVE AMOUNTS OF MONEY

The \$33-million investment that construction projects for the first five years will require represents less than 10 per cent of the total Makaha Valley development program.

Subsequent projects will bring a community of single-family homes, town houses, smaller apartments and tower-condominiums on the valley's sloping hillsides.

The five other major hotels will be graced with quality shopping areas. Also, there will be residential shopping centers.

A beach club will overlook Makaha Surfing Beach.

The golf courses provide not only an ideal setting for the likes of Dudley Wysong, who represents the Makaha Valley Courses on the professional golf circuit, but also offer challenging recreation for weekend golfers.

An architectural innovation in the Makaha Inn and Country Club is the use of large, arched laminated beams which reach as high as 24 feet.

OVERLOOKED BY MOUNT KAALA

Another aspect of the valley is that it is overlooked by Mount Kaala. The mountain's 4,064-foot elevation makes it the highest point on Oahu.

The second golf course was opened Feb. 3, Makaha West—which opened in the fall of 1966—was closed temporarily on that date. It will reopen when the Makaha Inn and Country Club open next Saturday.

Chinn Ho purchased most of Makaha Valley in 1946 from Waianae Sugar Co. Sugar production in the Valley ended with World War II.

Ho had long dreamed of transforming the property into golf courses, "second homes" for Islanders who want to vacation there, apartments for Mainlanders who wish to visit for lengthy stays and luxury resort cottages.

He made a significant observation about Makaha Valley while present development plans were in the early stages:

"A few years ago it was arid land going to waste. It's amazing what a little water can do."

The warm, dry valley is within convenient driving distance from downtown Honolulu.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS PRAISED FOR WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it was recently brought to my attention that the Pittsburgh diocesan Catholic schools office was singled out for special praise by a national advisory body in a report to President Richard M. Nixon and the 91st Congress. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children said the schools office, working with the public schools, has administered a Federal-aid program for disadvantaged children in Catholic schools better than has been done anywhere else. Involved is aid provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Funds come to the Pittsburgh Public School Board, which with nonpublic school officials decides on programs for disadvantaged children in all schools of the city.

Coordinator for the Catholic schools' program under Auxiliary Bishop John B. McDowell, schools superintendent, is Sister Collette Link.

The program is not connected with the war on poverty, although it does aid many of the same children. It has been providing remedial teaching during school hours, and special equipment and supplies for public and parochial schools throughout the area.

The National Advisory Council said it has studied 17 large and small communi-

ties and found that only Pittsburgh has done a thorough job of administering title I aid to nonpublic school children. A major reason, apparently, it said, was that public and nonpublic school officials here maintain "regular, cordial, and open communication."

I am very proud that Sister Collette Link was born and raised in my hometown of Painesville, Ohio. She is a member of the Holy Humility of Mary Order which is recognized internationally for its contribution to education.

This is a much better world because of Sister Collette Link.

THE MORAL MYOPIA OF MR. U THANT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no other area of human endeavor in which the dearth of consistently applied values is more glaring than in the field of geopolitics. And, of course, the world's foremost geopolitician, by virtue of his position, is Mr. U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and past master of the double standard.

It is not surprising that the U.N. in recent years has suffered from a confidence gap when one reviews the statements and positions of its chief spokesman in various areas. Mr. Thant heartily endorses an economic boycott of Rhodesia because of that country's alleged voting irregularities. But the Secretary-General deplores the economic boycott of Cuba where there is no meaningful voting rights at all.

Presumably, there was no threat to world peace when the tanks and troops of the U.S.S.R. and certain Soviet-bloc nations smothered Czechoslovakia in August of last year. Certainly, there was justification for a U.N.-imposed economic boycott in this case.

Mr. John D. Lofton, Jr., in his article, "The Moral Myopia of Mr. U Thant," appearing in the March 15 issue of Human Events, reviews some of the Secretary-General's tragic inconsistencies. Tragic is the appropriate word for the lives and rights of millions of human beings are involved in the unprincipled manipulations of Mr. Thant.

I include at this point the above-mentioned article by Mr. John D. Lofton, Jr., in the RECORD:

THE MORAL MYOPIA OF MR. U THANT

(By John D. Lofton Jr.)

The 16th-Century essayist and skeptic, Montaigne, once remarked that "he who has not a good memory should never take upon him the trade of lying."

U.N. Secretary-General U Thant has just illustrated how sage this advice is.

In a front-page story in the New York Times recently, Secretary-General Thant "spoke out firmly" for an end to the economic boycott of Communist Cuba. But he couldn't just stop there. He had to elaborate: "I am always for the termination of the isolation or segregation of any member of the international community. I am always for the revival

of contacts and communications and exposure, as I have said."

Well, almost always.

I quote again from the New York Times, this time the Dec. 31, 1966, edition: "Fear and prejudice, suspicion and ignorance breed war, Thant said, and these have caused 'the present distressing state of affairs in Southern Rhodesia, where a minority is making a last-ditch effort to preserve its privileged position.' Mr. Thant asked the 'most resolute' action by all the nations of the world in implementing the 'historic' Security Council resolution of December 16. This called for selective, mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia, including a prohibition on the shipment of oil to that country. The sanctions banned the purchase of 12 key Rhodesian exports."

Shocking, you say? Not really, for Mr. Thant has been making outrageous statements for years and by now such moral confusion certainly can be nothing more than mere reflex action.

For example, in a speech over 10 years ago entitled, "A Burmese View of World Tensions," Thant spoke before the 62nd annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science and, among other things: affirmed his belief in a free people while advocating a planned economy; echoed the Soviet Union's propaganda line that the only reason they subjugated their neighbors was to "... establish a friendly cordon of states around itself"; and lastly, stated unequivocally that "... unlike Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union did not compel by actual military invasion any of its neighbors to become satellites."

Mr. Thant did not dwell on the Soviet conquest of White Ruthenia (1917), Georgia (early 1920s), the Ukraine (1920) or Azerbaijan, all four presumably agreeing to surrender their freedom after Socratically discussing the matter, the Red Army being in attendance no doubt to merely see that proper rules of debate were observed.

While professing a devotion to free institutions and the right of individuals to be free, U Thant has at the same time consistently refused to remain neutral and sided with the pro-Communist, anti-Western forces whenever the occasion arose. The three examples that come immediately to mind are: the Cuban missile crisis, the war in Viet Nam and the Mideast war.

At the height of the Cuban missile crisis, on Oct. 30, 1962, Secretary-General Thant went to Cuba and reportedly encouraged Fidel Castro to reject the all-important on-site inspection proviso—which, of course, was the key to insuring the removal of all offensive Soviet missiles from the island.

Thant, in his talks with Castro, emphasized that the U.S. quarantine was unusual—in his words, "something that only happens in a time of war." Latin observers at the time said that it was this tacit backing of Castro by Thant that led to Castro's taking a much firmer line against on-site inspections than if Thant had remained neutral.

As for his role in the Mideast war of June 1967, it was central to the conflict. The war may never have occurred had it not been for Thant's immediate, affirmative response to Egypt's demand for withdrawal of the U.N. peace-keeping force, a force created and empowered, by the U.N. General Assembly and not the secretary-general. With this irresponsible, unwarranted action, Thant opened the door to direct action by Nasser to blockade the narrow straits which control Israel's access to the Red Sea and its markets in Asia and Africa. Automatically, tensions increased and war was ineluctable.

But of all his public utterances, U Thant's statements on the war in Viet Nam have been the most contemptible. He has consistently sided with the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong against the United States, making odious comparisons of our American

Revolution with Communist aggression in Viet Nam.

"It is nationalism and not communism that animates the resistance movement in Viet Nam and against all foreigners and now particularly against Americans," Thant told a World Conference of Quakers in Greensboro, N.C., in July 1967. "Those Vietnamese who have fought and still fight against foreigners do so to win their national independence. I am convinced that the war cannot be brought to an end until the United States and her allies recognize that it is being fought by the Vietnamese not as a war of Communist aggression, but as a war of national independence."

This sort of nonsense has since been dispelled time and time again, but most recently in a column by the Los Angeles Times' Asian expert, Robert Elegant. Quoting from what he called the "Mein Kampf" of the North Vietnamese, a 23,000-word lecture delivered by Hanoi's No. 3 man, Truong Chinh, last summer, the document revealed beyond a shadow of a doubt what advocates of the domino theory have said all along: the so-called "liberation" of South Viet Nam by the north is but the first step in a campaign which will next proceed to the Communist conquest of the remaining states of Indo China—that is, Cambodia and Laos. The next step is "liberation of the oppressed peoples" of all Southeast Asia and the entire world.

Five years ago in an article in the *Reader's Digest*, Noel Bush wrote of U Thant: "One wonders if U Thant has a clear enough view of the moral issues at stake in our current international disputes."

Today it is no longer possible to wonder.

POTENTIAL CRISIS IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I have joined today with my Appropriations Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), in the introduction of legislation designed to restore the civil service retirement fund to a sound basis.

Dispassionate actuarial studies have made plain that the fund is in trouble.

I should emphasize that there is no immediate danger—that employees now retired, or soon to retire need not worry. There is money to pay their benefits.

The problem is for the future—will the money coming in from deductions from the salaries of present employees, plus the current rate of governmental contributions—the employer contributions—provide enough to guarantee payments to all who will be retiring in future years? The actuaries say no, and their evidence is disturbing and persuasive.

Through the years, the Congress has endeavored to improve retirement benefits for the career civil service employees of our National Government, but it is difficult for the individual retiree to comprehend the hard actuarial fact that what seems to be a very small increase in benefits in his case involves a commitment of the fund to an obligation of many billions of dollars in increased pay-

ments for the future years, not only to those already retired, but also to the thousands retiring each year.

I am glad to associate myself at this time with the bill of my chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), in the conviction of the need for prompt study of means to restore soundness to the fund, and with the belief that this bill could serve as a basis for responsible congressional action.

YOUTH CHAMPIONS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of our youth today are all too often overlooked in the crush of headlines about demonstrations and other misdeeds by a small minority. Yet if the full story were recognized, it would tell of unprecedented progress and achievement among the vast majority of our young people.

In this respect, our young people today are more deserving than ever of full recognition as contributors to society. In fact, they are so far advanced—as compared to we of the older generation, when we were their age—that I believe we should change many of our standards of age for admission into the responsibilities of citizenship. We should lower the minimum voting age to 18, as one step.

Recently I was pleased to read of the accomplishments of the fine son of John H. Burnside, a rural mail carrier for the Post Office Department in Dade County, Fla. I have long been acquainted with Mr. Burnside, and consequently I was not surprised to learn that his son, Bill, is making an outstanding record on his own.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the Miami News concerning Bill Burnside and his fellow State wrestling champions. I especially congratulate Bill, Jeff Davis, Andy Burge, and Mike Soto of my congressional district, who won championships—the first three at the State level, and Mike Soto at the all-county level. They are indeed champions among our youth.

The article follows:

STATE CHAMPS TOP ALL-COUNTY WRESTLING SQUAD

(By Charlie Nobles)

When Don Drinkhahn, Killian High's wrestling coach, got some literature on a wrestling camp in Virginia last year, he passed it along to his wrestlers. Two of them—Bill Burnside and Jeff Davis—decided to go, along with Palmetto's Andy Burge and Jeff's ninth grade brother, Bob.

They are glad they did. All except Bob won state championships recently, and he had a legitimate excuse—he's not in high school yet.

"It helped a lot," says Burnside, the Cougars' 98-pounder whose 28-0 record is the best in the county. "I had an NCAA champ (Gray Simons) working with me. He'll be glad to hear we won state titles."

Palmetto's Burge won the 115-pound state

title and Jeff Davis the 168-pound crown. The three lost just twice between them in 80 matches.

For having the county's top record, Burnside heads this year's Miami News All-County wrestling team, which features 10 state champions in the 12 weight classes.

Two other wrestlers finished unbeaten—Curley's 136-pounder, Marc Stead (23-0) and Norland heavyweight Glen Nardi (16-0), and both won state titles.

Other state champions: Carol City's Leroy Walker (123), Rdy Daniels (130) and Walker Miller (178), Miami Military's Angel Maybin (141) and North Miami's Frank Forestiere (148).

But it was Burnside, a bespectacled junior who likely is mistaken for more of a bookworm than an athlete, who stole the show this season. "This year," he says, "it was just a matter of getting my moves down good. I had learned a lot about what to do last year."

Last year, he had a 9-3-1 record in his first exposure to anything but back-yard wrestling with his brother Bob, a Killian star last season.

With another year ahead, one wonders what new horizons Burnside has to conquer. Everything hinges on how much he grows, and Bill has mixed emotions about getting bigger. "On one hand I want to get bigger," he says, "but for wrestling I want to be as small as I can."

At the same time, though, Burnside is philosophical about the whole thing. "I'm not watching my weight," he shrugs. "If I gain, I gain."

Bill does anticipate doing some weightlifting, which should make him stronger than ever next year. "I'll probably be in 106 next season," he says. "I don't think I'll gain that much weight. I only gained about eight pounds between my sophomore and junior years."

Four of the 12 All-County selections are juniors and one is a sophomore—Carol City's Walker—so competition should be better than ever next season.

Norland's Nardi, who has signed a football scholarship to Florida, defeated his chief opponent—Miami Springs' Gary McAlpin—both in the finals of the district and state competition to lock up the heavyweight spot.

The hardest selections came in the 106- and 157-pound divisions. Coral Park's Mike Soto got the 106 berth because he defeated his two closest rivals—Carol City's Jack Love and Palmetto's Ed Becker—more than they beat him in the regular season.

North Miami's Bill Brissson got the 157 shot because of overall consistency. He edged out Norland's Bob Cohen, who finished second in the state.

THE TEAM

Name and school	Weight	Class	Record
Bill Burnside, Killian	98	Junior	28-0
Mike Soto, Coral Park	106	do	23-2
Andy Burge, Palmetto	115	do	25-1
Leroy Walker, Carol City	123	Sophomore	24-1
Rudy Daniels, Carol City	130	Senior	24-1
Marc Stead, Curley	136	do	23-0
Angel Maybin, Miami Military	141	do	17-2
Frank Forestiere, North Miami	148	do	18-2-1
Bill Brissson, North Miami	157	do	22-3
Jeff Davis, Killian	168	Junior	25-1
Walker Miller, Carol City	178	Senior	22-1
Glen Nardi, Norland	(1)	do	16-0
Coach of year—Ed Newkirk, Carol City.			

¹ Heavy.

HONORABLE MENTION

98—Hayward Bain, Carol City; Bob Roberts, Palmetto; Pat Murphy, Curley. 106—Jack Love, Carol City; Ed Becker, Palmetto; James Cooley, Northwestern. 115—Bob Robinson, Coral Park; Kevin Well, North Miami. 123—Ron Sherman, North Miami; Ray

Branch, Miami Springs. 130—Henry Britt, Killian. 136—Jeff Meyer, Edison; Rick Cadiente, North Miami; Don Wrinkle, Miami Military; Randy Goldberg, Norland. 141—James Bryant, Coral City; Bob Russell, Hialeah; John Hoyt, Coral Gables. 148—Don Jackson, Coral City; Steve Ellis, Palmetto; Don Huckins, Coral Park. 157—John Williams, Southwest; Bob Cohen, Norland. 168—Creigh Gibson, Coral Gables; Don Williams, Jackson. 178—Roy Griffin, Jackson; Chris Corder, Edison; Winston Palmore, Killian. Heavyweight—Gary McAlpin, Miami Springs; Ken Valentine, Hialeah; Tim Burrows, Killian; John Hyde, Southwest.

WAR ON ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John N. Mitchell, the Attorney General of the United States, spoke last week in New York before the Fordham University Law Alumni Association. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

I am pleased to observe that the Attorney General has pledged to use all of the resources and tools available to him to end the tyranny of organized crime. The Attorney General has recognized, however, that the Federal Government alone cannot eliminate the evils of racketeering and the States must share the burden of this vital task. I believe his recommendations that the States adopt comprehensive organized crime laws and establish statewide organized crime divisions are sound.

I am gratified that the Attorney General has seen fit in the first days of the administration to declare war on organized crime. I commend this speech to my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN N. MITCHELL BEFORE THE FORDHAM LAW ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 8, 1969

INTRODUCTION

You will be pleased to know how highly a Fordham man is regarded in the nation's capital. After one month in office, I can report that his opinions are constantly sought by the press and television and radio. His slightest comment is given the most serious analysis. A statement of present policy or future plans is quickly relayed to the public. I would be less than human if I could not enjoy this attention and, very soon now, I am going to ask Vince Lombardi how he manages to get it.

Today, I want to discuss with you the Department of Justice as I find it on beginning the assignment given me by President Nixon and to outline briefly some of my purposes and hopes for the Department's future.

I am the 67th Attorney General who has served under the Judiciary Act of 1789. It established the federal judicial system and the Office of Attorney General. The Act provides for the appointment of a "meet person learned in the law to act as Attorney General of the United States." I feel that Dean Mulligan would perhaps agree that I am a "meet person" but I have considerably less reason to believe that the Dean would consider me anywhere near as "learned in the law" as the first Attorney General, the distinguished Edmund Randolph.

Of course, Congress was thinking in terms of a legal counselor for the government—an official to interpret and expound the common law and the Constitution. In a way, I think I would have liked that concept of the job. It evokes for me a picture of things past, of a simpler life lived at a slower pace. The quilled pen and the standup desk, everything but the powdered wig, would have been congenial. But I must accept the Department as it is today and my responsibilities to it.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: PHYSICAL STRUCTURE

For here is an organization of no less than 208 separate entities. These include five offices—the Office of the Attorney General; the office of his chief assistant, the Deputy Attorney General; the office of the Solicitor General who, in his fine morning coat, presents the government's position to a sometimes receptive, sometimes not, Supreme Court; the Office of Legal Counsel, who is—let me tell you a secret—my private lawyer (and I need one); the Office of Public Information, which is a rather inflated title for my overworked speech writer.

The legal heart of the Justice Department is the seven law divisions:

The Antitrust Division.

The Civil Division, which represents the United States in most civil proceedings.

The Civil Rights Division.

The Criminal Division.

The Internal Security Division, which, like that other division of the State Department, is rather hush hush.

The Land and Natural Resources Division, which supervises suits relating to real estate claims, waterways and natural resources.

The Tax Division, which, I am sure, you know and I only hope you will never have to know them very well.

There are three very important Bureaus. The FBI, which is the most efficient and most deservedly renowned investigatory body in the world. The Bureau of Prisons, which operates federal correctional institutions. The new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, for which we have great hopes to finally reverse the tide of addiction in this country.

The Department also has two Services. The Immigration and Naturalization Service which, among its functions, meets you at the airport. The Community Relations Service, which attempts to guide and counsel racially-tense cities so that tragedies may be avoided or at least mitigated.

There are two Boards. The Board of Parole, whose name speaks for itself, and the Board of Immigration Appeals, which hears challenges to deportation orders.

And then, of course, in addition to the other entities which I do not have time to discuss, there are 93 offices of United States Attorneys spread out around the country who represent the Department in most criminal and civil matters at the trial level, and 93 offices of the United States Marshal.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: PHILOSOPHICAL STRUCTURE

In its earlier days the concept of the Department of Justice was viewed primarily as that of a prosecutor or defense counsel in individual cases. In general, we took law violators to court when we found them and we proceeded on a case by case basis. We focused on a particular set of facts and on the rights and obligations which arose in a specific situation.

It is becoming more evident every day, however, that our statutory authority covers considerably more cases than we can effectively handle. The question is how can my 2,000 attorneys in the Department of Justice make a significant contribution to the improvement of life of our 200 million citizens.

The answer to this question is that, with our limited resources, we must select priorities—and in selecting them acknowledge that

we are placing the full weight of federal authority behind the cases we choose.

Our priorities today deal with cases which affect the rights and obligations—not only of a single individual—but also of hundreds, thousands, and in some instances, even millions of citizens. It is this concept, of recognizing priorities in view of the massive problems to be solved, that historically and philosophically has placed our Department in an institutional transition.

Our population continues to grow and our economy, continues to expand, I predict that our nation's legal problems may multiply in the next decade even faster than they have in the last. I am sure that, relatively speaking, our legal federal manpower will become smaller and smaller.

Of course I recognize that there will still be those who argue that the most technical violation of federal law should be prosecuted with the same aggressiveness as the most heinous. They contend that a case involving a single individual's rights is as important as a case which would rectify a wrong for thousands. Morally speaking, I suppose they are right. But as Attorney General, I must consider the national morality and what ends I am trying to achieve with my limited means.

Permit me to give you some examples of three areas in which we find problems all over the nation rapidly outstripping our present resources. These are areas in which the Department of Justice has been forced to select priorities and to consider national goals.

ANTITRUST AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

My first example is the Antitrust Division. The major responsibility of this Division is to assure the free market competition of goods and services. In recent years, the difficulties of enforcement have been compounded. The law has become increasingly complex and the scope of many cases requires the attention of a dozen lawyers and economists when, in past years one or two lawyers would do.

The Antitrust Division itself was not formally established until 1933. At that time, it had a staff of 67 persons. Last year it had a staff of 528 persons and a budget of \$8 million. This growth in personnel and resources, however, has not matched the growth of the gross national product. The gross national product has increased fifteenfold from 1933 to 1968. But the personnel of the Antitrust Division has increased only half as much. The significance of this disparity need not be belabored.

Under the circumstances, it has become increasingly difficult for the Antitrust Division to keep pace with the demands of our growing nation and to assure a free competitive economy which makes our prosperity possible. To effectively protect the American consumer, the Department of Justice is not only concentrating on traditional price-fixing cases, but is also moving into cases involving marketing structures and especially the structure of pure conglomerates.

The great economic power of such conglomerates and the fact that they operate in many fields of commerce poses a danger to the American consumer. There has been some question as to whether, under existing law, we have the authority to attack the pure conglomerate—a corporation which acquires another in an apparently unrelated field of business.

My view is that, when in doubt, I will give the benefit to the American consumer by attempting to successfully prosecute pure conglomerates. If the courts defeat our attempt, we will ask for new legislation. It is the American consumer, whose interest in the end, the Antitrust Division is seeking to protect.

Our priority, therefore, is the major economic problems of the day and their rela-

tionship to citizens all over the country. Of course, we could spend our time searching around for smaller companies who may be in violation of traditional price-fixing laws. But with our limited resources, we plan to focus our efforts on key issues confronting our competitive economy. We must seek benefits for two-hundred-million consumers rather than fragmenting our efforts on 200 small cases.

SUPPLEMENTARY HELP FROM THE STATES

What is needed, obviously, is help—the kind of help that the federal government alone cannot provide to protect the consumer. The most obvious source of this help is the states—some of whom have already enacted consumer protection or antitrust legislation.

Since the beginning of this new Administration, we have maintained that the basic responsibility for the welfare of our citizens lies with the states and their subdivisions. The federal government will lead the way in difficult areas such as the conglomerate merger and in the more traditional areas such as major nationwide price-fixing. For here, the states may not have the manpower, investigative facilities, or the concentration of experienced legal talent to prosecute such difficult cases.

However, we hope that the states will follow our path in consumer protection and in the other areas I will discuss today. For example, we urge that the states make a substantial commitment to the protection of the national economic integrity in insuring free competition in local industry.

The Department of Justice has already started making the states more of a partner in federal law enforcement on all fronts. Three weeks ago, the State Attorneys General met in Washington. We told them that we would cooperate with them and exchange information in a number of areas including, in the antitrust field, the treble damage actions. We assured them that we would work closely with them and would, at every opportunity, give them guidance, and if possible, funding for consumer protection.

You see, I believe it is just as much a crime to deny a poor child an adequate diet because restraints on competition have made his food more expensive than his family can afford, as it is to strike that child with a stick in violation of the traditional criminal law. I urge the states to pass effective consumer protection codes and antitrust legislation if they do not have them; and if they do have such codes, to strengthen them wherever possible. Also I suggest that the states implement this legislation by establishing statewide consumer protection bureaus.

I urge the states to consider whether an empty stomach month after month may not damage a child as much as physical abuse.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The second area which I would like to discuss is civil rights. The Civil Rights Division was founded on September 9, 1957, under Attorney General Brownell. Its founding was a most important commitment by the Department of Justice to negroes and other minority groups. In 1957, it had 30 lawyers and a budget of \$500 thousand. This year, it has 106 lawyers and a budget of \$3 million.

But this question remains. How can a Division with only 106 attorneys effectively enforce all the federal civil rights laws. I know that not a week passes in this nation when our black citizens, be they lawyers or laborers, are not subjected to some aspect of racial discrimination. Much of this discrimination is subtle and may never be reached by the government.

But there remains massive legal discrimination against minorities. They are illegally segregated in schools. They are discriminated against by unions and industry. They are crushed into teeming ghettos and denied the ability to purchase adequate homes.

I have pledged to enforce the civil rights laws and the civil rights protections in the Constitution vigorously. I do this to insure that all Americans can share equally in our prosperous and promising nation.

In the field of civil rights, we have chosen housing, education and employment as the three priorities of our Civil Rights Division. And even within these areas, we must use our resources selectively.

For example, in the education field alone, we are involved with more than 200 school districts in about 150 law suits. If we are to eliminate racial discrimination, we need the help of the states. We urge the states to pass effective civil rights legislation; and if, like New York and Massachusetts, for example, they have such legislation, to strengthen their laws wherever possible. We urge the states to establish statewide civil rights divisions.

The federal government will, as it has in the past, continue to lead the way in new areas of the law and in massive cases of discrimination. But the time has now come for the states to look carefully at their own subdivisions.

They must be aware that there are many impoverished negroes and other minority group citizens who are subject to discrimination which cannot be handled by the federal government. These citizens cannot afford the lengthy litigation of a civil rights case and they may not even be aware of their right to demand equality.

In noting that the government should lead the way, let me mention one area which we are now considering. It is racial fairness in the market place—especially the money market place. There is ample evidence to indicate that many fields of commercial transactions discriminate against the minority borrower. Here is an area where we also believe state civil rights efforts could be extremely successful.

THE CRIMINAL DIVISION—ORGANIZED CRIME

The last Division I will discuss today is the Criminal Division and I am advised that it is impossible to fix a date for its establishment.

The Criminal Division has today 177 attorneys and a budget of \$4.2 million. It handled, last year, 6700 cases and 6600 evaluations of investigations and other matters.

Given its broad jurisdiction over most of the federal criminal law, it could, on any given day, recommend dozens of prosecutions for petty crime. And yet, five years from today, what impact would misdemeanor prosecutions have on the nation as a whole. On the other hand, I can select a priority, a legal and moral symbol for the nation and employ my resources against crime to the fullest.

During the coming year, there will be two priorities for the Criminal Division. The first is organized crime. I will spare no effort to attack the nationwide organization of racketeers who corrupt our youth with illegal narcotics, who taint our public officials with bribes and corruption, who pervert the outstanding ideals of the labor union movement, who employ murder and torture to collect their debts, and who, in a very real sense, prey mainly on the poor and less educated segments of our population.

To be effective, we must launch a nationwide campaign against organized crime with all the weapons at our disposal. For example, we will engage in wiretapping in order to obtain evidence, which we might otherwise not have, to prosecute these syndicates which reportedly take in more than \$50 billion a year. Another tool at our disposal is the Strike Force which we are now reorganizing and greatly strengthening. These Strike Forces are a unique concept of governmental law enforcement. They are composed of representatives from the FBI, several divisions in the Justice Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Labor Department, and

Customs. This interdepartmental unified approach has proved extremely successful and in one city alone, we have been able to obtain 30 indictments in an attempt to weaken an organized crime syndicate.

But organized crime is probably too widespread to be completely eliminated by the Department of Justice. Indeed, most experts in the field believe that it cannot exist without the cooperation or apathy of local law enforcement officers. It should be a prime local responsibility and we urge the states to pass comprehensive laws against organized gangsters. Also we urge the states to establish statewide organized crime divisions which will have substantial resources to staff their effort.

Similarly, we strongly advise that if the states allow wiretapping, that they will pass laws and regulations which will insure the closest supervision. They must decrease to a minimum any unnecessary invasions of homes and offices.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION AND STREET CRIME

A second priority in the criminal field is street crime which is, in many ways, the opposite of organized crime. It is disorganized crime, exploding with unpredictable viciousness and frequently without the cool reasoning of an experienced gangster. The latest FBI statistics show that serious crime in the United States increased 17 per cent in 1968 over 1967. This is an area where the federal government has little enforcement power. Here as in no other area we must rely on the states for their cooperation. As Attorney General I can tell you that street crime and the fear of street crime is changing the fabric of our society—that crime is crushing us. The fear of crime is forcing our citizens to change their traditional living patterns, to stay off the streets at night, to shy away from helping strangers, to be distrustful and insecure in their own neighborhoods.

Our federal leadership in the war against street crime will come from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

It has a 300 million dollar authorization for the next fiscal year, most of which will go to the states in block grants. We hope that a majority of the money available to the states and the communities through LEAA will be used, in one form or another, to attack street crime.

We need more police and they must be better educated and trained. We need, in most cities, better juvenile facilities and education programs to stop our youth from turning to the streets. We need more efficient justice so that those who are arrested will be tried promptly and either convicted or acquitted. We need a complete overhaul of most state prison systems with rehabilitation facilities, psychiatrists and social workers to assure that the prisoners of today will not be—as 4 out of 10 are expected to be—the prisoners of the future.

We hope that the states, in attempting to solve our national crime problem, will invite private industry and non-profit organizations to participate under the guidance of government officials and professional organizations. The voluntary sector offers an enormous reservoir of money and manpower to help in non-policed functions such as juvenile programs, narcotic rehabilitation programs and work re-training programs for prisoners.

CONCLUSION

Protection for the consumer, protection for the minority group, protection for the law-abiding citizen from street crime and organized crime—these are three priorities of my Department and they should be the three priorities for America.

The federal government will lead the way but it cannot succeed without the cooperation and help of the states. With this cooperation we will succeed. Without it, I warn

you, we only face the increasing prospect of tragedy. However, I am optimistic that with my 2 thousand lawyers, with help from the states, and with your help, that we will make a significant contribution to the improvement of life for two hundred million Americans during my tenure in Washington.

JACOB BEAM: OUR MAN IN MOSCOW

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, James Kilpatrick, in his column appearing in the Evening Star for March 9, raises apprehensions regarding Mr. Beam's suitability as our Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Unfortunately, Mr. Beam did not have the opportunity to dispel the suspicion and doubt surrounding his nomination at the hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The American people would hope the Senate will remand Mr. Beam's nomination to the Foreign Relations Committee so that some of these serious questions can be answered.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the testimony before the committee, taken from the official transcript, Mr. Kilpatrick's column of March 9, and an excerpt from my article in the RECORD of March 3, at page 5076 consisting of a report from the Government Employees Exchange following my remarks:

COPY OF TRANSCRIPT ON THE HEARINGS OF JACOB BEAM BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN. Mr. Beam, would you for the record very briefly state how long you have been in the Foreign Service and you know the usual.

Mr. BEAM. Sir, I came in in 1931, in June 1931.

CHAIRMAN. And how many posts have you served in? Do you have some of those things, for the record, for the information of the Committee?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN. Could you state very briefly where you were, the principal posts?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, first in Geneva then Berlin then London, the State Department several times. Then the Netherlands Indies as it then was, became Indonesia; Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union.

CHAIRMAN. In what capacity in the Soviet Union?

Mr. BEAM. I was Charge d'affaires ad interim.

CHAIRMAN. When?

Mr. BEAM. Through, 1952 through 1953.

CHAIRMAN. Do you speak Russian?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir, I have a working knowledge.

CHAIRMAN. Yes. And you were there in 52-53? What is your most recent visit to the Soviet Union?

Mr. BEAM. I haven't been back there since 1953.

CHAIRMAN. '53?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN. Where have you been serving for the last few years?

Mr. BEAM. I have been in Czechoslovakia for the last 2½ years.

CHAIRMAN. How many positions have you served in as Chief of Mission?

Mr. BEAM. It is 3. Three, sir. Poland—I beg your pardon, two, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

CHAIRMAN. Poland and Czechoslovakia. This will be your third?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir, if confirmed.

CHAIRMAN. Would you, I don't know whether I should ask you this or not, you use your own judgment if you would like to say a few words about the conditions in Czechoslovakia where you so recently served.

Mr. BEAM. Well, sir, they have gone through a very tragic experience and they are having difficulties right now. The struggle, I don't think is over yet, it is an internal political struggle which is going on of great interest to the world.

CHAIRMAN. I am sure you are very conversant with conditions in the Soviet Union at present, aren't you?

Mr. BEAM. Not recently. I have not been there since 1953.

CHAIRMAN. Don't you follow those events with great interest?

Mr. BEAM. I do, yes, sir. On the periphery we do.

CHAIRMAN. Don't you consider our relations with the Soviet Union of greatest importance?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir, I do.

CHAIRMAN. And I hope you will be able to improve them. Do you think you can?

Mr. BEAM. I hope we can, sir, while maintaining our own interests, of course.

CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, that is your main objective of this operation. Senator Sparkman?

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. I think Mr. Beam has performed wonderful service in his long years that he has been in the Foreign Service, and I wish him well in this most important post to which he is going.

CHAIRMAN. Senator Mundt.

Senator MUNDT. I am glad the Chairman brought up this matter of residence of the ambassadors we have. I said to our friends from New Jersey and New York I was aware of the imbalance to the point where they publically gloat about it, and you are looking at one Senator who is about to run out of yes votes for ambassadors. I have already told Mr. Annenberg I would vote for him, and I will vote for John Eisenhower and I don't know why I should victimize you, but I think the White House and State Department should learn if we are going to have an adequate appropriate and effective understandable and acceptable foreign policy the time has come when the central part of this country should get their fair share of ambassadors. When it has gotten to the point where representatives of eastern states publically gloat about the monopoly they have, this message should be heard loud and clear in the State Department and in the White House.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the Senator yield?

Senator MUNDT. I want to finish what I have to say. You have done your gloating.

Senator JAVITS. I am sorry, sir.

Senator MUNDT. And I accept it, as well justified.

Senator JAVITS. That is what I object to most strongly, if I was, I was not conscious of gloating. I apologize.

Senator MUNDT. Don't apologize, I want it in the record. I appreciate it.

Senator JAVITS. I didn't intend to and I think the Senator is wishing something on it.

Senator MUNDT. That is the word. Under which ambassadors have you served, Mr. Beam?

Mr. BEAM. Sir, my first ambassador was Mr. Dodd in Berlin, Mr. Cochran in Indonesia, Mr. George Allen in Yugoslavia, and Mr. Bohlen very briefly in the Soviet Union.

Senator MUNDT. You were in Czechoslovakia, were you, at the time of the invasion?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir; I was.

Senator MUNDT. From your knowledge of Czechoslovakian affairs do you see any justifi-

cation whatsoever for this invasion which the Russians took?

Mr. BEAM. No, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Nor do I. I have no other questions.

CHAIRMAN. Senator Pell.

Senator PELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a longtime friend of the ambassador, it is hard to be objective but I am sure we know he will do an excellent job. And as one who descended upon him in Czechoslovakia three times in the last ten months I find my familiarity with him has increased and my respect and regard, too. I wonder if as a kind of valedictory you had any thoughts as to how we could help in Czechoslovakia? Do you believe it a good idea to focus public attention, if it were put there with resolution of the gold problem and maybe some steps taken toward the most favored nation treatment toward that unfortunate country in order to try to keep the channels of economic and cultural access open even though the political channels have been closed?

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir, I believe in that very strongly, yes, sir. I think the increase in trade with Czechoslovakia is now important so we can get some money on those claims, we have a large amount of claims due us for nationalization of our property.

As regards the political and cultural situation I think exchanges should continue as a means of encouragement for them to maintain their identity and sovereignty, and I hope we can continue along these lines.

Senator PELL. I know it is the opinion of Czechoslovakia, at least of their government, that we have sort of lumped them in the outer world, we have cut them off from us and we are not interested in them, and I would hope this opinion could be corrected. I think the problem has been the focus of public opinion has been, on the more spectacular events in Czechoslovakia but not in the fact that Administrations have sought to keep these channels open and that we are doing the best we can in this regard and I think this to be a good forum to France, if you would agree with that statement, to enlarge on it.

Mr. BEAM. Well, I do agree with that, and I think in the time that I have been there, which is 2½ years the situation has changed in our favor and they found out we are a friend of their countries.

Senator PELL. Not only that but in favor of the Czechoslovak peoples, too.

Mr. BEAM. Yes, sir.

Senator PELL. Thank you. The other question in connection with your new post, we are particularly fortunate that you should be going from Czechoslovakia where you have seen the Soviets in action to Moscow but do you feel that you will be able—that you yourself might suffer from a certain subjective view from having seen them at their worst and will be able—to have an objectivity about the Soviet position there?

Mr. BEAM. Well, it is something which, of course, I can not forget, but if I go to Moscow I will be representing the United States government and not the Czechoslovak government.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, I am really so pleased with this appointment. I think we are doing very well.

CHAIRMAN. Senator Case, do you have anything further?

Senator CASE. Only this, Mr. Chairman, I am so happy that the excellency of this appointment has made it possible for us to indulge in even a surface friendly rivalry here on the Committee. It is an excellent appointment and I may just, having said that, and meaning it very deeply, refer back to a man from another Dakota, who used to be, I think, he certainly was, a Member of the Senate, whether a member of this Committee or not I am not sure, our great friend, Bill Langer, whose chief song was They never got an appointment from North Dakota, and

his outrage was such and so well-expressed that I am sure it was one of the factors that led to his reelection in his native state regularly like striking a gong.

Senator MUNDT. Will the Senator yield?

Senator CASE. I will be happy to yield.

Senator MUNDT. That is something else that led to the appointment of Tommy Wayland to Nicaragua.

Senator CASE. It led to something else, too, that his daughter lives in my state of New Jersey. Shows there is good stuff in that family. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN. Senator JAVITS.

Senator JAVITS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to cause a stir in Committee. I was not just gloating, and I don't and Mr. Beam certainly is not a resident of New York. But I do think it is pertinent to say a word about what Senator Mundt very feelingly, and I can understand it. I would be a very strong advocate of doing our utmost to recognize talent and high quality in his state or in any other in the U.S. I must say, however, that I would be equally against the idea of appointing second-raters because we want to make for geographical diversity to ambassadorships of the U.S. and that is the only reason I spoke. Perhaps I am too serious but I have the greatest affection for my colleague and the greatest feeling for what he has said, and I would be the first to vote authority and money for international education courses in any of the universities.

Senator MUNDT. We are not a backward state. We don't need the money coming from New York. I just want a chance for our capable people to have a chance to be ambassadors.

Senator JAVITS. I don't want to make it worse.

Senator MUNDT. Now, you are italicizing the gloat.

Senator JAVITS. And I certainly approve of Ambassador Beam. I am sorry that he, as a dignified diplomat is the innocent butt.

Senator CASE. Which the Chairman started, by the way.

CHAIRMAN. I started? I was just commenting on a fact as it has developed. I hope the Senator from New York wasn't suggesting that people from that great and rich and powerful state gloat without being conscious of it.

Senator JAVITS. Well, I wasn't conscious of it, Mr. Chairman. So I suggested just that.

CHAIRMAN. Mr. Beam, do you have anything further to say?

Mr. BEAM. No, sir.

CHAIRMAN. Well. We congratulate you on your long and distinguished service in the Foreign Service and wish you well. It is a difficult post. I hope your health is good.

Mr. BEAM. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. How old are you?

Mr. BEAM. Sixty-one this month.

CHAIRMAN. You are getting along, but that is about right. (Laughter)

Thank you very much, Mr. Beam.

Senator CASE. He is at the peak of his powers.

CHAIRMAN. You don't look that old.

Mr. BEAM. I don't feel it either.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 9, 1969]

JACOB BEAM: OUR MAN IN MOSCOW?

Concern is being voiced on Capitol Hill these days at the President's nomination of Jacob D. Beam, to serve as U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union. Before the gentleman is confirmed, several Senators propose quietly to inquire into a troublesome time in his career.

On paper, and perhaps in fact, Beam is well qualified for the Moscow assignment. At 60, he has spent 38 years in the Foreign Service. He began as a clerk in the U.S. consulate at Geneva, in the days of the League of Nations; he moved on to Berlin for a six-year stint; served in London during most of the war; did a tour of duty as consul general

in Java, and spent seven months in 1952-53 in Russia.

In August of 1957, Beam arrived in Warsaw as American ambassador to Poland. He was to serve in this assignment until he returned to Washington in the fall of 1961. He resigned his post, and then was appointed assistant director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In 1966 he became U.S. ambassador to Czechoslovakia. Mr. Nixon's proposal is to shift him now to the most important and sensitive chancery of them all, the U.S. embassy in Moscow.

The nomination may be entirely in order. All the same, members of Congress remember the disarming sex and spy scandals that occurred in the Warsaw embassy during Beam's administration there. A number of Senators are concerned at the prospect of having him serve as ambassador in the very center of Communist intrigue.

The story of those Warsaw days is as fantastic as any tale ever contrived by Ian Fleming for his fictional James Bond. To judge from various printed hearings and other published material, Communist intelligence agents infiltrated Beam's embassy as merrily as a swarm of termites boring holes in a tasty log.

Irvin C. Scarbeck, second officer of the embassy, was among those who succumbed to the age-old lure of a beautiful woman. He fell in love with a 22-year-old blonde, Urszula Discher. The presumption is strong that she was an agent of Polish intelligence. In any event, Urszula set him up for a raid that led to blackmail; this led in turn to the theft of classified documents. Scarbeck was caught, indicted, convicted and sentenced at first to 30 years in prison. Later the sentence was reduced. It was a sensational case.

Scarbeck was not alone in female involvements. A detachment of Marine guards, assigned to the embassy, engaged in wholesale revels with Polish girls. The wife of a middle-rank embassy employee had an affair with a Russian agent. A code clerk implicated in an illicit relationship was "permitted to resign."

It was during Beam's tenure that construction began on the new \$1.6 million American embassy. The ingenious Poles succeeded in bugging the building from the ground up. Eventually, some 40 concealed microphones—including a mike in the code room itself—had to be dug out of the walls by a team of Seabees.

Guy Richards, in "Imperial Agent," and Clark Mollenhoff, in "Despoilers of Democracy," have dealt with the Warsaw intrigues. All told, more than a dozen embassy employees were compromised. Mollenhoff has written that "the near total destruction of security in the U.S. embassy in Warsaw was a frightening demonstration of how the Communists could effectively bore inside an American embassy." Other publications, notably the Government Employees Exchange here in Washington, have carried sensational accounts of the intricate webs that were woven by Polish intelligence agents.

None of the published material raises any question of Beam's loyalty. No one doubts his expertise in European affairs. He is given high marks for his performance in Prague during last year's invasion by Soviet troops. He speaks fluent Russian. Nevertheless, there are unmistakable stirrings in the Senate. Beam may be the right man for the vital Moscow assignment; but then again Senators are saying, he may not.

POWER STRUGGLE LOOMS OVER BEAM, OTEPKA, SONNENFELDT BETWEEN CONGRESS, STATE

A "violent storm" is brewing between the Nixon administration and Capitol Hill over the failure of the President and his Department heads to extend normal consultation courtesies to Senators and Congressmen, this newspaper was informed on February 15. Although the "storm" already encompasses more than one Department, it is becoming

sharpest between the State Department and Capitol Hill over the issue of "excessive privilege" as defined by Secretary of State William P. Rogers, the informant said.

The first lightning flashes have already been seen privately in the tone of the letters between Capitol Hill and the White House concerning Ambassador Jacob Dyneley Beam, whom Secretary Rogers is supporting for the position of the next U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, the source claimed.

The first reaction from the White House to the letters was "pained surprise" that the personnel dossier on Ambassador Beam sent to the President by the State Department did not contain such material on him as that which *The Exchange* had published more than a year ago, the informant stated.

JACOB BEAM

As readers of this newspaper will recall, Jacob Dyneley Beam was the American Ambassador at Warsaw during the outbreak of the notorious "sex and spy" scandals there in 1959-1961. Included in these scandals were Foreign Service Officer Erwin Scarbeck who delivered secret documents to the Polish authorities after he was surprised and photographed naked in bed with his mistress, Urszula Discher. Mr. Scarbeck was subsequently convicted by a Federal court in Washington, D.C. and was sentenced to prison. Ambassador Beam testified during his trial.

Another Foreign Service Officer, Thomas A. Donovan, was also named during the hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as having had sexual relations with Polish female intelligence agents. This newspaper reported that, although the State Department wished to re-assign Mr. Donovan immediately to Washington after his "liaison" was discovered, Ambassador Beam arranged with his former Princeton College "old school tie" classmates, Ambassador E. Allen Lightner Jr. and Foreign Service Officer Howard Trivers, to have Mr. Donovan transferred instead to Berlin, Germany, where Ambassador Lightner was chief of mission and Mr. Trivers was his Deputy Chief.

In Berlin, Mr. Donovan was placed in charge of the Eastern Affairs Division, which had supervision over all reporting concerning East Berlin, and East Germany. In this role, Mr. Donovan received official documents recording telephonic intercepts by American intelligence officers of telephone conversations made between West Berlin and East Berlin and East Germany.

THOMAS A. DONOVAN

Because of his knowledge that these telephone intercepts were being made, Mr. Donovan went to Communist East Berlin to evade the telephonic monitoring of his own unauthorized telephone calls to Polish friends in Warsaw. These included his "girl friend" and such Polish officials as Jerry Michalowski, then the Director General of the Polish Foreign Ministry and today the Polish Ambassador in Washington, D.C.

During one of these telephone conversations, Mr. Donovan requested Ambassador Michalowski to instruct the Polish Military Mission in West Berlin to issue a visitor's visa to Mr. Donovan without the prior knowledge of American diplomatic officers in Warsaw so that Mr. Donovan could proceed there without their previous authorization. The Polish Military Mission honored the instruction of the Polish Foreign Ministry and issued Mr. Donovan the visa he desired.

When Foreign Service Officer Stephen A. Kozak reported these telephone calls to Foreign Service Officer Howard Trivers and to Ambassador E. Allen Lightner Jr., they accused him of trying to "stab Donovan in the back" and did not convoke any board of inquiry to ascertain the truthfulness of Mr. Kozak's allegations. Instead, they informed Mr. Donovan of Mr. Kozak's reports to them about him. Subsequently, Messrs. Donovan, Trivers, and Lightner destroyed the original

pages of the efficiency report they had written in 1961 on Mr. Koczak, forged substitute pages, backdated these and inserted them into his efficiency report as if they had in fact been the original pages. In addition, Ambassador Lightner wrote an "Additional Reviewing Statement" to the effect that Mr. Koczak had read the entire report and had, in the course of interrogation, admitted to "tale bearing" and one instance of "intrigue" against Mr. Donovan. Mr. Kuczak has repeatedly denied having made any such admission; he also denies ever having read the altered efficiency report prior to its dispatch to the State Department.

Despite Mr. Koczak's denials, he was fired by the State Department under the procedure of "selection out," a process which denies any formal appeals procedure to officers and does not permit confrontation and cross-examination.

Mr. Koczak's attorney, Marion Harrison, has repeatedly asked the State Department for admission or denial of these facts and, to date, the State Department has refused to comment on them.

SOVIETS BREAK CODES

Another "disturbing item" in the letters of the Senators to President Nixon concerning Ambassador Beam, the source continued, was the charge that the Soviet Union broke the "top secret and secret" codes of the United States by implanting "listening devices" into the bricks ordered from Yugoslavia for the new American Embassy building built in Warsaw during the incumbency there of Ambassador Beam.

ELMER DEWEY HILL

After the Embassy's walls were erected, an "electronic survey" was conducted by State Department security electronics technician, Elmer Dewey Hill, to detect and eliminate any "bugging" devices. Mr. Hill found none. Thus the Soviet and Polish intelligence agencies successfully recorded the reading of the texts of American top secret and secret codes by the code clerks while doing the encoding and decoding. Subsequently, by comparing these with the transmitted messages, the Soviet Union broke the codes. This resulted in the breaking also of the major codes of the United States in messages being sent to Germany, Italy, France, England and Japan. Central Intelligence Agency telegrams and communications were "broken" in the same manner by the Soviet Union, the source revealed.

OTTO F. OTEPKA

Elmer Dewey Hill was subsequently instructed by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, John Reilly, to "bug", with the assistance of Clarence Jerome Schneider, the telephone and office room of Otto F. Otepka, the State Department's top security evaluator, the source continued. Mr. Hill later denied under oath that he had had this role but when George Pasquale, a friend of Mr. Otepka, obtained an admission from one of the participants, Mr. Hill recanted and admitted he had lied under oath. Subsequently, Mr. Reilly also recanted and both he and Mr. Hill resigned from the State Department.

A lawyer and protege of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Mr. Reilly subsequently was given a job as a "hearing officer" with the Federal Communications Commission at the same salary he had before.

Mr. Otepka, on the other hand, was demoted and reprimanded by Secretary of State Dean Rusk for having told the truth "without authorization", to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

WILLIAM P. ROGERS

The informant revealed further that Secretary Rogers was very upset about the attempt of the three Senators to influence President Nixon through correspondence to

change his mind about appointing Ambassador Beam to Moscow. Secretary Rogers is known to have been personally very critical of the role Mr. Otepka played in cooperating with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and for "telling the truth" without authorization. According to the source, Secretary Rogers is of the firm opinion that Mr. Otepka should have refused to answer the questions posed to him by Julian Sourwine, the Subcommittee's chief counsel, on the grounds of "executive privilege", a doctrine which Mr. Rogers espoused and expanded during the Eisenhower administration when he was Attorney General.

As this newspaper reported in its February 5 issue, Secretary Rogers has already vetoed President Nixon's election promise to re-examine the Otto F. Otepka case. On January 21, he informed Mr. Otepka, through intermediaries, that he would not allow Mr. Otepka back as an "active security officer". He also asked Mr. Otepka to indicate to him any other "alternative remedy" on the understanding Mr. Otepka would not remain in security work. Mr. Otepka's terms were communicated to Secretary Rogers through intermediaries, in the form of a memorandum, January 24, ostensibly addressed to Mr. Otepka's lawyer, Roger Robb.

The source revealed that Mr. Rogers chose this course of action in regard to Mr. Otepka because he is aware that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is planning new hearings on State Department security. The re-instatement of Mr. Otepka to security work would be hailed by the public and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as an admission by the State Department that "executive privilege" could not be invoked by it in forbidding its employees to "tell the truth" during testimony before Congressional Committees. Thus Secretary Rogers could not refuse "authorization" in the future to any State Department employee to testify truthfully and fully under oath on State Department practices.

Regarding Mr. Otepka, Mr. Rogers was reported saying he feared especially that, if re-instated and again ordered to testify under oath, Mr. Otepka would again proceed to tell the Subcommittee the "truth" about the current state of the State Department's security clearance program, including such matters as the disappearance of classified information from the security files of Ambassador Jacob Beam and of Helmut Sonnenfeldt, until January 20 an employee of the Department of State. Mr. Sonnenfeldt, about whom controversy is raging secretly within the intelligence and security communities, was recently appointed by Dr. Henry Kissinger to join him on the staff of the National Security Council located in offices next to the White House.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

As defined and expanded by Secretary Rogers when he was Attorney General, "executive privilege" is the doctrine that the executive branch of the government has the "right to refuse" to give Congress any document that includes either an advice, a recommendation or a conclusion. These documents therefore include all personnel actions involving the selection, promotion, demotion, transfer, dismissal or reprimand of any federal employee, if such action involves advice, recommendation or a conclusion from or by any federal officer.

Although he admitted as Attorney General that the Constitution did not explicitly give the executive departments such "power to refuse", Secretary Rogers nevertheless contended the executive branch had "an inherent right" to refuse to give testimony or produce records. In fact, he went much further and insisted that Congress could not even pass a law to require or force the executive department to produce such records, and that any such laws already on the books were not

binding on the executive branch. In short, under this interpretation by Attorney General Rogers, Congress was impotent versus the "executive privilege", even if it was being invoked to "protect" or to "cover up" or to "white wash" executive actions.

In addition, Secretary Rogers claimed that the so-called independent regulatory agencies, including the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, also had the "right" to invoke "executive privilege."

On the basis of this extreme definition of "executive privilege", no Federal employee would have the "right" to "tell the truth" or produce records on any substantive subject unless he had the prior approval or "authorization" from his superiors, the source commented.

CONGRESSIONAL RIGHTS

The doctrine of "executive privilege", as espoused by Mr. Rogers when he was Attorney General and as he is now re-asserting it to President Nixon in the cases of Ambassador Beam, Otto Otepka and Helmut Sonnenfeldt, is expected to lead to a "Constitutional storm and crisis" in the next six months, the source said, "unless President Nixon backs away from this exaggerated claim of executive privilege". Either Secretary Rogers will have to change his point of view radically or the battle between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government will become "irrepressible", the source concluded.

JUDGE M. E. McCONNELL

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, Sumter County, Ala., which comprises part of my congressional district, has recently lost one of its most respected citizens in the death of Judge M. E. McConnell.

Editor Dick Smith, of the Sumter County Journal, has very eloquently expressed the thoughts and feelings of the community. I am pleased to spread his tribute upon the RECORD:

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple."—Ps. 19:17.

That verse from the Great Book certainly reminds us of the active life of the late Judge M. E. McConnell. The earth swallowed him up last Sunday afternoon . . . but nothing can ever take his memory from those who knew him nor the history he made in Sumter County, Ala.

As depicted by the verse, he always kept life in focus.

He was a public servant, an elected official, a person truly interested in his fellowman and our children's education. He was a sportsman, a merchant, a cattleman, a humanitarian, a Christian of the first order.

He was further a legend in his own right. Judge McConnell, a one-time Tennessee Vol football player, will be remembered by all who knew him during his very active life. A probate judge, a senator, a mayor, a sportsman, he was always active in civic affairs.

He was the kind of man right to his death who would "teach" his listeners by the very fact they would listen.

There is a football field named for him in Livingston . . . there is a street named for him in York. Most of all, there are literally thousands of good people who will, down through the years, be praising him for what he was.

GENERAL KRZYZANOWSKI AND
THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the centennial commemoration of the Civil War produced a great deal of historic research which enlightened us about this epic struggle in American history. One of the historians who produced extensive material in conjunction with Civil War commemoration was Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, Midwest coordinator of the American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee.

He called attention to the fact that numerous officers and men of Polish descent, many of whom had fought in the battles against the Russian and Prussian oppressors of their land, made significant contributions to the Union Armies' successes.

The latest article of significance covering the Civil War which was carried in the February 1, 1969, Polish American, Chicago, is a very dramatic report by Maj. Gen. Charles G. Stevenson, U.S. Army, retired, discussing action at the Battle of Gettysburg:

GENERAL KRZYZANOWSKI AND THE BATTLE OF
GETTYSBURG(By Maj. Gen. Charles G. Stevenson, U.S.
Army, retired)

In early 1863, General Vladimir Krzyzanowski's brigade was assigned to the 3rd Division of Major General Carl Schurz in the newly constituted XI Corps, (Major General O. O. Howard Commanding of the Army of the Potomac).

At Gettysburg on July 1, 2 and 3, 1863, the regiments of Krzyzanowski's Brigade (2nd Brigade, 3rd Division, XI Corps) were the following, 58th New York Volunteers, 119th New York Volunteers, 75th Pennsylvania Volunteers, 82nd Ohio Volunteers, 26th Wisconsin Volunteers.

GENERAL KRZYZANOWSKI AT GETTYSBURG

Now I would like to sketch briefly what Krzyzanowski's brigade did on July 1, and 2, 1863, the first two days of the crucial battle of Gettysburg. I think General Krzyzanowski and his brigade made outstanding contributions to the famous battle which are generally overlooked. Krzyzanowski's brigade had 669 killed, wounded and missing in the battle.

FIRST DAY OF THE BATTLE

Map. No. 1, which I have prepared, is a rough sketch showing the position of Krzyzanowski's brigade, north of Gettysburg on the afternoon of July 1, 1863. It also shows the location of the other troops of the XI Corps on the right and left of Krzyzanowski. Krzyzanowski's brigade was in the center of the corps position. The sketch also shows the general line of the 1st Corps on Seminary Ridge on the left of the XI Corps. Also shown is the location of the Confederate troops which attacked the XI Corps.

You will note that the Confederate unit which attacked Krzyzanowski's brigade was the brigade of Brigadier General George Doles. These were Georgia troops and seasoned veterans.

General Doles was one of the outstanding brigadiers in the Confederate Second Corps (which was Stonewall Jackson's old Corps) of the Confederate Army. The second Corps was commanded in the Battle of Gettysburg by General Ewell, Stonewall Jackson having

been mortally wounded at Chancellorsville on May 2, 1863.

As the battle progressed the XI Corps was driven back by the superior numbers of Ewell's Confederate Corps which were much stronger in numbers than the Federal Corps.

Doubleday's 1st Corps also was compelled to retire but both Federal Corps inflicted heavy losses on the Confederates and succeeded in saving the high ground along Cemetery Ridge for the main Union Army to form on and on which it won the final battle on the third day. Krzyzanowski's brigade put up a staunch fight as it withdrew through the town of Gettysburg and took position on Cemetery Hill, south of the town.

Krzyzanowski's brigade did its share to let the Confederate General Ewell know that he had been in a fight. Rodde's division of Ewell's Corps, which included General Doles' Georgia brigade, had 3,000 casualties out of 8,000 men. Not all of the casualties were at the hands of Krzyzanowski's brigade, of course. The fact is that Ewell showed no great eagerness to press the advantage that he had won. He did not continue the attack in the late afternoon and evening of July 1. He was content to stop in the southern part of the town, and wait until he got positive orders from General Lee for a general attack.

Many military experts, including Mr. Bruce Catton, Chairman of the New York Civil War Centennial Commission, as stated in his book "Glory Road," think that if Ewell had carried through his attack, he probably would have taken Cemetery Hill during the evening of the first day. But, due to the resistance he had met from the I and XI Corps, including General Krzyzanowski's brigade, Ewell was in no condition to press the attack any further on that day.

SECOND DAY OF THE BATTLE

The second map shows the position of Krzyzanowski's brigade on Cemetery Hill on July 2nd. Here again Krzyzanowski and his brigade made an important contribution to the Union victory. For five hours from about 4:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., the Confederate bombarded the position of the XI Corps, including Krzyzanowski's brigade on Cemetery Hill with the heaviest cannonade of the war. The brigade endured it with coolness and resolution.

At about 9:00 p.m., Ewell sent Early's division against General Ames' 1st Division of the XI Corps, which was on the right of the Corps position. Hays' Louisiana brigade broke into the Union lines and fought hand to hand for the guns of Captain Wiedrich's Battery, 1st New York Light Artillery, which Ames' 1st Division was supporting.

Krzyzanowski and his two New York regiments, the 58th and 119th New York Volunteers were sent to recapture the guns and drive the enemy off the hill. Other reinforcements were also sent to assist General Ames' infantry. These reinforcements included Carroll's brigade of the II Corps. In all the books, except one, that I have read on this particular fight, including Mr. Catton's book: "Glory Road," no mention is made of the contributions to this fight made by Krzyzanowski and his two New York regiments, the 58th and 119th New York. Most books give all the credit to General Carroll's brigade for this action. These accounts are not fair to General Krzyzanowski and his two New York regiments, if the official reports of the Commanders concerned are taken into account.

Let me read from the after action report to General Krzyzanowski by Major Willis of the 119th New York, regarding this fight:

"Late in the evening (about 9 P.M.) the enemy made a most desperate charge upon a battery supported by the First Division of our corps. They rushed forward with incredible fierceness, driving back the First Division in disorder, and actually reached the

guns (one of which our men had already spiked) and demanded a surrender, but the commander of the battery and his brave cannoners did not yield. Then you, (note: General Krzyzanowski) seeing the critical position of affairs, and well knowing how soon the enemy would possess himself of the battery and that commanding heights, if not forced back, called upon our regiment and Fifty-eighth New York Volunteers, also of your brigade, to fall in and advance against them. It is needless for me to say, general, for you led us in person, with what alacrity the regiment responded, and with what determination it moved forward, and with what courage it met the foe, and, in conjunction with the gallant Fifty-eighth, drove him back, saved the position, and thus secured the whole army from irreparable disaster. Here ends the second day's struggle."

This report by Major Willis of the action of Krzyzanowski and his two N.Y. regiments, in coming to the assistance of Captain Wiedrich's battery of artillery, is confirmed by the after action report of the 58th N.Y. and also by that of the division commander, Major General Carl Schurz; and, finally, by the report of the Corps Commander, Major General O. O. Howard.

I must admit that a brief history of the 58th New York in Fox's book—"New York at Gettysburg" states that when the 58th got to this fight they found that the assailants had been, "repulsed without their assistance." But, that was written ten years after the war. I prefer to place greater credence on the after action reports written immediately after the battle when it was fresh in the commanders' minds. I, therefore, say that General Krzyzanowski and his New York Regiments, the 58th and 119 New York Volunteers, should receive a fair share of credit for their actions in this important part of the battle of Gettysburg.

FOUR RESOLUTIONS OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHU-
SETTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include four resolutions by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation removing the restriction on the amount of income a person may earn while receiving social security benefits

Whereas, Under present law a person receiving social security benefits is not permitted to earn more than sixteen hundred and eighty dollars in any one year without a decrease in payments received by him; and

Whereas, Many of the persons receiving such payments are almost totally dependent upon them for their living expenses; and

Whereas, The cost of living has increased substantially so that the benefits referred to are now totally inadequate; and

Whereas, The removal of the restriction on the amount of income that a person may earn while receiving social security benefits will enable such person to retain his self respect; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation removing the restrictions on the amount of income a person may earn while receiving social security benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, February 12, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,

Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 19, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code to permit homeowners to deduct up to \$500 a year for the maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation of their homes

Whereas, The existing stock of residential property in the cities and towns of America provides the core of the residential resources of our Country; and

Whereas, The creation of new housing can never provide more than a small percentage of the units available in the existing housing stock; and

Whereas, The preservation of this priceless natural and economic resource must be the keystone of national housing policy; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit homeowners to deduct up to five hundred dollars a year for the maintenance, preservation and rehabilitation of their homes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, February 13, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation granting tax incentives to those businesses which will locate in the slums and to those which give training necessary for the employment of the disadvantaged in or from slum areas

Whereas, One out of every three residents living in our city slums has a serious employment problem; and

Whereas, The continuing shift of the more affluent population, businesses and industries from the central cities to the suburbs is intensifying the employment problems of the poor who remain in central cities; and

Whereas, Strong measures are needed now to stem the flight of business and industry from the central city areas and to encourage private enterprise to offer opportunities for training to the nation's disadvantaged; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress to enact legislation granting tax incentives to those businesses which will locate in the slums and to those which give training necessary for the employment of the disadvantaged in or from slum areas; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, February 13, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the amounts of minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act

Whereas, The cost of the necessities of life in this country has risen to an all time high; and

Whereas, A substantial portion of the people of this nation depend to a large extent, if not entirely, upon the monthly payments received by them under the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, The current minimum monthly payments under said program have now become grossly inadequate for their needs; and

Whereas, An increase of such minimum payments to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple would tend to relieve such conditions; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, February 12, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,

Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 19, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that Pan American World Airways will commence direct daily service between Chicago and Shannon, Ireland, on June 1, 1969, according to James Montgomery, vice president, sales.

The Pan Am flight will depart Chicago O'Hare International Airport 7 days a week and arrive at Shannon the following morning. The flights leaving Chicago on Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday will continue on to Paris and the flights departing on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday will proceed to Amsterdam.

This will be Pan Am's second daily flight between the United States and Ireland this summer, reflecting Pan Am's confidence that travel between the midwestern United States and Ireland will flourish and reach new peaks in the months ahead.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DENIED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, ramifications from the Supreme Court's injecting itself into the religious freedom of the American citizens continues to raise questions—serious questions to free men—as to whether the Court has laid to rest the separation of church and state issue or if its usurpation has denied equal opportunity to religion in favor of establishing a pseudoreligion of secularism.

The Supreme Court, in striking down the Arkansas antievolution law, tacitly approved of teaching the evolution theory while suppressing the fundamentalist belief. If so, the Court has itself violated the first amendment prohibitions.

Should we not pay serious attention to the same analogy with the Court's prohibitions against nonsectarian prayer honoring God in school; yet, under the emotion of academic freedom, by inference encouraging the teaching in schools of a nonprohibited secularism such as socialism, communism, and internationalism.

Perhaps the Supreme Court has gone so far against religion they may soon encounter new law suits by those who feel the first amendment rights of their children are being infringed by the teaching of secularism in public schools.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial appeared in the Liberty magazine for March-April, 1969, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

MONKEY BUSINESS

The United States Supreme Court's ruling against the Arkansas statute forbidding teaching in the public schools the theory "that mankind ascended or descended from a lower order of animals," seems, on the face of it, to be a wise decision compatible with principles of religious freedom.

"It is clear," the Court said in last November's ruling, "that fundamentalist sectarian conviction was and is the law's reason for existence," and the "law's effort was confined to an attempt to blot out a particular theory because of its supposed conflict with the Biblical account, literally read."

Questions arise, however, when one thinks through an observation made by Justice Black in his reluctantly concurring opinion.

"Since there is no indication that the literal Biblical doctrine of the origin of man is included in the curriculum of the Arkansas schools," observed Justice Black, "does not the removal of the subject of evolution leave the State in a neutral position toward these supposedly competing religious and antireligious doctrines?"

In other words, no evidence showed that the creationist theory was being taught in Arkansas schools. Did not the Arkansas antievolutionary law, then, simply guarantee neutrality? And is not the State now in the position of favoring evolution? Adopting the Court's own argument in the Schupp case, unless the creationist hypothesis is given equal time with the evolutionary hypothesis, is not the State establishing a religion of secularism?

In Schupp the Court warned that a State might establish a religion of secularism by opposing or showing hostility to religion,

thus preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.

On reflection, one wonders why the Court felt called on to render a decision at all, especially in view of the facts that (1) Mrs. Epperson—the teacher involved—no longer lived in Arkansas, but in Maryland; therefore the case was mooted; (2) Mrs. Epperson made no attempt to show that she ever had been prohibited from teaching evolution as a theory, even as a teacher in Little Rock; (3) it is a matter of record that no attempt ever has been made, even once, by Arkansas to enforce "Initiated Act No. 1," the statute forbidding the teaching of evolution in the State. How, then, could she claim damages, as a plaintiff?

When the above facts are considered, what appears on its face to be a decision compatible with religious liberty raises the suspicion that the Court may have disestablished one religion only to establish another.

R. R. H.

AN APPEAL TO SECRETARY FINCH

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues will recall, the Air Quality Act of 1967 allows California to seek waivers from the national auto emission standards. The waivers may be granted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—but only for standards that are more stringent than the national requirements.

California was given the right to attempt to run her own auto smog control program over strong objections by the auto industry, which apparently felt it might be inconvenienced.

A substantial majority of our colleagues agreed, however, that the State has uniquely severe smog problems which entirely justified the waiver clause in the air quality bill.

But the Detroit moguls, who sell millions of cars in California, remain unconvinced. They are trying to block a new set of standards recommended by the State legislature, and it can be assumed they will bring formidable pressure to bear on the Federal authorities who must pass on the California proposals.

I am confident that our new HEW Secretary, Robert H. Finch, a southern Californian who knows well the severity of the smog problem, will grant the waiver, as urged in the following editorial published 4 days ago in the Los Angeles Times:

THE RIGHT TO HAVE CLEAN AIR

Issue: Will California continue to have trouble winning the right to set and enforce strict auto exhaust control standards?

Seven million people in the Los Angeles Basin this week had the rare experience of breathing easily and seeing clearly in unpolluted air.

It was the kind of weather that made state and local officials plead all the more forcefully Tuesday for federal permission to make California anti-smog laws tougher. They know that our air cannot be cleaner until vehicle emissions are effectively controlled.

But the auto industry, as usual, had its foot on the brake at the hearings held this week by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on the state's request to waive weaker federal regulations.

Although cars and trucks are responsible for 85 percent of the smog in Southern California, Detroit has continuously resisted the stringent exhaust standards enacted by the state Legislature.

California should take "on faith" the statements of auto company executives that they would work voluntarily for better pollution controls, said an industry spokesman at the HEW hearing Wednesday.

He seemed to forget that Detroit installed exhaust control devices on new cars only after the Legislature decreed that no new autos could be sold in California without them.

He also did not mention the auto industry's fight in Congress to deny California the right to continue to impose tougher requirements. Or that the federal government last January filed a civil suit charging the automakers with conspiring to delay development and installation of smog control equipment.

California must be allowed to require ever stricter standards on the emission of hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen—the vile ingredients of smog. A committee of scientific and technical experts has declared that the standards can be met, if Detroit tries.

HEW Secretary Robert Finch, a Southern Californian and former lieutenant governor of the state, knows the seriousness of the local air pollution problem. He is aware that 10,000 persons leave the smog-filled basin annually on the advice of their physicians.

The Times urges Secretary Finch to grant the waiver that will permit California to continue its pioneering efforts to control auto-caused smog. Every urban state will benefit.

AMERICA: GREATEST COUNTRY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1967, I inserted in the RECORD a column by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press entitled "America: Greatest Country."

I am very pleased to see that the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has granted its George Washington Honor Medal Award for 1968 to Mr. Danielopol for the article which originally appeared in the San Diego Union, Monday, November 6, 1967.

In presenting the award, the Freedom Foundation stated:

An outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American Way of Life.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this column by Mr. Danielopol truly merits the award which has been bestowed by the Freedom Foundation and feel it most appropriate in view of the timelessness of the message that it be inserted again in the RECORD:

AMERICA: GREATEST COUNTRY—DELAYED PILGRIM ASHAMED OF CURRENT ATTITUDES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dumitru Danielopol, former Romanian banker and diplomat, refused to return to his native country after the 1947 Paris peace conference. Instead, he came to the United States. Here, he reminisces on 20 years in America and the changes in the American spirit.)

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Twenty years ago today I set foot for the first time on American soil.

On that gray, misty morning New York's harbor was crowned with low dark clouds. The Manhattan skyline was a forbidding sight. It looked more like a barrier than a gateway to a new life.

This was not a city I was looking at; it was a world.

And from the deck of the Holland-America liner Nieuw Amsterdam it looked foreign, cold, ruthless, cruel.

IMAGE CHANGES

Then suddenly the image changed. We came within sight of the Statue of Liberty holding aloft her torch to: "Your tired, your poor, your huddled masses . . . the wretched refuse . . ." The statue softened the stark reality of the brick and stone skyline.

New York could not be so tough. How many millions like myself had fled Europe's troubles to find a new life.

Suddenly fear and awe gave way to a sense of challenge. Those tall buildings seemed to say, "Show us what you can do."

As I reminisce now 20 years later, I remember, too, the gratitude. Those of us who arrived by the thousands after World War II were grateful just to be here.

It never occurred to us to ask for favors. We had been granted the greatest of all favors: The freedom to try.

Thirteen years later President John F. Kennedy put it all in one sentence:

"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

It wasn't easy, believe me. We—the "refugees" of World War II and postwar failures—were not the usual type of immigrant who came to stay and were immediately absorbed.

We were political exiles or refugees from communism. We were "DPs" (displaced persons). Often we were resented by our ethnic groups, the immigrants of long ago.

"DP" was not a pleasant term. It described a person adrift.

But we did not accept this.

"DP doesn't stand for displaced person," we quipped, "it stands for 'Delayed Pilgrim.'"

Today, many of those who arrived with me still cling to the hope that one day they can go "home."

Others, like me, have found "home." We have become citizens. We love to be here.

Those of us who continue to preach against communism and totalitarianism do it in the hope that we can protect our new home against this 20th Century disease.

It never occurred to us in 1947 that in a few short years we would see Americans expecting to live on the efforts of others: Refusing jobs because they could do better on relief; refusing to serve their flag; demonstrating against their duly elected President.

NOT OWED LIVING

It never crossed our minds that anyone owned us a living.

Free speech and the right to dissent were two of the riches that America gave me. I do not for one moment challenge the right of others to these riches but on this important anniversary in my life I claim the right to speak, too.

For the first time, I'm ashamed of some of my fellow Americans. I'm ashamed of the draft-dodger and draft card burner; of the youngster who lives in filth and claims to be "pure" in spirit; of the puppets who follow high-sounding, but often questionable leadership and go about inciting disturbances, sit-ins, riots, civil disobedience and demonstrations; of the self-styled intellectual who wants to bring communism to this country.

I'm also ashamed of the politicians who blind themselves, who apologize for enemies of our freedom, who describe the fight for freedom as "arrogance of power;" of the columnists who have made defeatism and appeasement their credo.

Certainly America is not perfect. But this

is a country which has come closer to perfection than any other.

Impatience with technical, social and educational shortcomings is fuel for progress. But those who preach communism know nothing of progress.

For many in America, their tragedy is that they were born here. They don't realize how much they have to be thankful for. They have never experienced the thrill of becoming an American.

To those who would despair, who would capitulate to tyranny, who would renounce this heritage, I have only this advice:

Audi alteram partem: Listen to the other side.

Look around you. Look around the world. You live in the greatest country man has ever put together.

Be proud of it.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN CRITICIZES HIGH INTEREST RATES AT HOUSING CONFERENCE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, delivered a landmark address before the 38th annual convention of the National Housing Conference yesterday concerning home financing.

Chairman PATMAN was quite frank in his discussion of this matter, and because of the interest of the American people and my colleagues in this most important subject, I herewith place his remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE 38TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am always honored to be invited to a meeting of the National Housing Conference. The NHC is made up of people who are really trying to do something about housing. You are a sincere and dedicated group.

We haven't always agreed right down the line. Last year, I remember that you—reluctantly—went along with the increases in the FHA and VA interest rates. But, that was last year and by now I hope I have some converts on this question.

I am always impressed by the Housing Conference. I am impressed by the optimism and the spirit that you generate for worthwhile housing programs. Your resolutions contain strong, well-thought-out programs and these resolutions inevitably find broad support among Members of Congress. The NHC, in my opinion, is a vital factor in rallying Congressional support for housing and urban programs. I don't know what we would do without you.

But, my friends, I have been coming down here to the Statler Hilton for the past four years to meet with you, and each year it seems that the nation's failures in the field of housing become more obvious and more depressing. We are not gaining in the race to house the nation in decent homes. We are falling back.

Each year—despite the fine optimism generated here—we find ourselves with bigger backlogs in practically every type of low-income and moderate-income housing. We're apparently doing all right in the \$50,000 to

\$100,000—and up—brackets, but below that, we are dropping pitifully behind.

The housing field is pockmarked by goals that have never been met. All of us here can recall the string of high-sounding goals that have come forward from the National Housing Conference, from Presidents of the United States, and from various Committees of the Congress. Wonderful words, excellent goals, but little performance.

This is shameful in a great and powerful nation. We pride ourselves on our ability to produce. In the production of material goods, we look on ourselves as second to none in the world.

We are able to build sophisticated space vehicles that reach to the moon. We are able to glut the market with millions of shiny highpowered automobiles, and we are able to devise and construct the most complex computer and communications systems.

Yet somehow—and for some reason—we cannot put together the financing, the bricks, the lumber, and the glass to house our population in decent, reasonably priced homes.

This kind of failure demands attention from the highest levels of the Federal Government. This is an emergency which cannot be dealt with by another round of high-sounding Presidential Messages and reports from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The nation must have action—real action—on housing and not another reshuffling of existing machinery. To do this we are going to have to pursue a national housing policy which steps on some toes—the toes of some pretty big people in our economy.

I'm not sure that the Nixon Administration is up to the task.

I have great respect for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney. I have known him for a number of years and I regard him as one of the real geniuses of our free enterprise system.

But I am greatly disappointed by his start as the chief housing official of the nation. Before he even had a chance to rearrange the furniture in his office, Mr. Romney signed orders which sent FHA and VA interest rates through the ceiling . . . well above existing rates on conventional mortgages.

This increase was totally unnecessary. It was not based on the facts. The Secretary obviously fell for a bunch of high interest nonsense from one of the Republican whiz kids somewhere in the Administration. In any event, this was a pretty sad start for a man who professes to want to build houses.

Unfortunately, Mr. Romney has spent most of his time telling the nation about the impossibilities of meeting the previous Administration's goals on housing. He describes the 26 million units that President Johnson said should be built in the next decade as an "impossibility."

Well, I am sure we won't build many houses with this kind of defeatism. I know that Mr. Romney didn't produce all those Rambler automobiles by sitting around wringing his hands about the difficulties and the impossibilities.

We need officials all down the line who really believe in these programs and who believe that the nation's domestic priorities can and should be met. We need Cabinet members who are "can do" officials. We don't need a bunch of nervous nellys running around telling us why they "can't do" what needs to be done.

What we need is a lot of courage . . . a willingness to face the special interests that dominate and hold back housing. And this means that somewhere, sometime, and somehow, this Administration and the Congress will have to face up to what the monetary authorities have done and are doing to housing.

This will take a whale of a lot of courage. But without it, we are not about to solve the nation's housing crisis.

Credit—its availability and price—is the prime factor in all housing construction. You know that. The Administration and its housing experts know that. Yet they are still talking about tinkering with the fringe factors rather than facing the basic problem.

I realize that there have been a lot of price increases involving materials that go into housing. I am aware that lumber prices have skyrocketed, that the price of land has moved up at fantastic rates and that other costs are following. It is also a fact that many of these cost increases are the direct result of the shortages that have been built into the economy by high interest rates and tight money.

It is inescapable that the price of money is the number one cost in any house regardless of where it might be built in this nation. It dwarfs everything else. Today the interest charges on an average mortgage will be anywhere from 100 to 150 per cent of its principal. And this does not take into consideration the interest charges on construction loans which become part of the price of the house.

These are the kind of facts that make a lot of people in this nation—and particularly in our Federal Government—nervous. They don't want to face the special interests who control the availability of credit for housing. For the average politician, this is too much to ask. They would much rather talk about other costs.

The Congress did, back in 1966, gather up its courage enough to pass legislation giving the Federal Reserve authority to purchase housing paper in the open market. Congress renewed that authority in 1967 on a temporary basis and then made the measure permanent last year.

This was a law like any other law. The only difference is that no one has bothered to obey this law.

The Federal Reserve, led by its chairman, William McChesney Martin, has steadfastly refused to follow this law and buy housing paper in the open market. They have totally defied the Congress.

Mr. Martin has done this despite his promise to obey the law if the Congress passed it. Here is exactly what he told me when this legislation was before the Banking and Currency Committee:

"Whatever law you pass here, we will do our best to carry it out, Mr. Chairman."

In addition to the legislation passed by both Houses of Congress, the Joint Economic Committee—made up of Members of the Senate and the House—has called the Federal Reserve Board's attention to this legal authority and urged that it be carried out. The Federal Reserve has ignored the directive.

The legislation I am talking about is quite simple. It would mean that the Federal Reserve—through the purchase of housing paper in the market—would reallocate some of the nation's credit resources to the sorely pressed housing market. It would allocate your credit—the people's credit—to meet a need that has been established beyond any doubt.

This is not very revolutionary. Why should anyone oppose allocation of credit for housing? Why should all of this money go into loans for business purposes? Why should not some of it go to meet a critical shortage of housing?

The time has come to put an end to this nonsense at the Federal Reserve. It is time that agency was required to obey the law like any other agency of the Federal Government.

Therefore, tonight I am challenging President Nixon and his Administration to go to the mat with the Federal Reserve on this issue. I urge that the President call in William McChesney Martin and the entire Federal Reserve Board and determine why the

Board has refused to support the housing market.

The President should make it clear to the Federal Reserve Chairman that he wants the law carried out. If Martin continues to defy the Government, then the President should immediately issue an executive order requiring compliance with the law.

Should the Board refuse to accept the order, the Congress would have firm ground to remove any Member of the Board who defied the order.

Such a move undoubtedly would bring President Nixon a great flurry of opposition from the members of his own Cabinet who are so closely allied with the banking industry. I am sure that Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy, formerly Chairman of the Continental-Illinois National Bank of Chicago, and the Under-Secretary of the Treasury, Charls Walker, formerly chief lobbyist of the American Bankers Association, would oppose—with everything at their command—such action against the Federal Reserve.

Both of these men, in their capacities in the commercial banking industry, were among the major apologists for the Federal Reserve System and I am sure that they are continuing to press this viewpoint within the Administration.

But this provides President Nixon with a clearcut chance to act in the public interest and to show his independence from the banking pressures.

President Nixon, of course, is not the only one who needs to act to protect housing and other vulnerable areas of the economy from the ups and downs created by misguided monetary policies.

The Congress has been derelict in its duty. It has not protected the public interest and has treated the Federal Reserve in the most gentle, kid-glove manner imaginable. It is time for the Congress to exert itself and to make sure that the Housing market does get the proper allocation of credit—at reasonable rates—even if this means hurting the feelings of a few well-heeled lobbyists.

This year I hope the Congress will correct the mistake it made last Spring on the FHA and VA interest rate ceilings. Amidst a lot of propaganda, the Congress relinquished its power over these rates and turned the authority over to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

This was a terrible mistake and its only saving grace is the fact that the law was made temporary. The law expires on October 1 and the Congress at that time will regain authority over these rates.

The folly of allowing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to handle these rates was brought home to the American people when Mr. Romney slapped an effective FHA rate of eight per cent on homeowners January 24th—four days after the Nixon Administration was inaugurated.

As you remember, this Romney increase actually pulled the FHA rate nearly three quarters of one per cent above the average conventional mortgage at that time. The net effect was to pull all interest rates up drastically.

Apparently Mr. Romney was once again acting on the old worn-out theory that high interest rates somehow create more housing. Obviously, Secretary Romney did not bother to read his own Department's first annual report on National Housing Goals. He would have found it highly instructive on the point of interest rates. Here is what the report says:

"A review of experience during the last two tight money periods, 1959-60 and 1965-66, suggests that rising mortgage interest rates are likely to lead to a significant decline in housing starts."

That is a pretty clear and concrete state-

ment. High mortgage interest rates reduce housing. And the Report fully documents this assertion.

High interest rates—according to one line of fallacious thinking—are supposed to reduce those so-called discounts or points. These points are terrible burdens for the seller and the buyer. And I think they should be eliminated.

But you cannot do this through high interest rates. When the Congress took the ceiling off FHA and VA interest rates last Spring, we were told that this would eliminate the points. The truth is, the points were back on almost overnight. And by the time Secretary Romney had assumed office, the points had climbed to six or seven on most mortgages. After the eight per cent interest rate imposed by Secretary Romney in January, the points declined slightly and are now on their way back up to their previous levels. It is my understanding that most FHA mortgages are carrying three, and possibly four points, as well as the Romney eight per cent interest.

I hope that groups like the National Housing Conference will do everything in their power to put an end to this fallacy that high interest rates are beneficial to housing. You know and I know that they are the most destructive things that can happen to housing programs.

These new high interest rates will tear the heart out of all of the low income programs—programs which I guess we would have to say are subsidized. But whether you use the term subsidy or not, these programs are worthwhile and are in the public interest.

As you know, under these programs, the Federal Government picks up all interest charges above one per cent. Now that the Nixon Administration has increased the interest rate to eight per cent, this leaves a tremendous gap to be picked up with the existing funds. The net result, obviously, will be a reduction in the number of units that can be built under these low-income programs. The funds that we had hoped to use for these additional units will simply go to pay higher interest charges.

This is an awful injustice. It puts us further and further away from solutions to our really bad housing problems.

We must find some lasting solutions to all of these problems for the low income families as well as the great mass of middle income families. It is obvious that we don't have the solutions now.

In just the last few days, there have been some estimates that the country is suffering its greatest shortage of housing in more than twenty years. In some localities, the housing shortages are as bad as those existing during World War II. This could have extremely serious consequences for the future of the nation.

According to the Federal Reserve System's own estimates, the nation will barely build 1.5 million units of new housing during 1969. The goal was 2.6 million units. We will fall exactly 1.1 million, or forty per cent, behind our hopes.

This puts us well behind the pace needed to build the 26 million new units in the next ten years. And at the lower end of the scale—the low income housing—the gap between goals and performance is growing even greater.

The Congress and the Administration are going to have to find solutions and quickly. I have outlined some of my ideas on the question of monetary policy and housing but I know that there is much more that must be done for us to have a long-range housing program that works.

Let me assure you that the House Banking and Currency Committee is well aware of the problem and there is great sentiment on the Committee for action. I hope that the Bank-

ing and Currency Committee this session will be able to launch a full-scale study of all of the housing and development problems of both our rural and urban communities. I would like this to be more than just a study. It should be a study that is aimed toward finding specific administrative and legislative solutions.

This type of study is long overdue. We must find out why the nation has consistently fallen so far behind its housing goals. We need to find out why the construction of low-income housing is so difficult; why transportation systems have failed to keep pace with the movement of the population. We need to know much more about the almost-forgotten problems of our rural areas and what effect the mass migration of rural people has on the urban problems. And we must pin down, for all time, the means to finance this entire area of activity.

This would be a comprehensive study covering every possible aspect of rural and urban growth problems. To accomplish this, it must be a "no-holds barred" study—perhaps investigation is a better term. To be successful, we would have to forget all the old clichés of housing and urban development and agree to find fresh solutions. The study would be worthless—a waste of the taxpayers money—if it ends up simply rehashing and rewording existing programs. This must be a new look, a new start.

As I see this study, the Banking and Currency Committee would have a great opportunity to lay out a blueprint—a working blueprint—for rural, urban and housing development through at least the year 2000. I regard this as a prime responsibility of the Banking and Currency Committee and I want to see the Committee carry out its responsibilities to the fullest.

In my opinion this must be a study which can be completed quickly—and still get all the facts. We cannot afford one of those unending two or three year studies. The country simply cannot wait that long to start finding real solutions to the rural and urban development crisis.

The country is waiting for answers and it is up to the Congress to provide them.

And, again, I cannot overemphasize the critical need to find the answers in the area of financing. Now I have asked that President Nixon take the Federal Reserve to the mat on this issue. I am serious about this.

If this fails, we are going to have to move in other directions, to get the necessary credit in the housing market. If the Federal Reserve does not fulfill its responsibilities and carry out its legal authorities, we must find other machinery.

When an agency fails to exercise a power it has been granted, then that power should be re-delegated elsewhere in the Government. We already have the Federal Home Loan Bank System for the Savings and Loan institutions whose sole purpose is to provide credit for homes. Therefore, we should consider giving the Federal Home Loan Bank Board additional authority—authority which now rests with the Federal Reserve System.

In short, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board could be given the power to use the credit of the nation—just as the Federal Reserve now uses the credit of the nation. This would allow the Home Loan Bank Board to make the credit—the people's credit—available for housing. This would mean a basic restructuring of our monetary system and I am sure that the conservative money managers and the bankers will be horrified at the suggestion. But it is this kind of old-line thinking that we have to overcome if we want to build housing in this country. We are going to have to think new thoughts and restructure old institutions to move the country forward in this area.

Thank you for inviting me.

THE WASHINGTON POST'S DR.
STRANGELOVE OVERLOOKED A
FEW FACTS ABOUT DR. NUTTER

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, recently the Richmond Times-Dispatch, one of the finest newspapers in the Nation, expressed its amazement over the reaction of a Washington Post editorial which was critical of the appointment of Prof. G. Warren Nutter as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch took the Post editorial writer to task for his obvious bias. I concur in the Richmond editorial writer's views about the strange case of Dr. Strangelove on the Post's editorial staff. I commend the editorial to follow to my colleagues, just to set the record straight on this fine American and able public servant:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch,
Feb. 28, 1969]

IN DEFENSE OF DR. NUTTER

In its long lead editorial last Sunday, the Washington Post fumed with indignation over the appointment of Professor G. Warren Nutter of the University of Virginia to a key job in the Nixon administration.

Ordinarily we do not answer editorials which appear in other newspapers. But the Post exercises unusual influence in matters such as these in Washington, and in this instance fairness demands a reply.

The selection of Dr. Nutter as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs—an office sometimes referred to as the Pentagon's "State Department"—was "strange" and "improbable," said the Post.

What is rather strange is that the Post, for all its fuming, was unable to cite anything very specific about Professor Nutter to justify its apoplexy. The paper asserted that he has a "history as an intellectual zealot of the Right," and that he has made "harsh and somewhat simplistic statements" concerning U.S.-Soviet relations.

Unfortunately, however, the Post failed to supply any details concerning Dr. Nutter's background, or to quote any of his statements to back up its assertions. The casual reader who knew nothing about him might easily assume, on the basis of the editorial, that he is a Bircher, a Babbitt or worse.

Certainly one would never have learned from the editorial that Professor Nutter earned his Phi Beta Kappa key, taught at Yale, has been chairman of the economics department at the University of Virginia, has written several scholarly books, and is widely regarded as one of the nation's foremost experts on the Soviet Union.

In fact, one would not even have learned from the editorial that Dr. Nutter is a professor at all! Though the Post referred to him once as "G. Warren Nutter of the University of Virginia," it never mentioned his faculty position, and all other references were to "Mr." Nutter—not "Dr." or "Professor."

The basis of the Post's complaint over the Nutter appointment was summarized in a single paragraph. It boiled down to the fact that in 1964 Dr. Nutter was active in Barry Goldwater's campaign for the presidency as an adviser and speechwriter. Whatever else he may have accomplished, in the eyes of the Post that alone was enough to bar the good professor forever from high office.

"To have thought that a man with such

eccentric views (as Goldwater's) would have been a good president, is scarcely a mark of the kind of judgment required for this sensitive job," asserts the Post, concluding that, in making the appointment, "Secretary Laird—and through him Mr. Nixon—is taking quite a chance."

We would refer the Post's editorial writers to "The Making of a President, 1964," by Theodore H. White. In his book, Mr. White—hardly a right wing zealot—described Dr. Nutter as the "one man of unquestionably superior intellectual quality" who served on the Goldwater campaign staff.

It might be added that if support for Goldwater were enough to disqualify an individual from high federal office, the blacklist would include the names of 27 million Americans. High on that list, in case the Post has forgotten, would be the names of Mr. Nixon and Mr. Laird.

GET TOUGH WITH WHOLESALERS
OF NARCOTICS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the mounting problem of narcotics, I want to commend the vigorous stand taken by the district attorney of Erie County, N.Y., in which my congressional district is located.

The answer to halting the flood of narcotics into our communities is to make it tough for the major peddlers—the ones who are supplying narcotics to the local pushers and the addicts.

District Attorney Michael F. Dillon is giving full support to stiffer penalties for heroin wholesalers—penalties as strong as life imprisonment.

It is time we showed these illicit operators that we really mean business in controlling narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the March 6 edition of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News:

DILLON URGES LIFE TERMS FOR DOPE
WHOLESALERS

Stiffer penalties—up to life imprisonment—for heroin wholesalers were supported today in a letter being sent by Dist. Atty. Michael F. Dillon to all area legislators as well as leaders of the State Senate and Assembly.

Mr. Dillon is asking them to vote for a series of bills that would make large-scale dope peddlers subject to long prison terms—up to life imprisonment—for possession of more than 16 ounces of heroin, morphine or cocaine, and up to 25 years for possession of 8 ounces or more.

The bills are now before the Codes Committee in both houses.

"Present penalties have proved inadequate and ineffective to cope with the activities of major violators," Mr. Dillon said.

A 15-YEAR TERM HIGHEST NOW

"The drug problem continues to grow at an alarming rate and profits are substantial. The new law may well be strong enough to discourage individuals from entering or continuing this illicit, lucrative enterprise."

He noted that under present law, an addict who sells a small quantity to support his own habit, is subject to the same penalties as the large-scale commercial seller, who is rarely an addict himself. They are

both subject to punishment for Class C felonies, with a maximum term of 15 years. Possession of one ounce or more is now a class C felony.

CITES REHABILITATION COST

The proposed legislation would make 8 ounces the necessary amount for a class B felony and 16 ounces, the amount for a class A charge.

Mr. Dillon said the changes would not interfere with the care and treatment or rehabilitation of drug addicts under present law.

"We spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year in the United States to rehabilitate addicts," he said. "If we can strike an effective blow at the source of narcotic traffic, we can save substantial moneys for our taxpayers. More importantly, we can help to preserve and protect human dignity."

The district attorney also noted that narcotic addiction is responsible for 40 to 50 per cent of all crime, especially in large urban centers.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR CON-
GRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, efforts to achieve meaningful congressional reform are gaining momentum. Last month H.R. 6278 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, DONALD RUMSFELD, with a long list of Republican sponsors. Recently the gentleman from California, Congressman THOMAS REES, together with a number of Democratic Members, has introduced a similar measure providing for substantial changes in congressional rules and procedures.

While there are some differences between the two bills and the measure which passed the Senate during the last Congress, they can and will be resolved. Of greater significance than the specific details of each bill is the fact that their introduction serves as an indicator of broad-based bipartisan support for reform. I include a release from the office of Congressman REES at this point as a reminder to my colleagues of the bipartisan nature of our efforts to modernize the Congress:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM THIS SESSION
PREDICTED BY REES

"This is the year for congressional reform," predicted Congressman Thomas M. Rees (Dem.-Calif.). "I believe the public will demand that we bring the legislative branch of government into the 20th century."

Legislation designed to reorganize and update Congress will be introduced next week by Rees. The bill will closely parallel the one recently introduced by Congressman Donald Rumsfeld (Rep.-Ill.) and generally supported by Republican members of the House.

While both bills are the work of the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization, Congressman Rees indicated they will contain some significant differences from the version which passed the Senate in 1967. Many of the changes are new additions which could be supported by congressmen generally, regardless of party affiliation.

"I'm hoping to have considerable support

from Democratic members of the House on the bill," stated Rees. "While my bill differs from both the Rumsfeld bill and the original Senate bill, I'm hopeful that the differences can be worked out and that we will continue to have a bipartisan approach in dealing with the modernization of our legislative system. In talking with Republican members I'm convinced that this is possible."

Rees and the Democratic members worked closely with Rumsfeld last year in an effort to bring the reorganization bill to the floor for action. It had languished for nearly a year and a half without any action.

"I'm very hopeful that reorganization and the upgrading of Congress will be a top priority matter this year," Rees concluded. "With an early start this session I'm confident we will be successful."

TWO STATEMENTS BY OPPONENTS OF THE ABM SYSTEM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this morning contains two eloquent statements by opponents of the ABM system.

One analysis, reprinted from the Saturday Review, is by its distinguished editor, Norman Cousins, who suggests that the ABM decision "could be President Nixon's Vietnam." The other, by columnist Tom Wicker, is titled simply "A Decision That Makes Itself." The case they make against deployment of an ABM system is not new. The overwhelming evidence against the system has been available to us for some time. But, at this critical moment of decision, these two gentlemen have made a real contribution by summing up the opposition case in unusually clear and cogent fashion. The texts of their analyses are as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1969]
IN THE NATION: A DECISION THAT MAKES ITSELF

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Mr. Nixon's interesting custom of setting dates upon which he will deliver major policy pronouncements has this capital positively quivering in anticipation or dread of his promised decision on the antiballistic missile system. In fact, the case against ABM deployment is so overwhelming that it is hard to see how the President could decide for it.

Even the technical feasibility of the system is in doubt, particularly if deployment is to be justified by placing Sprint missiles to protect ICBM sites; and the Defense Department's research director, Dr. John S. Foster, warned two years ago that the whole Nike-X system—now known as Sentinel—would soon be obsolete.

The rationale first advanced by the Johnson Administration, that Sentinel some day would protect the nation against a Chinese missile attack, has been discredited by no less a hawk than Senator Richard Russell, a pillar of the armed forces establishment in Congress. "The Chinese are not completely crazy," he has said. "They are not going to attack us with four or five missiles when they know we have the capability of virtually destroying their entire country."

Now the ABM defenders have virtually abandoned the Chinese rationale and talk of

deploying Sentinel to protect ICBM sites from new Soviet multiple-warhead weapons. But Senator Cooper of Kentucky has pointed out that no one has produced evidence that the state of Russian weaponry makes it imperative for the United States to deploy such defenses; and two authorities, Dr. Hans Bethe and Dr. J. P. Ruina, told a Congressional hearing last week that they knew of no such evidence.

The cost estimate attached to Sentinel—about \$5 billion—is conservative at best and Senator Stuart Symington has effectively demonstrated that defense hardware costs always mushroom beyond Pentagon estimates. Moreover, the out-of-pocket cost to taxpayers is the least of it, while the worst is that these same dollars could be and should be used for all those domestic social needs so long starved for funds by the devouring demands of the military.

INSURING MILITARY EMBRACE

Politically, for the President to opt for Sentinel against these social needs, or even to insist, Johnson-like, that we can have missiles and social programs, would throw his Administration into the arms of the military-industrial complex and its servants in Congress, insuring for another four years the pre-eminence of generals and militarists, because a decision would repudiate the most progressive forces in Congress, now gathered in bipartisan opposition to the ABM system, and further alienate all those voters who already question Mr. Nixon's concern for the poor and the black, and doubt his interest in the quality of American life.

STEPS TO COMPLETE SYSTEM

The deployment of any ABM system, moreover, however "thin," ineffective or near obsolescence, will be regarded by its victorious proponents as a "building block" in a vastly more expensive ABM defense against Soviet missiles. "It is the first step," Senator Russell said of Sentinel, "toward the deployment of the complete system that I think is required."

But the estimated \$40-billion cost of the "complete system" that Russell and others really want to develop from Sentinel deployment is not much better than an arbitrary guess; and former Defense Secretary McNamara has pointed out persuasively that even the "complete system" would be penetrable by the sophisticated Soviet weaponry its deployment would force them to build.

Above all, a decision to deploy an ABM system now might well trigger what McNamara called an "action-reaction phenomenon that fuels an arms race." The Soviets might and probably would step up their offensive or defensive missile armaments, or both, in response; they might recoil from the nuclear arms control talks Mr. Nixon has said he desires; and military hardliners in Moscow might well picture themselves as vindicated and find their influence enhanced for years to come.

If these arguments, all of which are being made to Mr. Nixon, not only by Democratic liberals but by such Republicans as Cooper, Javits, Percy, Brooke and Hatfield (even Everett Dirksen and John Stennis, the Armed Forces Committee chairman, have expressed reservations), should persuade the President, he even has at hand a sound political explanation just waiting to be made.

He could say that the proposed ABM system needs more study and further development, which it does. He could add that this need dovetailed with his desire as a peace-maker to defer deployment at least until he had determined whether the Soviets would negotiate in good faith on arms control. And he could play on the disenchantment on Congress and the public by pointing out that deploying the Sentinel was Lyndon Johnson's idea, anyway. After, all, this is a new Administration, isn't it?

[From the Saturday Review, Mar. 8, 1969]
THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE DECISION: PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAM
(By Norman Cousins)

President Johnson's most difficult decision in the early days of his office was whether to press for a military solution in Vietnam or to seek a negotiated settlement. From his military leaders in the field and from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington came maximum pressure for stepping up the war. The President was told that North Vietnam would continue its attack in the South unless there was clear and specific evidence that the United States was prepared to become directly involved. Those who urged this view on the President said they were certain that North Vietnam would not dare to confront American military might.

President Johnson thereupon ordered U.S. combat units into the field. The direct intervention of the United States, however, did not bring about the expected result. Instead, North Vietnam stepped up the pace of the war, bolstered by increased military supplies from the Soviet Union. At this point, the President publicly declared that no military solution to the war was possible and urged Hanoi to come to the negotiating table. U.N. Secretary-General U Thant privately obtained Hanoi's agreement to participate in peace talks and so informed Washington. The American military, however, urged the President to spurn any talks at that time, persuading him that direct and sustained bombing of the North was absolutely essential.

And so it went. Each time it was demonstrated that the quest for a military verdict was fruitless and increasingly costly, our Government's response was to step up the military pace of the war. Meanwhile, thousands of Vietnamese and Americans were being killed or wounded. Meanwhile, too, the billions of dollars expended for the war made it impossible for the President to carry out his excellently conceived program for enlarging social justice and upgrading the quality of life inside the United States. The war cut deeply into the American subconscious, producing one of the most far-reaching and divisive debates in the national history. The result in the end was a debacle, with the President sacrificing his own political future to seek negotiations under circumstances far less propitious than might have been possible two or more years earlier.

In many respects, President Nixon is now facing the same kind of decision that confronted President Johnson in 1964 with respect to Vietnam. The issue today is whether to proceed with the full development of an antiballistic missile system. Again military pressure is being applied. It is argued that the Soviet Union has already started on its own ABM system, and that therefore we have no choice except to ring American cities with installations from which missiles containing nuclear warheads could be fired at attacking missiles.

The idea of protecting American cities against missile attack seems logical and incontestable until it is recognized that the ABM system would result in less security, not more. For there is an obvious and inevitable consequence of the ABM. And this is the development of an expensive decoy missile system and the packaging of greater destructive megatonnage in the missile warheads. An aggressor nation can readily afford to saturate a target with ten or more decoys to one armed missile, activating the defense and causing it to expend most of its explosive payloads on unarmed attackers. Radar devices have no way of discriminating between decoys and destroyers. Moreover, it takes only one penetrating armed missile to destroy a city, creating a hurricane of fire that can rage over hundreds of miles.

One thing is certain: once an ABM system is installed, its advocates will be no less energetic in pressing for funds for a full decoy system and for more powerful warheads. And, once the decoy phase of the nuclear arms race is in full development, it will be claimed that the Soviet Union intends to disadvantage the United States by going underground with its major industrial and defense facilities, its utilities, and its key government bureaus. We have no choice, it will be said, except to go underground ourselves with even more of our establishment because of our greater concentration of industry and population. Cost: anywhere from \$300 billion to \$500 billion.

The resultant atmosphere of tension and terror and its concomitants of political extremism are not difficult to imagine. The prodigious inflationary pressures and the squandering of national resources and wealth on measures that do not add to but actually subtract from the nation's security will create a stage for internal upheaval and explosion. The next step urged on government will be the need for preventive attack. It will be argued that there is no point in living with the mounting fear of surprise attack, and that the only thing that makes sense is to destroy the enemy before he destroys us. Both the United States and the Soviet Union will be (as they are now) in the same boat. Yet it will be argued that we have to knock a hole in their end of the boat before they open one in ours.

It would be dangerous to dismiss any of the foregoing as fanciful or exaggerated. What is happening already is a form of accelerating madness. The major nations are now capable of expunging life from this planet. Force is extolled and endlessly multiplied despite the fact that security no longer depends on the pursuit of force but on the control of force. President Eisenhower's warning about the inevitable tendency of installed power to magnify itself has not been taken seriously. Nor are the implications fully understood of President Kennedy's statement that there was scarcely a serious problem confronting the United States abroad in which the Pentagon did not advise him to use military force.

Is military power becoming an end in itself and a law unto itself? This may well be one of the most serious questions in American history. It is no answer to declare that the men at the head of the American defense agencies are balanced, intelligent, sober, responsible. This is not the issue. The issue is whether a context of power is now being created beyond the ability of even the best men to change. At the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787-89, no principle of history and political science was more thoroughly understood and applied than that good men cannot be expected to produce good works in a bad setting. Accordingly, it was decided to create good government through good laws and good structure. This meant preventing runaway power situations. Today, the system of checks and balances has become seriously impaired through both the massive spending power of the military and its ability to take action and to create situations in the field that force the hand of the President.

Is it claimed that the President's hand is forced only by the actions of other nations? Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird said as much when he justified his position by pointing to what he described as initial steps taken by the Soviet Union in building its own ABM system. It is the action of the Soviet Union, he insisted, that creates the need for an American system of anti-ballistic installations. Yet the hollowness of this argument was demonstrated when he was asked by U.S. Senators whether the best way to resolve this problem would not be to seek enforceable agreements with the Soviet Union under

which both countries would forgo ABM development. It was pointed out to the Secretary that the Soviet Union had called for agreement to head off an ABM race and that, at the very least its stated willingness to talk should be tested. The Secretary replied that he was inclined to go ahead nevertheless. What, therefore, are we to conclude? If the stated reason for proceeding with the ABM lacks validity, is the real reason to be found in the determination of the military to press for massive appropriations whenever an opening presents itself?

The absence of logic in Secretary Laird's reasoning is not confined to the argument over the Soviet position. The discussion over Chinese missile capability is equally distinguished by its absence of rational examination. The question is being debated whether the United States ought to devise a system to defend against Chinese missiles or against Russian missiles. What the discussion overlooks is that if an attack should occur, there would be no way of determining whether the missiles come from China or the Soviet Union or any other nation.

This monstrous danger is now producing precisely the wrong response. We seek to confront the danger by enlarging it and igniting it instead of recognizing that there is now a totally new condition on earth, calling for a new emphasis on world controls and world approaches. The old reflexes of absolute national sovereignty are inconsistent with either peace or progress. The extent to which the United Nations can be transformed into an effective source of world law will be the measure of security and sanity for the United States—and everyone else.

President Nixon has declared that the main objective of his Administration is peace. The ABM road on which his Secretary of Defense is embarked, however, cannot lead to peace but only to increased tension, a tragic deferral of programs for meeting internal needs, relentless pressure on the American economy, and a world of no return. The ABM could be President Nixon's Vietnam. This is the time to stop the juggernaut.

GEORGE ANASTAPLO ON GREEK-AMERICAN RELATIONS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, a source of continuing concern to Americans who are dedicated to the principles of democratic government is the existence in the Kingdom of Greece of a military junta which rules that nation through intimidation and force. An article which amply describes the dilemma in which we Americans find ourselves—the dilemma of supporting and fostering this undemocratic regime—was recently published by the Southwest Review. The author, Mr. George Anastaplo, is chairman of the Political Science Department of Rosary College, River Forest, Ill., and a lecturer in the liberal arts at the University of Chicago. More than this, he is an astute observer of affairs in Greece, having visited that country regularly, most recently during the constitutional referendum of 1968. It is my pleasure to place Mr. Anastaplo's thoughtful article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

For those of my colleagues who are not able to read the entire text of Mr.

Anastaplo's article, I would recommend at least that they review with care his recommendations on what our Government can do to hasten the restoration of democratic rule in Greece. I list below a summary of these seven recommendations:

First. The United States should clearly indicate its disapproval of the colonels' regime in such a way that the Greek people cannot be mistaken about it.

Second. The United States should suspend completely the delivery of all military aid to Greece, not merely reduce it selectively as it did in early 1967.

Third. The United States has available a wide range of economic powers that it can exercise to put pressure on the Government of Greece.

Fourth. The United States should do what it can to see that the King is allowed to return to the Palace in Athens.

Fifth. The United States should provide better guidance than it has in the past 2 years for influential Greek-American organizations interested in Greek affairs.

Sixth. The United States should join forces with its friends in the Council of Europe to put pressure on the regime and even to isolate it politically and economically as various Western European countries are prepared to do.

Seventh. The United States has the ultimate sanction of moving to expel Greece from NATO.

I think it behooves all of us who are interested in preservation of democracy in the land which gave democracy its birth to consider the above recommendations. They come from one who by inclination, training, and experience is eminently qualified to make them.

The article referred to follows:

GREECE TODAY AND THE LIMITS OF AMERICAN POWER

(By George Anastaplo)

"Look to her, Moor, if thou hast eyes to see:
She has deceiv'd her father, and may thee."
—SHAKESPEARE, *Othello*, I, iii.

Americans, in government as well as out, have become concerned in recent years about the attempted exercise of American power over political and other developments around the world. Our folly in Vietnam has taught us that our power to influence events abroad is far more limited than some had thought. There is in such self-appraisal a healthy note of realism.

But to recognize that American power is limited does not require us to say that it does not exist at all. One speaks realistically of "limits" when one recognizes that they mark not only the area beyond which one's power cannot reach but also the area where one's power can have some effect.

I have heard officials of the State Department insist the past eighteen months that the United States is without power to affect significantly the state of affairs in the Kingdom of Greece today. More precisely, the United States insists that it cannot do anything (short of armed intervention, which almost no one calls for) to help the Greeks dislodge the colonels who seized power in April, 1967.

It is hard to find in Greece today an informed man—whether a supporter or an opponent of the present regime—who agrees that American power in Greece is as ineffectual as we make it out to be. Indeed, I found in September, 1968, as I tried to make with Greeks an argument based on American impotence in the form then circulated by the

American Embassy in Athens, that my credit as a student of Greek affairs was rapidly exhausted. Anyone who could believe that the United States is virtually powerless to induce a change in the government of Greece, I was told (sometimes in anger), would believe anything. And yet, it is hard to see that any other belief on the part of our State Department makes more sense than this as an explanation of the public attitude of the United States since the military coup in 1967.¹

What is most curious about the Greek situation is that Greece is, I believe, the only place in the world where an unpopular and repressive government, which is somewhat dependent upon our support, has as its most likely popular alternative a government of the Right. This, I believe, cannot be found anywhere else in the world today and does make somewhat puzzling American behavior in Greece.

If we really cannot influence events in Greece, despite our role in that country since World War II and despite the continued dependence of that country on us for economic and military support, then we should reconsider our alliances and pretensions in many other places around the world. We should also reconsider our assumption that the Russians (or the Chinese or the Cubans) are able to influence and even to undermine governments in distant places where they cannot bring their armed forces to intervene.

In any event, whatever may be our limits with respect to Greece, we at least retain the power to face up to the truth about what is going on there. This, I am sorry to say, we have not done.

Someone might observe, in response to my characterization of the present Greek government as "unpopular and repressive," that there has been recently conducted in Greece a constitutional referendum which found 92 per cent of the electorate voting for the adoption of the constitution written and endorsed by its government. Indeed, many rural areas of the country reported returns of 99 per cent in favor of the new constitution.²

I myself witnessed, in Delphi on the Sunday of the referendum, September 29, 1968, an instance of 99 per cent voting in favor of the proposed constitution. I was present in the local polling place, a large schoolroom, from long before the opening of the polls at sunrise through the counting of the ballots, which began upon the closing of the polls at sunset. (It is, perhaps, not irrelevant to note that I have served, on several occasions, as a Judge of Elections in Chicago precincts.) I was so placed that I could hear and see everything that was going on inside that room. There were 684 ballots cast in Delphi that day, of which 676 were NAI (Yes), 7 were OXI (No), and one was spoiled.³ There can be no doubt that this was what was put into the ballot box by the individual voters and that this was what was counted by the judges, while I sat with them for the two hours it took to sort and tally the ballots.

Whoever does not believe this was "an honest count" is simply not in the position to assess properly what has been happening in Greece since a few dozen army officers took power unconstitutionally in 1967. I am persuaded upon talking to others that what happened in Delphi that day happened in most of the other country towns as well. The votes counted that evening throughout Greece—except, perhaps, in certain traditionally radical urban areas—were very likely the votes cast during that day. Thus, there was probably no need for the government to falsify figures in announcing the 92 per cent vote it did announce in favor of its constitution.

Nevertheless, one is obliged to add that these votes cannot assure us of the popular-

ity of either the government or its constitution. In fact, this overwhelming popular endorsement should make us suspicious, especially those of us who know how excessively individualistic Greeks can be in political matters. Greeks like to think of themselves as different—as somehow special among the peoples on this earth—but this Russian-style referendum displayed for the world one thing which some no doubt already suspected, that this people is like all other peoples in one decisive respect: they, too, can be intimidated, bribed, and indoctrinated.

Intimidation took many forms. The best-known leaders of the country, especially the politicians who had had before 1967 considerable popular support (whether of the Left, Right, or Center), had been in confinement for some months prior to the referendum. A few of these politicians were released the Monday before the referendum: they were permitted to vote, but they were given to understand that they must not campaign against the proposed constitution or speak against the regime. (In fact, many members of the suspended Parliament have been forbidden during the past eighteen months even to appear in their constituencies.)

In addition, several thousand political prisoners (designated as "Communists") remain in island exile, having been picked up at the time of the April, 1967 coup. No one outside the government can be certain how many were originally picked up, how many have been released, or how many more have been picked up from time to time. I understand that there are also in island exile a number of senior Army officers who remained loyal to the King after the April, 1967 coup. There is for such prisoners, whether communist or royalist, no immediate prospect of trial. Few Greeks care to join them in their island confinement—and so all are cautious. It was evident during the period leading up to the referendum that one spoke publicly against the proposed constitution at one's risk. Anyone whose employment or business was susceptible to government control was expected to exhibit publicly his approval of the constitution.

The pursuit even into the American Embassy by the Greek police, a few days before the referendum, of an American family because of an OXI sign displayed in the family automobile revealed how excited the authorities can become upon confronting an unauthorized expression of dissent. I heard again and again, as I traveled across Greece, of people warned by local officials that they were expected "to vote right." I was also informed that the word had gone out that not only were people in the country towns to vote NAI, but they were to do so openly. That is certainly what happened in Delphi. Of the 684 voters on the day I observed the polling, less than twenty took both the NAI and the OXI ballots they were entitled to take into the curtained-off polling booth. That is, 96 per cent of the voters at Delphi took only a NAI ballot off the two stacks of ballots and sealed it in the envelope provided for the ballot box. (Few of them even bothered to enter the polling booth.) I personally know people in Delphi who detest the colonels' regime but who nevertheless took only the NAI ballot and thus assured the supervising authority that they were behaving as they had been told they should. (In the large cities, on the other hand, where most of the negative ballots were recorded, voters often took both ballots into the booth. Even so, I know men in Athens who voted OXI in fear and trembling.)

I can testify from personal experience to the kind of effort at intimidation exercised in the country from the attention I received one night before the referendum at my hotel in a Peloponnesian town from a police captain who had been telephoned by the police of another town (an hour's drive away)

which I had visited that afternoon. The captain wanted to know what I had said that afternoon to certain people (whom I had interviewed in the privacy of their offices) about the constitution and the regime. It was not necessary, in order to turn aside his inquiries, for me to produce my accreditation as a foreign correspondent: it was sufficient protection for me on this occasion to be recognized by him as an American citizen, and— even better—one born in the United States. Thus, although this officer came to realize he would not be able to coerce me, he did reveal by his very presence and interest the kind of intimidation that has been exercised throughout Greece since April, 1967, to discourage serious public criticism either of the regime or of the Army officers who betrayed their military oaths and their King by seizing power unconstitutionally.

Bribery has taken various forms, some of them reminiscent of the political regime prior to that of the colonels, others perhaps distinctive to the current regime. Military officers have been granted financial privileges which have, in effect, increased their income. (These substantial pecuniary inducements for loyalty have been reinforced by large-scale purging of the armed forces, purging which has eliminated from active duty all high-ranking officers suspected of loyalty either to the prior political regime or to the King. "Unreliable" officers in the lower ranks have been assigned to remote parts of the country or otherwise put where they are less likely to be able to threaten the regime.) Government posts generally, including academic appointments and judicial offices, are being redistributed with a view to loyalty to this regime. Supporters of the regime, especially relatives of Army officers who were early participants in the successful conspiracy to seize power, have found themselves in prestigious positions, including cabinet posts: not even notorious scandal and public contempt can dislodge these office-holders.

The most significant bribery, statistically, has been that of the farmers, whose families make up half the population of Greece. Their debts to the Agricultural Bank were canceled in the spring of 1968 by the Prime Minister (in a move which caught even his Minister of Agriculture by surprise). No one has been permitted to point out publicly the bad economic and social effects of this cancellation: it, in effect, rewarded one group of farmers, those in default on their debts, at the expense of another group, those who had discharged or who had never contracted such debts; it encourages other interest groups to hope for similar debt cancellations and hence to conduct themselves accordingly; and, thus, it tends to undermine the delicately-balanced credit system of the entire community.

There can be no doubt that this cancellation of agricultural debts, accompanied as it has been by lavish praise in the government-controlled press, has had a marked effect on Greek rural opinion, however vulnerable such effect might someday be to informed analysis and honest discussion. Peasants with whom I talked in Crete, in the Peloponnesus, and in Boetia commented favorably (and, I believe, sincerely) on this measure. Similarly, I heard common people throughout Greece speak well of the credits made available to them by the government for the building of private dwellings, credits which they tended to talk about as if they were really outright gifts.

Indoctrination has been the product of eighteen months of continuous effort by the government in the censored press, on film, on the radio, and in printed pamphlets and signs. The government has been hard at work dramatizing its supposed accomplishments, disparaging its predecessors (and indeed all politicians), and magnifying the dangers from which it has saved the country. It has been relentless, unscrupulous, and often shameless in its propaganda efforts. One

Footnotes at end of article.

should not be surprised to learn that the government has been somewhat successful: after all, a people tends to believe what it hears month after month without substantial dissent. Any well-armed regime, anywhere—so long as it is not that of a foreign conqueror and so long as economic conditions do not become intolerable—can probably compel at least grudging support from its people if it enjoys long enough a virtual monopoly of the modern means of influencing public opinion and if it is known that a reputation for loyalty is necessary for retention of one's job or one's liberty.

For these reasons, then, the government was able to secure its 92 per cent vote. Thus, those who voted for the constitution can be divided into several groups.⁴ There was, of course, the minority of deliberate supporters of the regime, Greeks who consider this regime and any constitution it might endorse an assurance of stability, of anticommunism, and of clean government. In addition, the unsophisticated, who see and hear nothing but government propaganda from both Athens and their local dignitaries, may have voted sincerely for the proposed constitution. Some opponents of the regime, on the other hand, were intimidated into voting for the constitution, especially in the easily-terrorized rural areas where the voter is never sure (even in normal times) that his choice can be kept secret from the authorities. Other opponents of this regime voted for its constitution in the hope that a return to political life under even an authoritarian constitution might be useful for restoring Greece to normal conditions, especially since the government had threatened to continue the martial law of the previous seventeen months until one of its constitutions was "accepted" by the people. (American policy, too, seems to cling to the hope that some good may come in Greece when the forms, if not the substance, of parliamentary government are restored.) Finally, since it is hard to imagine that a government that came to power by deceit and conspiracy would be reluctant to adjust the vote count to suit its convenience, some opponents of the regime believed it foolish to expose themselves to political and economic reprisals by a futile act of defiance in the polling place. All in all, it made more sense to many simply to take only the NAI ballot and thus be "free" to go on about their business.

The colonels realize that they must continue to use the means they have used in order to maintain themselves in power. They appreciate the fact that their regime must maintain constant vigilance lest it be overthrown: they know that even their ruthless purges of the military cannot keep the armed forces from going over to the King if an opportunity presented itself. Thus, the measures that have had to be used to preserve the regime and to secure a popular endorsement of its constitution reveal the fragile character of the colonels' mandate. Even their sincere support, including that of various remarkably sycophantic newspapers, would vanish immediately if the colonels could be freely exposed to criticism by the legitimate leaders of the country.

It should be remembered, if one is to understand why the colonels must maintain a government by institutionalized conspiracy, that they know they have against them most of the talented politicians of the country, most of the accomplished military officers, most of the royalists (including the King himself), virtually all of the skilled intellectuals, and quite a number of businessmen. Members of the government argue that these critics merely resent the loss of the power and privileges they once had. But this defense of the regime is made by men who have themselves gained power, influence, and privileges they would never have been able to secure by constitutional means.

How long will it be before the economic and social effects of the present regime begin to weigh more heavily upon the Greek people than even government handouts can conceal or government propaganda can explain away? What, that is, have been the social and economic effects of the colonels' eighteen months in power?

We should not be surprised to learn that the military governors of Greece are, despite their original good intentions, no more competent to assess and run the political and economic affairs of their country than twentieth-century Greek politicians have been to conduct the military campaigns in which they have meddled from time to time. One curious result of military rule has been that the Army of Greece, perhaps our most reliable NATO ally in normal circumstances, has been seriously damaged by a handful of junior officers who consider themselves entitled to dismantle the Army in their effort to retain power.

No one denies that there continues in Greece vigorous suppression of civil liberties, although this suppression seemed to me somewhat more relaxed in the summer of 1968 than it was the previous summer. That is, the regime may regard itself as somewhat more secure now, having (at least for the moment) taken care of many potential sources of effective opposition. (Consequently, among opponents of the regime a deeper sense of hopelessness was in evidence this past summer.) There continue as well the serious economic disturbances resulting from mismanagement of and loss of confidence in the economy which were manifested during the early months of the colonels' rule. Certainly, there is in Greece today a situation in which no thoughtful man knows what to believe of what the government says and permits to be said. This makes it difficult to learn what is really going on and to conduct one's affairs intelligently.

The longer the colonels stay, the more apparent it should be to anyone who looks behind government propaganda that they had no business seizing power in the first place. Even when desirable corrections of long-standing abuses have been made by the colonels, they have often been made in such a way as to induce people to remember the abuses as less significant than they had once been thought to be. The visitor is reminded of the tone and effects of a mild communist regime, an impression reinforced by the pervasive self-advertisements by the government to which I have already referred. The visitor who understands the Greek language and who visited Greece before the colonels took over cannot help but notice the oppression that has come in the name of "calm, order, and security." The foreign visitor, especially if he is known as an American professor, need not be too concerned about his own safety: but it becomes tiresome and even depressing continually to have to take precautions lest one's friends, whether of the Right, Left, or Center, or even nonpolitical, be compromised by what one says to them or does with them. Greece was far more pleasant, and certainly safer, for an intelligent Greek of spirit to live in during the unduly publicized crises of 1965 to 1967 than it is now.

The more serious economic effects of the regime are yet to be generally felt. Shopkeepers already know they have been hurt, especially since the tourist trade has been severely affected two years in a row after several years of steadily increasing traffic. The annual rate of growth in the national product, which at 7 to 8 per cent had been one of the highest in the world for years, has dropped since the coup to no more than 4 per cent (and in 1967 may have been close to zero). This drop should be reflected in an increase of unemployment. And unless foreign grants and loans intervene, or foreign investments revive dramatically, the government's dispensing of favors will make itself felt in ex-

traordinary pressure on prices. Between the largesse of the government, the accumulation of savings by people who are waiting to see what is going to happen, and the reckless credit expansion encouraged by the government, there is a considerable amount of latent purchasing power available in an economy that is not much more productive now than it was before 1967. In fact, I have been informed by some of the best economists in Greece (who are not in the government, of course) that inflationary pressures have already begun to be felt, that prices have begun to rise significantly despite all that the government either decrees or admits.

But, it should be at once added, Greece has a long way to go before economic developments alone can unseat this government: there is still considerable room to fall back in the economy before the pressure becomes intolerable. (This is testimony, by the way, to the strength of the economy taken over by the colonels.) It remains to be seen what effect recent investments (such as those associated with Mr. Onassis) will have. Much was expected in early 1967 by apologists for the regime from the contract signed by the government with Litton Industries. But critical to that arrangement was that Litton was, for a handsome commission, to induce foreign capitalists to invest in Greece—and it has been unable to do so. First reports indicate that Mr. Onassis promises to do no more than that, that he (like Litton) is not putting up his own money. In any event, the pinch should be felt in Greece from the economic difficulties of the colonels' first eighteen months before any recovery that follows from whatever is now invested can manifest itself. Thus, the second winter of the colonels' rule could be particularly severe—and this would be a fitting prelude to their replacement in early 1969.

One serious social effect of this regime is that a primitive attitude toward the problems of the country is encouraged: education, urbanity, and experience are pushed aside by men who seem to think that an aptitude for conspiracy, a monopoly of armed force, and a rigid self-righteousness entitle them to rule. They regard loyalty to themselves as a far more important criterion for selection of subordinates than professional competence. This regime does not even represent a return to the simplicity and virtues of the Greek peasantry of a generation or two ago. There is here little of the charm, graciousness, and dignity that one associates with the country people from whom the colonels spring. There is instead the harshness and the narrowness that come from fanatical zeal and thwarted ambition.

The wild spontaneous reception given the King even in antiroyalist Kavalla on December 13, 1967, when he appeared there (without advance preparation) during his well-intentioned but badly-timed campaign to return to Greece to constitutional government, suggests how much the silenced Greek people resent their military dictators. Similarly revealing was the massive demonstration under the eyes of the government in Athens on November 3, 1968, during the funeral procession of George Papandreou, one of the principals in the imprudent July, 1965 confrontation between the King and his liberal Prime Minister. These spontaneous acclamations, for both royalist and antiroyalist, give one a better idea of what the Greeks really feel than does a carefully contrived referendum.

The United States has had to be deeply involved in the affairs of Greece for a generation. We will eventually be called upon to help repair whatever damage is left by the colonels. What should be done now by the United States?

I have made, ever since my visit to Greece in the summer of 1967, the suggestion that the most prudent resolution of the current Greek crisis would be the return to power

⁴Footnotes at end of article.

of Constantine Karamanlis. (I say "current Greek crisis" because the colonels' regime, in its inevitable precariousness, relies on and, in effect, promotes constant crisis.) Mr. Karamanlis, who served as Prime Minister from 1955 to 1963, is a conservative politician of proven effectiveness, a man who has shown he can exercise power vigorously without having to silence his critics. (It should be remembered that he was enough of a constitutionalist to permit himself to be defeated during the Parliamentary elections of 1963, despite his long-standing control of the machinery of government. It would be naive to expect the colonels to permit themselves to lose any election which they conduct.)

Mr. Karamanlis is more apt than anyone else today to secure the support of all factions in Greece, to be received by genuine public approval (not merely by the tolerant apathy or the contrived enthusiasm or the silent resentment found among many Greeks today), and to be respected by his country's indispensable ally, the United States. He is remembered as the disciplined architect of the great task of reconstruction needed in Greece after the terrible destruction of both World War II and the even crueler Civil War that followed. He is equipped to get the economy back on its feet even as he promotes the social and economic reforms which he recognizes that his country requires.

The United States should, therefore, long ago have encouraged the King to call upon all Greek political personalities, both in that country and abroad, to unite behind Mr. Karamanlis. We should have used our influence with the colonels to induce them to surrender power, as bloodlessly as they seized it, to the one Greek politician who could establish a stable government made up of major figures from all parties, including supporters of both the Army and the colonels.

The problem remains that of getting Mr. Karamanlis past the colonels and back into power. I found in my conversations in Greece in the summer of 1968 that his prestige throughout the country remains such that, once in power, he will be kept there for several years by his fellow citizens. Indeed, even if Mr. Karamanlis should be brought back to Greece by the colonels, and installed in one of their governments on their terms, he would not long remain a mere collaborator or "front man." No assurances that he could give them, no precautions that they could take, would long keep a man of his talents, ambition, and prestige in a subordinate position. Thus, the day that Mr. Karamanlis returns to Greece will mark, in the present circumstances, the beginning of the end for the colonels. The more astute colonels, who intend to stay in power indefinitely, know this: they will agree to give way to him only when they come to realize that they themselves can no longer retain power. They might also realize that Mr. Karamanlis is politician enough to know when and how to let bygones be bygones. Indeed, he could do for Greece what General de Gaulle did, in like circumstances, for France.

But the transition to legitimate political rule which would have been relatively easy for the United States to help bring about in 1967 became more difficult in 1968 and will be even more difficult in 1969. One of my concerns has been that Greek affairs not be permitted to drift beyond our ability to predict and to some extent influence them. Once large-scale violence begins in Greece, there is no way of knowing who or what will emerge to govern the country. If something should happen to Mr. Karamanlis, the chances of peaceful resolution of the current crisis would be significantly reduced.

The measures the United States would now have to take or be prepared to take to help its friends in Greece to disarm the colonels and thereby prepare the way for the bloodless return of Mr. Karamanlis are more drastic than what would have been required in, say,

the summer of 1967 while the King was still in Greece and the Army was still healthy. Now, various of our corrective measures may have to be more public than they need have been then, with the possible repercussions that can have among any people who are sensitive about unwarranted outside interference in their affairs. The half-dozen measures suggested below are provided partly in response to the often-made argument of the American government that there is nothing we can do to influence Greek affairs. In addition, the measures one suggests to correct a situation further indicate how one understands it. Some of these measures would not, indeed cannot, be advocated by a Greek, just as I am not in a position to advocate what the Greeks themselves should do now. (It is the legitimate American interest in Greece that I am ultimately concerned about and that I have addressed myself to in everything I have published about Greece.)

First, it is important that the United States clearly indicate its disapproval of the colonels' regime, and in such a way that the Greek people cannot be mistaken about it. A good deal of the apathy toward the colonels today reflects the general opinion in Greece that it would be foolhardy to risk opposition to a government being supported (if not actually established) by the United States. Again and again, one is told that this is indeed "the Americans'" government, that there can be no doubt about that, and that there is no point in trying to overturn it.

Second, the United States should suspend completely the delivery of all military aid to Greece, not merely reduce it selectively as it did in early 1967. This move would not only impress Greek public opinion but would also affect the military, most of whom remain dubious about the colonels but nevertheless believe the United States really supports the regime. The military have learned over the years to respect what the United States believes and wants.

Third, the United States has available a wide range of economic powers that it can exercise to put pressure on the government. Direct economic pressure would come in the form of restrictions on American investment in Greece and on Greek deposits and assets in the United States. Indirect pressure would come both in the form of restriction on loans and grants from international agencies over which the United States has considerable influence and in the form of control of American tourism in Greece. (The suspension of military aid would have economic consequences as well: thus, for example, the Greek government would have to purchase with foreign exchange the oil necessary to keep its military equipment moving. This would make even more acute the already critical balance of payments problem that has been concealed, but not eliminated, by the manipulation of official economic figures.)

Fourth, the United States should do what it can to see that the King is allowed to return to the Palace in Athens. The King in Rome is, unless a government in exile is formed—and it may now be too late for that—not much use to anyone opposed to the regime. A King in Athens, on the other hand, provides a rallying-point for those who are opposed to the regime. And even though royal powers are severely limited under the colonels' constitution, there can arise circumstances in which the King's very presence can be decisive, especially if there should be a rising in the armed forces. Thus, he may be able, in an opportune moment, to name a Prime Minister and then call for foreign as well as domestic aid in support of the legitimate government of his country.

I should report, however, that most of the politicians I talked to in Greece this past summer believe the King should not return home now. But theirs seems to me an imprudent judgment, a judgment that depends

upon an irrelevant sense of honor as well as upon a misconception of how the King's submission would be regarded in Greece and abroad. Everyone who counts should know now that the King is sincerely opposed to the colonels' regime and that he made (and is prepared to make) costly sacrifices in an effort to replace it. It is not generally appreciated how close the King came to success in his December, 1967 effort. It should be noticed, however, that the colonels do appreciate the threat the King poses to them—and they would prefer to keep him out of the country indefinitely. But could they continue to exclude him if the United States and its allies were to indicate that they could no longer continue to recognize a regime represented by a mock regent when the King himself is forcibly kept out of the country?

The resources Greece has at hand to displace the colonels are few—and the King in the Palace is one of them.

Fifth, the United States should provide better guidance than it has in the past two years for influential Greek-American organizations interested in Greek affairs. These organizations have tended, by and large, to support the current regime. This is partly because the information available to them comes almost exclusively from Greek government sources, partly because these organizations are themselves influenced by the seeming approval by our government of the Greek government, and partly because many Greek-Americans confuse a clique of the Army with the Army itself. It is indeed curious that Greek-American opinion, which is traditionally royalist, should thus be surrendered to the propaganda of colonels who have rebelled against their King.

Sixth, the United States should join forces with its friends in the Council of Europe to put pressure on the regime and even to isolate it politically and economically as various Western European countries are prepared to do. The United States could well consider adopting the measures and attitudes toward this regime that have been adopted by the Scandinavian countries, measures taken even at the cost of the lucrative trade advantages those countries had enjoyed in Greece. This is one situation where the United States need not run the risks of acting unilaterally: indeed, several of our usually "correct" friends have already done much more than we have ventured to do to interfere in "the domestic affairs" of the Greeks.

Seventh, the United States has the ultimate sanction of moving to expel Greece from NATO. The threat of expulsion would suffice, if the threat should be made in such a way as to seem serious.

But, I have been told by American officials, the United States dare not risk "another Nasser" in Greece. This, it seems to me, is an incredible response, one that displays a remarkable misconception of Greek circumstances. I was assured again and again by Greeks, including men who have held important portfolios in previous cabinets as well as officials in the present Greek government, that the colonels would be immediately overthrown if it were believed that they were taking Greece out of NATO and leaving her (so soon after the Czechoslovakia invasion) to take her chances in a Balkans dominated by "Slavic Communism." (After all, the unsubstantiated charge that Andreas Papandreu contemplated doing this very thing helped to undermine significantly his standing with the Army in 1965-66.) Indeed, insofar as the colonels have succeeded in persuading people of the seriousness of the communist threat from which they have saved the country—and insofar as the Army itself believes this—the prospect of a loss of American defense guarantees would be catastrophic for the regime.

Others might say, in arguing against the

sanction of expulsion from NATO, that the national interest of the United States requires that Greece be kept an ally, that Greece may be vital to us in the event of a Mediterranean crisis, and that this is a far more important consideration for the United States than the domestic welfare of Greece. But, it should be pointed out, it is precisely in a crisis that Greece is least reliable for us today. The Cyprus crisis, in November, 1967, revealed what is otherwise implicit in this regime, that the present Greek government cannot afford to mobilize its military reserves. That is, it cannot afford to entrust arms and regiments to the hundreds, if not thousands, of trained officers who have been purged (and consigned to the inactive reserves) during the past eighteen months. Thus, the colonels would tend to give in to hostile military pressure where their predecessors might have held out. If, on the other hand, an emergency arose which compelled even the colonels to order full mobilization of the reserves, it is doubtful whether the present government would last long. If, that is, the Army (fully mobilized or not) should have to be used as a defense force, rather than for internal security and for what the Army is now, the only active political party in the country, the colonels would be swept out of office with remarkable ease, however unsettling that might be in the conduct of the affairs of Greece in such circumstances. Thus, if we are really interested in a stable ally, one which can be depended upon to use civilians to run the country and to develop the economy and which can afford to use the Army to defend the country and to cooperate with its allies, it is in our interest to get the colonels out of power as soon as possible.

It may seem old-fashioned for us to remember, as well, in considering whether Greece should be threatened with expulsion from NATO, that NATO was designed to help free peoples defend themselves. The Greeks certainly remember this—and they cannot help but resent the fact that a NATO-trained and NATO-equipped army has been employed to subjugate them to the will of a military dictatorship.

Other measures the United States could take in Greece at this time will no doubt occur to students of Greek affairs, some of which it would serve no useful purpose to describe here. Enough have been described, I believe, to support my argument on this occasion. To assume that we have no power to help the Greeks rid themselves of a government that has been imposed upon them by the misuse of American arms and training is to display a shocking ignorance of Greek circumstances, a narrow view of our own national interest, and a callous abandonment of our true friends in Greece.

Indicative of what the United States has been doing since the colonels seized power is what we have done in Greece and out about those Greeks who have been regarded by everyone as our friends. (I am sure that Greeks who had been critical of the United States, such as Andreas Papandreu and perhaps his late father, have fared no better at our hands.) The American government is not in a position to know what men such as Panayotis Kanellopoulos (in Athens) or Constantine Karamanlis (in Paris) believe about Greek affairs or what they would like to have us try to do. The American government cannot know what these men are thinking from month to month, and this for the simple reason that no one connected with our government has been commissioned to keep in touch with such influential men. Representatives of other governments have kept in touch with these men, but not the United States. Indeed, we act in our caution as if we need the colonels rather than, as

should be obvious to every student of Greek affairs, the colonels needing us.

Even more revealing of our irresponsibility, perhaps, is the degree to which we have lost touch with the King of Greece. The American Embassy in Athens does not know what the King is thinking or even doing. The American Embassy in Rome has had virtually no contact with the King, even though he now lives in that city. (Sources close to the King have confirmed for me that what these American embassies indicate is in fact true.) Does the United States Government believe the colonels are permanently established in Greece? Does it believe that the King will never return to his throne? Does it take into account what our friends in Greece will think in the future of American friendship, especially when they recall how they were ignored by the United States in this time of adversity? The King of Greece is a young man. How long a memory will he have in days of renewed prosperity of the shabby way in which he was abandoned by the United States during his bitterly lonely exile?

One might have thought that self-interest—if only the desire to keep adequately informed about opposition opinion—would prompt us to keep in touch with the men who once led the country and who might well lead it again. But then, it is my impression that the government of the United States is remarkably unconcerned about how informed it should be as to what is happening in Greece today. In fact, what I have seen of our intelligence in Greece since the April 1967 coup reveals something of the approach to foreign affairs which has helped produce our failures in Vietnam: thus, we seem as unaware of Constantine Karamanlis' appeal in Greece today as we were of Ho Chi Minh's appeal in Vietnam five years ago; and we reveal ourselves in our actions to be as deluded about the extent of enduring popular support for the military rulers of Greece as we sometimes seem to be about the extent of enduring popular support for the military rulers of South Vietnam.

In any event, we announced in October, 1968 resumption of the shipment to Greece of the full military aid we had cut in half at the time of the April, 1967 coup. (This is no doubt regarded in Greece as still another endorsement by us of the present government.) We have, as well, neither discouraged large-scale investment by Americans in Greece nor exacted of the Greek government a significant price for our good will. But, most important, we have allowed ourselves to appear sympathetic to this regime; and this is the way we are indeed generally regarded among the Greeks, both by the naive and by the sophisticated, an impression that the colonels are of course eager to promote.

I have already indicated the kind of regime it is that we have allowed ourselves to become identified with in Greece. The people who have made this revolution are radically different from the politicians who had formerly ruled (and, at times, misruled) their country. It is possible, when talking to Greek politicians, to have a decent exchange of views, to hear divergent opinions, to expect someone to listen to an argument and to think about it. It is even possible to hear a politician admit now and then that he has made a mistake on this or that occasion. In short, one encounters in the politician—even the more selfish or corrupt—someone who is more of a human being than he is a caricature of a patriot. It should also be said for the politicians that they have by and large refused to curry favor with the unconstitutional regime that has replaced them.

It should be noticed as well that the army officers who have usurped power in Greece are not considered by their professional colleagues to be the best of the Army. These are not the men who have distinguished themselves in their military careers, but

rather men who have been occupied in plotting for years (beginning long before the 1965-67 crises, which merely provided them the opportunity they longed for). These colonels' lack of standing in the Army is reflected in what they have had to do to the armed forces in order to secure their power. Nevertheless, the colonels have presumed to compare themselves publicly to the military officers who intervened in Greek political affairs in 1909. The critical difference is, however, that the 1909 intervention was destined to establish the civilian Eleutherios Venizelos in power, whereas the 1967 intervention has been designed to establish in power the very military officers who carried off the plot. It should have been apparent in the summer of 1967 to anyone who had contact with these men—and it should now be obvious to everyone concerned with Greek affairs—that the colonels will stay in power as long as they can, and that they will self-righteously sacrifice the interests of the country if necessary to do so.

The true character of this regime is perhaps best revealed by the use that has been made by it of torture. I am not referring to the spontaneous roughing-up of a prisoner by the policeman who arrests him or by the officer who interrogates him. This is no doubt done all over the world. Rather, I refer to the deliberate use, with the knowledge of superior officers, of prolonged means of torture, such as the bastinado and electrical shock. This is not done indiscriminately; nor is it done, I have gathered, as punishment; but it is done and done systematically in order to elicit information from prisoners, especially about resistance activities and organizations.

One of the objectives of my recent visit to Greece was to learn what I could about the allegations of torture we had heard in the West. It is, of course, highly unlikely that a foreign observer would be able to testify from personal observation about torture. But one can talk to friends and relatives of men who have been tortured; one can talk to people who have seen tortured men and women when the marks and effects of torture were still fresh; one can talk to foreign correspondents stationed in the country who have also investigated these matters. The people I have talked with about the existence in Greece today of systematic torture are people whose reliability can be appraised, people whom one can question closely and whom one can check up on. My sources include men now in Greece who have held the highest cabinet posts in their governments.

The evidence and judgment I have relied upon, in coming to the unwelcome conclusion that deliberate torture has been and continues to be used by the present Greek government, are of the same degree of persuasiveness as the evidence and judgment which led me to another conclusion which I have already reported, that the overwhelming vote announced on September 29, 1968, for the new constitution in the rural areas of Greece (in addition to what I myself saw in Delphi) did represent an honest count of the ballots that were actually dropped by voters into ballot boxes that day.

There can be no serious doubt, to mention a publicized instance that I investigated with some care, that Gerassimos Notaras (a young liberal political scientist, coauthor of a useful book on Greek politics) has been brutally tortured, as has been his more conservative lawyer-colleague in the "Democratic Defense" resistance organization, Charalambos Protapappas. We need not concern ourselves here with these men's guilt or innocence with respect to the official charges made against them. (They were evidently members of an illegal organization which dared to organize the printing and distribution of materials attacking the colonels. Some members of this organization may have discussed as well the possibility of naval sabotage.) No one claims these men are

Communists: but then, the threat this government fears most is no longer (if it ever was) from Communists, but from liberals, conservatives, and royalists (who have all had representatives among the tortured).

It should be mentioned that Constantine Sophoulis was also part of Mr. Notaras' resistance organization: he, too, has been imprisoned (but not, it seems, tortured). Anyone familiar with the history of Greece knows that the Notaras and Sophoulis families have honored places in the annals of their country. A government that drives such men to "illegal" resistance and thereafter considers itself obliged to lock them up, and to torture some of them, is a government we should be much more reluctant than we have been to have anything to do with as an ally. The Greek government, in its indignant dismissal of torture allegations as "vile falsehoods," has itself fittingly described the alleged acts as "tortures of satanic inspiration." In short, it is thereby implicitly confessed that Greece under the colonels has gone to the Devil, even as the colonels piously proclaim the rebirth of "Christian Greece."

It should also be mentioned, as suggestive of the state of affairs in our State Department, that although other Western embassies in Athens expressed sympathetic interest in the torture of the particular men I have mentioned and even assigned representatives to observe their public trials, nothing has been said or done by the United States that anyone ever noticed. Reference has been made even in the House of Commons, and by the British Prime Minister himself, to the "bestialities" of the Greek government. The government of the United States, on the other hand, has remained shamefully silent.

Do we have an official opinion about what is likely to happen "in the long run" in Greece? Do we care? Who, in fact, is making our policy (or impeding the making of a sensible policy) for Greece?

The Greeks themselves are generally convinced that the American CIA is mainly responsible for what the United States is (and is not) doing in Greece. This may be no more than their way of saying that American policy in Greece is incomprehensible when one considers American principles and the genuine American interest. It is certainly true that whatever is responsible for American policy, it is something that cannot bear the full light of day. I myself suspect, however, that the Greeks overestimate our deviousness and underestimate our incompetence.

It is of course impossible to guarantee that any of the measures I have proposed that the United States adopt would in fact help the Greeks replace their present government by one more respectful of their character, interests, and desires. But a serious effort on our part to be helpful could help repair our moral position for the long future. If we do make a serious effort and fail, we will thereby at least learn as well as display to others the true limits of our power in Greece, perhaps even discouraging in the future exaggerated claims about the extent of American influence in a country such as Greece. (The least of our worries is that the colonels will not design hereafter to accept our military and economic aid if we should now make an unsuccessful attempt to dislodge them.)

A basic fact of Greek politics for a generation has been the ferocious, even blinding, feeling against communism that has corrupted the political thought of that country. This is one legacy of a frightfully barbaric Civil War. Now, another ominous fact of Greek politics is emerging, a growing anti-Americanism, even among influential elements in Greece who could once be counted upon as most sympathetic to the United States. Should this feeling be permitted by us to sink in and take root, it can generate toward America a sense of resentful despair which would take a generation to eradicate

and which can do neither the Greeks nor us any good.

We have ill served in Greece our friends of all parties and, consequently, ourselves. By not realizing in thought and in deed the true limits of American power in Greece, the United States is sacrificing the power it does have, that power which it should legitimately employ in the service of a free and humane world.

NOTES AND FOOTNOTES

This article, which was completed on November 7, is based on talks delivered in Chicago on October 27, 1968, and on October 31, 1968. These talks were sponsored, respectively, by the Hellenic Professional Society of Illinois and by the History and Political Science Departments of the University of Chicago.

Other publications by the author bearing on the subject of this article include:

"Retreat from Politics: Greece, 1967," *Massachusetts Review*, 9 (Winter, 1968): 83 (with errata noted in the Spring, 1968 issue at page 208).

"Greece Today," *Notes on World Events* (Chicago Council on Foreign Relations), 45 (September, 1968): 1.

"Greek Anarchy and American Paralysis," *Hellenic Review*, 1 (October, 1968): 13.

Letters to the Editor: *Christian Science Monitor*, September 9, 1968; *Chicago Daily News*, August 29, 1968.

Also drawn on is the author's talk, "Viet Nam and the First Amendment: The Presumption of Citizenship," delivered at the University of Chicago on April 29, 1966.

¹ See Note 6, *infra.*, for a summary of what seems to be the American policy in Greece today.

I realize that there are people in our State Department and in our Athens Embassy who would endorse much of what I have said on Greek affairs. I trust that what I say here will help them overcome in the next administration in Washington the excessive caution, if not institutional callousness, which impedes the development in Greece of a sensible American policy.

For a different account from mine of Greek affairs, see James Burnham, "What Are We Asking For?" *National Review*, October 22, 1968, p. 1062.

² "By 92.2% the Greek people approved yesterday the country's new constitution in a national referendum, held in absolutely irreproachable conditions of freedom and order throughout the country. Of the total number of 6,508,894 registered voters, 5,042,545 cast their votes. 18,473 of them were invalid votes. Of the valid votes, 4,633,602 were in favor of the constitution and 390,470 against it." *Information Bulletin No. 26*, September 30, 1968 (Royal Greek Embassy Press & Information Service, Washington, D.C.).

Any "parliamentary elections" in which the Greek government offers itself for legitimization will be conducted essentially like the constitutional referendum and will be eulogized the same way by apologists for the regime.

³ Delphi had voted in 1964 (the last national balloting before the constitutional referendum of 1968) almost 3 out of 5 for the Papandreou ticket, that is, for the very party against which the 1967 military coup could be said to have been primarily directed. Most of the rest of the votes in Delphi on that occasion were cast for the ticket of the Karamanlis-Kanellopoulos party.

I was told by a voter in Delphi that he and two or three others who voted OXI would not have dared to do so if it had not been known in the town that I would be observing the election all day. (I am fairly well known in the town from other visits.) Many towns in the vicinity of Delphi recorded unanimous votes for the proposed constitution that day.

⁴ Some opponents of the colonels' regime approve of various provisions in the new con-

stitution. But even Greeks who found in the constitution some provisions they had advocated years before, such as the marked reduction of royal power, usually regarded the entire referendum procedure as dubious and irrelevant (however they decided to vote on September 29). Serious discussion of constitutional reforms has been referred by them to the time when the very fact of such public discussion will not constitute an implicit endorsement of the colonels and their methods.

⁵ It suffices, by way of illustration, to speak in the text only about men of the Right.

Mr. Kanellopoulos could still be considered the constitutional prime minister of Greece. Both Mr. Kanellopoulos and Mr. Papandreou (leaders of their respective parties in recent years) spent much of the first seventeen months of the colonels' rule in strict house arrest (with interludes of liberty to move about and to receive visitors).

Mr. Kanellopoulos indicated, during his stirring address at the funeral of Mr. Papandreou in Athens on November 3, 1968, that his friendly rival and he had reached an understanding about how their normally competitive parties might co-operate in the service of Greece. I assume, on the basis of what I learned in Greece in October, 1968, that this "understanding" related to the question of the possible return of Mr. Karamanlis. See, also, Anastasio, "Retreat from Politics: Greece, 1967," *Massachusetts Review*, 9 (Winter, 1968): 104. Mr. Kanellopoulos' funeral address appeared in *Le Monde*.

⁶ See, on the resumption of military aid to Greece, *Newsweek*, November 4, 1968, p. 50.

When a clutch of obscure colonels seized power in Athens eighteen months ago, the U.S. did what it so often does when soldiers anywhere oust a legally elected government: it cut off military aid. Last week, Washington completed the pattern. As it also habitually does when a military regime survives and solidifies its position, the U.S. lifted its ban on major arms shipments to Greece.

To the Greek junta's numerous implacable foes, this seemed simply one more case of cynical U.S. coddling of an authoritarian regime. But to Washington policymakers, the resumption of arms shipments to Greece appeared a lamentable necessity of realpolitik. The U.S. has a considerable stake in the political stability of the eastern Mediterranean, and the junta in Athens has—if nothing else—provided Greece with stability. Moreover, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia did much to strengthen the position of those NATO strategists who hold that the Soviet Union, which now must be reckoned a major Mediterranean power, cannot be counted on to act responsibly. And since Greece is regarded as a potentially important element in any "flexible response" NATO might make to a new Soviet thrust, it seems vital to Washington to keep the Greek fighting forces in good working order.

Initially, Greece will get twenty to thirty jet aircraft and a handful of minesweepers, but the likelihood is that other major hardware will follow in the months ahead. For as Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford sees it: "The obligations imposed on us by the NATO alliance are far more important than the kind of government they have in Greece or what we may think of it."

It has been suggested by some students of Greek affairs that the United States should, rather than align itself against the present Greek regime, ally itself with one faction among the colonels against other factions and thereby work to improve things. This would assure, however, the permanence of "the colonels"—that is, of their guiding spirit and all that it means for the Greeks and for us.

If the steady industrialization of the country, interrupted by the coming of the colonels, should now be somehow resumed and

the scheduled incorporation of Greece into the Common Market should come about in the early 1970's, the colonels would become curiously irrelevant. That is, such a development would mean that businessmen and economists behind the scenes, in Greece and abroad, were really conducting the affairs of the country and that the ostensible Greek government was little more than an unpleasantly oppressive and ever-vulnerable charade. (The last years of the Turkish Occupation of Greece must have been like that, especially where the "governors" of the country had to take into account public opinion abroad.) But see Note 7, *infra*, on the conditions of stability in Greece.

Torture of this character was not resorted to, I have been assured, by the political governments preceding that of the colonels. It was resorted to, I understand, in the Civil War period as well as during the Metaxas regime on the eve of World War II.

The colonels have long held the opinion that one can govern one's country the way one governs an armed camp. The resort to torture suggests that the colonels also believe that Greece is to be treated like an occupied country in time of war. The foreign investors and tourists as well as "Washington policy-makers" who are now reassured by "stability" in Greece would have second thoughts if the colonels' opponents should be driven in desperation from their somewhat passive resistance thus far to organized violent attacks upon the "occupiers" of their country.

There has been published since this article was prepared the report of another American visitor to Greece who had inquired about the existence of torture in that country: Christopher Janus, "Greece—Police and Prosperity," *Chicago Sun-Times*, November 24, 1968, sec. 2, pp. 3, 6. He reports that "a few hundred people have been badly tortured." Consider, as indicative of what life can be like under the colonels, this testimony in the *Chicago Sun-Times* by Mr. Janus (a prominent Chicago investment broker and former newspaperman) upon his return home from his annual visit to Greece:

I talked to three of those who were tortured—two former members of parliament, one of whom I doubt will live, and a 24-year-old who is a family friend and the daughter of a prominent Greek citizen.

The girl told me that anti-junta literature was found in her home. She was taken to the Dionysos Military Camp between Athens and Marathon, she said, and while a motorcycle was kept running to muffle her screams, she was stripped naked by soldiers and beaten with a wire whip, among other indignities. And after several days of this, she was ready to tell them anything they wanted to hear. She was finally released, she said, after her father paid a ransom of \$25,000.

What makes this incident particularly ominous is the fact that it is generally known in Athens that the father is not only "a prominent Greek citizen" but also a man with an international reputation in his profession, and indeed one of the Greeks most famous abroad. If the colonels were not restrained by such considerations to behave in a civilized manner on this occasion, one can imagine what happens in the typical confrontation between this government and its opponents. (Mr. Janus checked out his information about torture with a lieutenant colonel connected with the Greek government.)

Mr. Janus included in his report a warning from Andreas Papandreu "for the businessmen who are signing all those palmy contracts with the junta": "One of the first things we're going to do, when we're in power, is review all contracts—starting with the contract Mr. Pappas has with Esso Standard. We'll review the contract of Olympic Airways. And we're certainly going to examine everything that Litton Industries has done."

CONGLOMERATES

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's economy is undergoing a modern industrial revolution. It is the product in large part of the advances in American technology and managerial science. It is causing, as President Johnson's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability put it, a "massive restructuring of the Nation's economy."

I am speaking, of course, of the rise of the giant conglomerate corporation, which has propelled the greatest wave of merger activity in our history.

Not so long ago, news about conglomerates was relegated to the obscure pages of financial periodicals and legal and business journals. It seemed that the average American would remain oblivious to this momentous development, in which he ultimately has the greatest stake. This was a major consideration which prompted me to introduce House Joint Resolution 315 on January 28, 1969. This legislation would direct a joint study by the independent regulatory agencies of the effects of conglomerate activities on the transportation and communications industries, the securities markets, and interstate and foreign commerce. Because of continued takeover activity in the transportation industry, I introduced H.R. 8527 on March 10, 1969. This bill provides for acceleration of the study proposed by House Joint Resolution 315, and for a freeze on takeovers of carriers by noncarriers until such a study can be completed.

As of late, I am encouraged to see the great interest taken in conglomeration by the Nixon administration, congressional committees, and the regulatory agencies, and the financial press. But it is particularly noteworthy that a popular and distinguished magazine as *Time* has seen fit to publish a cover page article on "The Conglomerates' War To Reshape Industry," March 7, 1969. *Time* should be complimented for its perception in recognizing that the conglomerate phenomenon is not just the concern of bankers, legislators, lawyers, and financiers—but of all Americans. I highly recommend that all my colleagues read this article:

THE CONGLOMERATES' WAR TO RESHAPE INDUSTRY

The leaders of America's larger corporations have long been almost unchallenged rulers of their realms. Proud and powerful, self-confident and certain of their authority, they have often run their publicly held organizations very much like private fiefs. Now in many executive suites and board rooms, apprehension and even fear have replaced the old self-assurance. Some of the richest and most respected of the nation's companies have become vulnerable to sudden capture by a new and daring kind of business operator.

These men, mostly young and self-made, have little regard for established rules or customs. They are reshaping business in a manner that deeply affects not only owners and managers but millions of stockholders and employees as well. In time, their expanding takeovers of hundreds of compa-

nies could transform the entire structure of the U.S. economy. Already, they have stirred intense debate among businessmen and Government officials alike: Are their actions a threat or a boon to U.S. business?

The men who are challenging established firms with exuberance and even effrontery are the builders of conglomerates—those multipurpose, multi-industry companies that specialize in hodge-podge acquisitions. They are often put together in a seemingly haphazard tangle, with only finances for a common bond. In the modern conglomerate, oil and water do mix. So do steel and airlines, theaters and tobacco, chemicals and clothes, meat-packing and insurance. Such unlikely combinations have repeatedly paid off—at least up to now.

The growing impact of the conglomerates has been so great that even conservative businessmen, who usually complain about too much federal interference, are pleading for Government help in combatting their onslaught. The chances are that they will get it; the Government has lately begun to act as if "conglomeritis" is a virulent disease. Half a dozen agencies—including the Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission—have begun investigations of the phenomenon. They are worried that the takeover companies may be creating too much concentration of economic power, that some of them have unsound financing and inadequate management, and that they may tempt many shareholders into trading solid stocks for flossy packages of paper.

CONCERN ABOUT RISKS

In his first pronouncement as the new chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, former Idaho Congressman Hamer Budge complained last week that some complex forms of conglomerate financing offer only "an illusion of security." Testifying before a House subcommittee, he counseled investors against being misled by "apparent improvements" in the earnings of aggressive conglomerates. "Those who are engineering the present wave of takeover," he said, "appear to find short-term profits so tempting that they ignore long-term risks." Later Robert W. Haack, president of the New York Stock Exchange, told another House subcommittee that he is becoming "increasingly concerned" about the real worth of debt securities that are being offered to the public corporate takeover deals. Next day in Atlanta, Haack told a reporter that two companies have gone to such extremes in this direction that the Exchange may even delist them. And at week's end, the chief Justice Department trustbuster, Richard McLaren, announced that he will move to stop conglomerate mergers between large companies. McLaren argued that such mergers tend to reduce competition and aggravate inflation.

McLaren may not have an easy time cutting down the conglomerates. Their growth stems largely from the vagaries of antitrust law—and there is still considerable question about whether the Government has the legal power to stop the trend. Diversification by merger has long been an attractive tactic for industrialists who were anxious to reduce profit-sapping fluctuations in the demand for individual goods and services. It is easier and quicker to diversify by buying a going concern than by starting from scratch. But Government antitrust barriers often stand in the way of combinations within a company's own field. They may prevent not only "horizontal" mergers with competitors, but, to a lesser degree, "vertical" mergers with suppliers or customers. The present law, though, generally enables companies to take over other enterprises in different fields—and it is just that loophole through which the new conglomerate organizers are moving.

Inevitably, "conglomerate" has become something of a dirty word in business, bring-

ing back memories of oldtime industrial trusts, interlock directorates and utilities pyramids that collapsed disastrously. Even most leaders of conglomerate companies loathe the name, largely because they are vocally critical of each other and do not like to be lumped together with some of the abrasive men and controversial companies involved in modern mergers. They prefer to be known as leaders of "multi-industry" or "multimarket" concerns. Yet "conglomerate" seems an apt title. Derived from the Latin verb, *conglomerare*, meaning "to roll together," it is also the geological term for heterogeneous stone fragments fused into a mass. However much the word grates, it has become fused into the business language.

STOCK MARKET gyrations

Today's list of mergers, raids and takeovers is the largest and longest in corporate history. Last year the number of corporate acquisitions rose to a record 4,462—ten times as many as in 1950—and most were conglomerate mergers. Hardly any corporation, no matter how large, seems wholly safe from the grasp of conglomerates. During the past two years, conglomerates have absorbed or gained control of such big and basic enterprises as Jones & Laughlin Steel, Lorillard, Wilson, United Fruit and Armour. Lately, relative newcomers to the corporate scene have attempted to take over Sinclair Oil, B. F. Goodrich, Allis Chalmers and mammoth A & P. Even Pan American World Airways, long considered to be practically an unofficial agency of the U.S. Government, feels threatened by Resorts International, a onetime paintmaking company whose primary asset is a Bahamas gambling casino and a few hotels. Resorts' total assets are about a quarter the size of Pan Am's, but through a complex swap of securities, Resorts may become a major Pan Am stockholder. Last month Wall Street rumors whispered that U.S. Steel, with its \$5.6 billion assets, was on several lists of takeover targets. The company has revamped its bookkeeping, as have many other steel companies, to increase reported earnings in an obvious effort to fend off surprise assault.

Conglomerate activity has figured prominently in the stock market's recent gyrations, and Wall Street is understandably worried. Day after day, frenzied trading has placed the shares of many conglomerates, and the companies that they seek to swallow, high on the most active list of the New York Stock Exchange. Often, two or more rival conglomerates are anxious to take over the same company, and their competition for shares boosts the stock of the target company. Lately, even takeover rumors have been enough to lift the share prices of companies supposedly about to acquire Caesars Palace, the Las Vegas hotel-casino. After the takeover, prices generally sink back. Stocks of the conglomerates themselves were among Wall Street's best performers until some months ago; lately they have broken sharply, and the dive only deepened last week after Haack's warning of possible delistings. Shares of such firms as LTV, Litton, Gulf & Western, Ogden, Bangor Punta and "Automatic" Sprinkler are down 33% to 66% from their 1968 peaks. In sum, trading in conglomerate companies has brought both riches and disappointment to countless investors.

WHO THE LEADERS ARE

Much of the argument about conglomerates revolves around the men who make them go. A few are accepted members of the U.S. business Establishment, but many are newcomers. They have fought their way up from obscurity by innovating and taking risks in a way that flabbergasts conventional executives. They are seldom hired managers; most are founders and owners still in their 40s. They have little if any memory of the Great Depression, and they see only growth ahead for the U.S. economy. They are willing to

dare much to gain a larger hold on the future.

Among the leaders of this new group of entrepreneurs are the three men on TIME's cover. Though they have much in common, each operates with individual style, convictions and aspirations. The companies that they manage are among the nation's largest and most discussed conglomerates. But, like the men who head them, they differ significantly in their speed of growth and state of financial health. Taken together, they reflect the origins, sweep and spirit of the most significant current trend in U.S. business.

Charles G. Bluhdorn, 42, chairman of Gulf & Western Industries, epitomizes the takeover specialist who fills the managers of sluggish companies with dread. "We have never been afraid to look for trouble," he says. "We are a damn competitive company." Vienna-born Bluhdorn came to the U.S. at 16 as a penniless wartime refugee, went to work as a \$15-a-week clerk for a Manhattan cotton broker. He learned the secrets of commodities trading, and made his first million before he was 30.

In 1958, Bluhdorn took over a run-down Houston auto-parts company and began expanding. Though many conglomerates have prospered by invading new technological fields, he stuck largely with prosaic companies: zinc mining, paper, chemicals, farm products. "Generally speaking, I love to buy things no one else wants," he explains. Last year he collected a dozen companies, including machinery-making E. W. Bliss, Associates Investment (assets: \$1.7 billion) and Consolidated Cigar Corp., which he acquired in the belief that the troubles of the cigarette industry would cause smokers to switch to cigars. As a result, Gulf & Western's sales leaped from \$645 million to \$1.3 billion, and its after-tax profits rose 50% to \$70 million.

Although he earns \$113,700 a year, and has an estimated net worth of at least \$50 million, Bluhdorn seems ruled by insatiable ambition. Afire with ideas, he is forever in motion—smiling, grimacing, gesticulating, pointing, reaching. When he is excited, which is just about always, his brows knit, his lips curl, his voice rises to a screech, profanity tumbles out in a kilometer-a-minute Austrian accent. Despite his manner, however, Bluhdorn inspires awe and devotion among close associates.

He draws criticism from competitors, and makes investors wary. G. & W. stock sells for only twelve times per share earnings, appreciably less than most older, slower-moving blue chips. Yet many securities analysts maintain that Gulf & Western is one of the best-managed conglomerates. Bluhdorn disposes of his critics bluntly. "If we are chisellers," he says, drumming his desk with his fists, "we are chisellers for our stockholders. I want a dollar for a dollar—or better yet, \$1.10."

James Joseph Ling, 46, chairman of Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., of Dallas, is one of the most controversial and troubled of the new millionaires. He thrives on imaginative deals so complex that they often baffle even stockholders. They seem elementary to Ling, who talks like an advanced mathematician and delights in doodling the formulas for his deals on legal-sized yellow pads. His specialties are spin-offs and refinancings, and he uses cash and almost every combination of securities known to investors. In twelve years, his varied tactics have propelled his LTV from a tiny electrical-contracting firm into a complex that turns out products as disparate as hamburgers and jet bombers (the Navy's A-7). Annual sales have jumped from \$4,000,000 to \$2.7 billion, making LTV one of the fastest growing major companies in the world. Ling expects that it will rank among the top ten of Fortune's list for 1969.

Ling, whose father was an Oklahoma oil-field roustabout, dropped out of high school at 15 and bummed around the country for

four years. He went into business in 1946 with a \$3,000 stake. Later, in order to finance his first acquisitions, he hired salesmen to peddle stock from door to door. Dallas brokers snickered, but investors who bought 100 shares for \$225 would today own stock worth \$4,098.

The company that carries his name has succeeded in large part because Ling has used the old technique of the spin-off with stunning effect. Improbable as it may sound, when a company is split into several parts, investors will often pay more for its parts than for the whole. Ling has carved LTV into separate, publicly traded subsidiaries (there are ten today), keeping control but often selling off enough shares to repay much of what he borrowed to acquire them. This gambit also had the effect of lifting LTV earnings per share, thus raising the price of LTV stock and enabling Ling to expand still faster.

Ling directs LTV with tireless enthusiasm and demands the same from aides. "Don't tell me how hard you work," he says. "Tell me how much you get done. A race horse can get around the track faster than a jackass." Recently, Wall Street skeptics have begun to speculate that Jimmy Ling may have overextended himself, as he did in 1961 when he almost lost control of his company. Last year Ling borrowed \$900 million to snare Jones & Laughlin, National Car Rental, and Braniff Airways whose latest advertising campaign shows odd couples flying high. He tried to refinance part of that debt last fall, but investors spurned his efforts. Ling scoffs at the doubters. "This is just the year to kick conglomerates," he says. He planned to sell off a small slice of Braniff, most of National Car Rental and perhaps a few other securities to raise all the funds that he said LTV now needs. At week's end, however, he cancelled the sale of National Car shares blaming "stock market condition."

G. (for George) William Miller, 43, heads Textron Inc., the oldest and one of the soundest conglomerates, and he is an articulate critic of racier companies. Textron, which started the conglomerate trend nearly two decades ago, has acquired the kind of image that newer conglomerates covet. Miller picked up two more companies last year—Talon zippers and Fafnir bearings—but Textron seems less interested in acquiring new branches than in managing and expanding the many that it already has. Its 33 diverse divisions turn out Bell helicopters, Sheaffer pens, Spindel watchbands, Gorham silverware, Bostitch staplers and some 70 other products. Last year the company earned \$74 million on sales of \$1.7 billion—both records.

Miller runs Providence-based Textron in low-key Yankee style. A model of blue-serve conservatism, he earns \$181,000 a year but operates from a modest little office. His headquarters staff is lean—only 105 people. With them, Miller keeps close watch on the spending and planning of Textron's subsidiaries.

The Oklahoma-born son of a furniture dealer, Bill Miller graduated from law school at the University of California in Berkeley. He was plucked from a job with a Wall Street law firm in 1956 by Textron's flamboyant founder, Royal Little. When Little retired four years later, Miller stepped into the presidency under Chairman Rupert Thompson, 63, an imaginative ex-banker. Thompson, a major stockholder, built Textron into New England's second largest company (after United Aircraft) before he turned over his chief executive's title to Miller a year ago.

A business philosopher, Miller argues that Textron and similar companies represent the tide of the future because they can shift capital in great amounts to where it can be most wisely used. He figures that this "mobility of capital" has an ultimate social purpose. "If this country allows itself to go the way of some European companies, where capital was kept deep in the sock," he says, "then we will never achieve full employment and

raise the standard of living for the bottom third of our population." At the same time, he faults many conglomerates for expanding wildly by issuing huge quantities of debt securities of questionable value.

THE BIG OPERATIVES

Many other makers of conglomerates have joined Miller, Bluhdorn and Ling in that elite group of American businessmen who have boosted their sales to more than \$1 billion a year. Henry E. Singleton, a Ph.D. from M.I.T., has built Los Angeles' Teledyne Co. into a \$1 billion conglomerate in eight years by moving into metals, electronics and defense systems. Ralph Ablon, a former business instructor at Ohio State University who heads Manhattan's Ogden Corp., has turned the world's biggest ferrous-scraps company into a billion-dollar conglomerate by moving into stevedoring, cattle raising, construction and food (Tillie Lewis). However fast other conglomerates are expanding, none has yet been able to overtake International Telephone & Telegraph Co., which had 1968 revenues of \$4 billion. Under Chairman Harold Geneen (TIME cover, Sept. 8, 1967), ITT has built an executive team envied by many, matched by few. "Hurry-Up Hal" Geneen's ITT runs hotels, builds homes, rents autos, sells insurance, bakes bread and manufactures communications gear.

Many conglomerates have evolved elaborate rationales for such apparently aimless accretions. Pioneering Charles ("Tex") Thornton has tried to confine his 15-year-old Litton Industries to expansion in technological fields, using scientific management systems to retain overall control. Nearly a dozen Litton executives have quit to apply the formula elsewhere. The alumni have even coined a name for themselves: "Lidos," for Litton Industries Drop Outs. One of them, Fred Sullivan, has lifted his Walter Kidde Co. from a burglar-alarm and fire-extinguisher manufacturer with \$40 million in sales five years ago to a \$350 million conglomerate. He figured that Kidde was really in the "safety, security and protection" field, and that gave him latitude to make bank vaults, rifles and light fixtures. Another Lido, George Scharf-fenberger Jr., president of New York's City Investing Co., has increased his firm's revenues in the past three years from \$7.5 million to more than \$1 billion by acquiring nine companies, including Florida's General Development and New York's Rheem Manufacturing.

THE BANKERS' ADVANTAGE

Even commercial bankers, who often criticize the conglomerate trend, are half joining it. The Bank of America, New York's First National City and about 80 other large banks have recently formed "one-bank holding companies." That is, they have reorganized their corporate structure so that the bank itself is a subsidiary; the parent corporation may then venture into such fields as insurance, computer leasing and mutual funds. Some high members of the Nixon Administration, convinced that the trend to bank holding companies is a far greater threat to the future of the U.S. economy than conglomerates, are preparing restrictive legislation. Unless the law is changed, they say, bankers who know the secrets and control the credit lines of other companies could have a large competitive advantage.

Railroads are also becoming conglomerates. Ben Heineman's Northwest Industries Inc., the holding company that controls the Chicago & Northwestern Railway, last year derived less than half its \$700 million revenue from trains. The company has spread into chemicals, steel, and the manufacture of apparel—from underwear to boots. Last month Heineman issued a \$1 billion tender offer for B. F. Goodrich, the nation's fourth largest rubber company.

At least a dozen other major roads, including the Illinois Central, Santa Fe, Union

Pacific, Norfolk & Western and Southern Pacific, have formed holding companies to diversify. Many railroad men insist that it hardly makes sense to invest money in railroads when they can net 15% in other industries. If this trend continues, some authorities fear that it will open the way for ultimate railroad nationalization in order to keep enough trains running to serve the public.

The technique of the takeover ranges all the way from polite negotiations to sneak attack. If the takeover is a friendly seduction, it usually follows a rather elaborate ritual. The first contact is often arranged by investment bankers, who stand to collect fees of up to \$1,000,000 for arranging the merger. The potential partners usually meet at a country club or on some other neutral ground. They size each other up stiffly and uneasily; drinks are practically never served. If extreme secrecy is necessary, the top executives travel to out-of-town hotels where they figure nobody will recognize them.

Ogden Corp.'s Ralph Ablon wanted to expand into housing construction. He simply phoned Los Angeles Architect Charles Luckman, whom he had never met, and proposed a discussion. Luckman flew to New York. In just two hours over lunch at Manhattan's 21 Club, where myriad American mergers are made, Luckman agreed to join Ogden in exchange for common stock.

Many deals start on the golf course. One day at a Dallas country club, Jim Ling ran across an acquaintance who was a steel-company director. The man remarked that the steel company was in trouble and should be available for a takeover. As it turned out, the company threatened to resist, and Ling backed off. But his appetite had been whetted. He started looking for other steel companies. By reading annual reports, he became interested in Jones & Laughlin. First there was a correct but tense meeting at the elegant Rolling Rock Country Club outside Pittsburgh, then a secret hotel-room huddle in Cleveland. Though J. & L. Chairman Charles Beeghly was far from eager to sell his controlling shares, he considered Ling's offer so generous—some analysts insist that it was too generous for LTV's good—that he agreed to go along.

INSIDERS' DILEMMA

After Gulf & Western was blocked by the Justice Department from taking over Armour & Co., Charlie Bluhdorn attempted to resell his 750,000 shares to the meat packer for about \$60 per share. He thought he had a deal—and an \$18 million profit—but Armour Chairman William Wood Prince tried a squeeze play to drive the price down to \$50. His method was ingenious. Armour made a public offer to repurchase 20% of its own outstanding shares at \$50 each. If successful, the move would have increased Bluhdorn's stake in Armour from 9.8% to 12½%, thus making Gulf & Western an "insider" under the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission—and insiders are barred from pocketing short-term profits in their company's shares.

To avoid becoming an insider, Bluhdorn would have been forced to sell part of his Armour holding—at Prince's price. Angered, Bluhdorn quickly arranged to unload 150,000 Armour shares at \$56 to Richard Pistell's General Host Corp., a Manhattan baking and food-freezing firm. Pistell took an option on Bluhdorn's remaining 600,000 Armour shares at \$60. Thus Bluhdorn escaped the patrician Prince's trap. With great help from Bluhdorn's stock, Pistell last month captured control of Armour, despite Prince's frantic efforts to resist.

Increasingly, friendly negotiations are being supplanted by unfriendly tender offers and outright raids. The raiders lay their plans with military precision, occasionally use industrial espionage to find a disgruntled inside executive who can be per-

sued to help. Often the attack begins in the stock market. Under the insider rules, a company may acquire up to 10% of another firm's shares without revealing the fact. The leader of the assault then confronts the target company. If management balks, the blitzkrieg begins. Its weapons include letters to stockholders, splashy ads in newspapers and personal approaches to the board of directors—all insisting that the offer is irresistible.

THE DEFENSIVE TACTICS

Companies sometimes use creative book-keeping to inflate their profits in order to promote—or stave off—mergers. AMK Corp., a meat-packing and machinery conglomerate, almost doubled its reported income by making accounting changes during fiscal 1968. After the company altered the way a major subsidiary was keeping account of its depreciation, inventory and employee pensions, AMK Chairman Eli M. Black won control of Boston's United Fruit Co. by offering a package of stock and other securities. Would he have been successful without making the perfectly legal accounting changes that lifted the earnings? The answer is elusive, but accountants agree that the question is pertinent.

Defensive tactics usually include an advertising campaign, press releases, phone calls to key Wall Street financiers, and letters to shareholders—all insisting that the takeover is foredoomed to fail. To thwart takeover bids in advance, numerous public relations men specialize in "multiple flogging"—boosting the price-earnings ratio of a stock by artfully touting a company's performance and prospects. Sometimes the target companies put considerable pressure on the attacker through suppliers or banks. After Saul Steinberg, the 29-year-old head of Leasco, Inc., brashly announced that he would like to acquire Manhattan's Chemical Bank, his company's stock plunged. The word in Wall Street was that other banks and mutual funds had dumped Leasco shares to help Chemical resist Steinberg.

Supporters of conglomerate mergers argue that they increase the efficiency of American business. After they take over, the new chiefs sometimes coolly fire aging veterans and replace them with bright young executives. After Charlie Bluhdorn acquired Paramount Pictures in 1966, he installed new management, increased the filming schedule, and began turning out such hits as *The Odd Couple* and *Romeo and Juliet*. More often, mergers give old managements the courage to expand by providing them with new capital, ideas and expertise. After Jim Ling took over Wilson and split it into three separate, publicly held firms, he named presidents and many officers in each division and gave them generous stock options. At Braniff Airways, only the chief executive, Harding Lawrence, had options before Ling took control; now a score do. Ling also told Lawrence to change his advertising agency—Wells, Rich & Greene—because it was headed by Lawrence's wife, Mary Wells.

CRITICISM AND "CHINESE MONEY"

If conglomerates sharpen efficiency, why are they so severely criticized? One reason is that they are not always effective; they can stumble as easily as they succeed. Harry Figge's "Automatic" Sprinkler Corp. went into a nosedive last year when strikes and production snags crippled two divisions, while a third ran into cost-control woes. Ogden Corp. suffered after its shipbuilding subsidiary hit rough weather. Tex Thornton's Litton ran into multiple trouble: losses in shipbuilding, engineering snags on a new typewriter, slumping sales of office furniture. Much to the dismay of investors, the company blamed its plight on management deficiencies.

Another basic trouble, as SEC Chairman Budge warned last week, is that takeovers are too frequently financed with securities of

doubtful future value. Such paper is commonly known to bankers and brokers as "Chinese money." The deals increasingly involve two little-understood kinds of securities:

Debentures are IOUs used to pay for companies. Like bonds, which they resemble, the debentures offer a fixed rate of return in interest. Usually the principal is repayable 25 years later, in two installments. Under that arrangement, recipients of debentures qualify for the so-called installment-sale tax provisions. If they swap shares in a target company for the conglomerate's debentures, they pay no capital-gains tax on the deal until they get their money back in 25 years. Debentures are doubly attractive because they are generally convertible into common stock at an above-the-market price. For the companies that issue them, debentures offer an even bigger tax break. The interest payments can be deducted from corporate taxable income as a business expense. On the other hand, stock dividends must come from after-tax earnings. Using debentures, conglomerates can often grab control of other companies at little or no real cost to themselves. For example, Victor Posner, Miami conglomerator who has plucked a personal fortune from slums and money-losing corporations, has just captured Sharon Steel (annual sales: \$225 million) after a bitter battle. Posner's NVF Co., a Delaware mini-conglomerate (annual sales: \$30 million), offered a package of debentures and warrants backed by so few assets that Sharon accused him of planning to raid its coffers to bail NVF out of financial trouble. Even Posner's prospectus admitted that the combine might well earn too little money to pay the \$4,500,000 a year interest cost on the debentures. Last week, as Posner was elected chairman of Sharon, six of its directors quit.

Warrants are often issued to sweeten takeover offers, especially unfriendly ones. The holder of a warrant has an option to buy shares of the issuing company in the future, at a fixed price. Warrants carry no voting rights, earn no dividends, involve pure speculation. Technically, they have no value at all unless the common stock climbs above the option price. They were in disrepute for most of the years since the Depression because their volatile prices make them extra risky for investors. But warrants caught on again after LTV and Gulf & Western used them to pay for acquisitions. Issued in moderate amounts, warrants may have no significant effect on a corporation's finances. But Manhattan's General Host Corp., which has only 2.6 million shares of common stock, last month offered 14 million warrants in its successful fight to win control of Armour & Co., whose \$2 billion in sales are ten times as great as General Host's. If even half of the 14 million are ultimately exchanged for stock, General Host's profits-per-share could plummet.

RISKS OF REGULATION

Many critics claim that too many bosses of conglomerates are too busy scrambling after Wall Street's Great God of Growth. These bosses are scorned as a phenomenon of the times, nurtured by inflation and a securities market possessed by the cult of performance. Yet many other conglomerates—ITT and Textron, to cite only two—are well-managed and amply financed. Quite a few more fit somewhere in between the two extremes. Saddled with debt and untested by any prolonged downswing in business activity, they present a considerable risk for shareholders. At the same time, they can offer correspondingly large opportunities for reward because they are widely diversified in expanding areas of the economy.

The problem for shareholders is to figure out which conglomerates are sound and which are shaky. The task for Government regulators is to devise ways to stop abuses without penalizing the innocent. Congress

has not yet decided what to do about conglomerates. "We don't even know the symptoms yet," says New York Democrat Emanuel Celler, whose House antitrust subcommittee is beginning still another major investigation. Even so, Congress seems determined to write some new tax and banking laws this year to make it less attractive for companies to combine.

To help investors now confused by financial legerdemain, Congress might well order the SEC to shed more of its editorial timidity and demand plain language instead of euphemistic evasions in prospectuses and annual reports. The SEC already has considerable power to act. If accountants cannot agree to require straightforward and easily comprehensible reporting of profits, federal authorities may. On the other hand, it is arguable whether Congress would be wise to require stockholders to pay capital-gains tax on their profits when they swap stock for debentures. It appears to make better sense to deny corporations their tax deductions for the interest on debentures issued for mergers.

The dangers in all-encompassing regulation seem clear. Establishments—political, social or economic—need periodic shaking up. For all their faults, the conglomerates have certainly shaken the established leaders of American business and caused many to sharpen their management. They have also given meaning to the saccharine and often hollow phrase "shareholders' democracy." Today more than ever, a public company is public. When the shareholders are given an offer, they have the right to choose.

WHERE THEY ARE HEADING

Experts disagree on whether the conglomerates will continue their rapid growth. To some Wall Streeters, they represent the bright future of capitalism. Others insist that so many conglomerates have been built on such weak foundations that it may be necessary to take them apart and rebuild them. Often enough, conglomerate executives share that concern. "Our greatest worry," says Textron's Miller, "is that a merger bubble built on arithmetic will burst, hurting the whole economy." Adds Bluhdorn: "A shakeout we're going to get for sure."

The managers of many conglomerates—especially the newer ones—have not yet convinced skeptics that they have the talent to run the huge structures that they have built. Warns Chairman Willard F. Rockwell Jr. of North American-Rockwell, the aerospace-electronics combine: "Sooner or later, after all the crazy speculation, after all the manipulations, those acquisitions must be operated profitably. And it isn't easy to find the management." Conglomerates must cope with the problems of maturity—the inevitable day when the pace of expansion slackens. Then, without the continuous growth-through-merger that has too often been the basis of their Wall Street appeal, the conglomerates will become indistinguishable from such traditional multi-industry companies as General Electric. Only then will come the real test of whether they can survive and prosper. The conglomerates may indeed already be the corporate archetype of the future. They have yet to prove it.

THE BALTIC STATES

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Baltic States continue to be dominated, exploited, and deprived of their right to self-determination by the

Soviet Union. Citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania who are residing in the United States are concerned over the plight of their countrymen. The Lith Club of Shenandoah, Pa., unanimously adopted the following resolution at their February 23, 1969, meeting:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE MEETING OF THE LITH'S CLUB, ON FEBRUARY 23, 1969, SHENANDOAH, PA.

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right of self-determination, by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people; Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(A) to direct the attention of the world opinion at the United Nations and at other such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(B) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency, the Honorable Richard Nixon, the Secretary of State, the Honorable William P. Rogers, our Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Charles Yost, our United States Senators, the Honorable Richard Schweiker, and the Honorable Hugh Scott, our Congressman the Honorable Gus Yatron, and to our Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Raymond P. Shafer and also to the press.

A. J. BENEDICT,

President.

EDWARD DERRINGE,

Secretary.

ALLEN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS BECOME INVOLVED

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, dissident students on the American campus are capturing many headlines these days, and as a result of the publicity given them, it often appears that a majority of students are involved in disrupting the academic community.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

While the revolutionary antics of such radical groups as the Students for a Democratic Society will continue to appeal to hard-core militants, I sincerely believe that today's college youth are more serious minded and better prepared to meet the challenges of the future than any comparable generation of students in our history.

Dramatic proof of this positive attitude on the part of most students is found on the campus of Allen University, a predominantly Negro institution located in my congressional district in Columbia, S.C.

Like many small schools with a limited budget, Allen is struggling financially. Although it may seem like a nominal sum, Allen needs to come up with \$350,000 that has been incurred as a debt.

The students at Allen, numbering about 750, decided upon a rather ambitious project for young people, most of whom come from poorer families. They met and announced confidently that they would raise the money somehow and pay off the debt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that college students can devise some ingenious schemes to keep themselves entertained such as holding contests to determine the champion in the matter of which male can hold the most coeds on his lap. But, raising \$350,000 is another matter entirely, and such an endeavor would tax the mind of even the most enterprising of students.

However, the Allen University student body is not to be denied. Back in January, they boldly predicted that the job could be done, and they are doing it. With the assistance of wonderful local support and favorable publicity from such noted radio and television personalities as Joseph McCaffrey, of WMAL here in Washington, the students are getting the money, slowly but surely. They hold dances, concerts, exhibits, and solicit contributions. Together with the great appeal of Dr. J. W. Hairston, president of Allen, and an outstanding educator, these fundraising events are meeting with success.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Allen University speaks for itself. It is symbolic of the typical American student who takes pride in his school and the opportunity that school affords him for excellence in tomorrow's world. Allen students are trying to build, not destroy. They may lack financial resources, but they are not lacking the spirit and sense of comradeship which make the university system such a great American institution. These students are to be commended and they deserve the support of everyone genuinely interested in the future of our colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I would like to include three editorials by Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, of WMAL, which describe more eloquently than I the magnificent efforts of the Allen University student body, as follows:

COMMENT

(By Joseph McCaffrey, WMAL-TV, Feb. 3, 1969)

There is nothing that brings an editor alive as much as the sight of blood. Blood is newsy.

So demonstrations are newsworthy. The more people involved, the more violence wrought, the more blood spilled, the bigger the spread either on page one, or on TV. Action is the key word.

It probably would be impossible to buy the space that has been devoted in the press and over the air to the blood letting at San Francisco State College. The College is one of Congresswoman Edith Green's targets when she says she is sick and tired of a minority making it impossible for the majority who want to attend classes.

J. Edgar Hoover suspects an international design behind the student uprisings, but a Democratic Member of the House Education Committee says he believes 25 percent of those making trouble are Revolutionists, and the other 75 percent are idiots. Whatever they are, they get lots of attention.

The question is how much attention and how much help will the students at Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, receive. This is a Negro college, and over the years, it has been under nourished. It needs help.

The other day the students held a news conference, announced that instead of protesting and throwing bricks and bottles they had decided to join hands, and with the help of God and the University President, to do something constructive.

They intend to help pay off the University's \$350,000 debt. And they hope that by March 8th, they will have raised—through contributions, dances, concerts, exhibits and other means, \$100,000.00.

It will be interesting to see how much publicity the students at Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, will receive. Or how many people who complain about campus disorders will sit down, address an envelope to Allen University and enclose a dollar or a five dollar bill.

Chances are the students at Allen would get a lot more attention by beating up an elderly professor.

COMMENT

(By Joseph McCaffrey, WMAL-TV, Feb. 4, 1969)

Last night I talked about Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, reporting that its student body announced at a news conference last week that instead of wasting its time protesting, it intended to rally round and help pay off the college debt. The response to last night's program was so great that today I called the College President, Dr. J. W. Hairston, to find out how the student campaign was coming along.

Dr. Hairston emphasized the whole idea originated with the student body and was being carried out by it.

To realize the challenge the students have before them, consider these two facts. The debt is \$350,000.00 dollars. There are only 700 students. But all 700 are involved, and they have faith.

Today, on Capitol Hill, a Democratic Member of the House Education Committee, James O'Hara said, the students at Allen have a lot better notion of what makes for a finer college, a better institution than students at some other colleges which have recently gotten much more attention.

The ranking Republican Member of the House Education Committee, William Ayres, commending the students at Allen, said this proves what most Americans believe, that 99 percent of the young people want a good education, that 99 percent of the young people think and act constructively.

Ayres, incidentally, is readying legislation which would cut off all . . . all Federal Funds to any College or University where the administration can not put an end to disorder.

But such legislation isn't needed for Allen University.

Its students may not be making the headlines through disorder and destruction, they are proving themselves by being constructive.

COMMENT

(By Joseph McCaffrey, WMAL-TV, Feb. 14, 1969)

A week ago last Monday I talked about a college whose students were not rioting, but rather were taking the other path. The students were starting a campaign to raise funds to help pay off the debt of the college.

There was so much interest because of that broadcast that I called the school, Allen University at Columbia, South Carolina, and talked to Dr. J. W. Hairston in order to give a more complete report the following night.

Today I talked to the President again and found out that more than thirty-three percent of the funds raised to date in the students campaign have come from the Washington, Maryland and Virginia area, and most of them as a result of last week's broadcasts.

Congressman Albert Watson, whose District Allen University is in, told me that the people in and around Columbia are beginning to rally around the students efforts.

And today Dr. Hairston told me that it would be difficult for only 750 students, the total enrollment, to raise \$350,000.00 dollars but he said, "You know, money isn't everything. What is more important is the spirit that is being shown here. What is more important is the feeling of unity we have achieved here at this school, and the pride we have developed."

And, I might add, there are hundreds of people in this area who, in backing the students of Allen University, have shown that they, too, endorse the positive, and that, contrary to the Code of Journalism—good news can be more newsworthy than bad news.

PFC. BRUCE E. REED, U.S. ARMY,
KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that another one of my constituents, Pfc. Bruce E. Reed, U.S. Army, of Peekskill, N.Y., died in Vietnam last month.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

[From the Peekskill (N.Y.) Evening Star, Mar. 5, 1969]

PFC. REED KILLED IN VIETNAM—IN ACTION
NORTH OF SAIGON

Pfc. Bruce Edward Reed, 20, son of Lloyd and Evelyn Puff Reed, of 865 King Street, was killed in action in Vietnam on February 28, according to word received from the Pentagon.

He was born in Peekskill on April 23, 1948 and graduated from Peekskill High School in June, 1967. Prior to entering the military service with the Army, he was employed by Peterson's Auto Parts, Washington Street. He went into service April 23, 1968 and went overseas on October 27, 1968.

Pfc. Reed had been out in the "boondocks" north of Saigon for several months. He was a member of the 25th Infantry Division, Company "C", 1st Platoon.

The family received several conflicting dates of his death, including February 8th

and February 20th, but it is believed his death occurred February 28th.

He was at one time active in Troop 42, Boy Scouts of America, sponsored by the Peekskill Rotary Club.

Surviving, in addition to his parents, is a sister Mrs. Judy Bechtold, of the home address, 865 King Street, and a brother, Robert, of Peekskill and his paternal grandmother, Mrs. Ethel B. Reed, of New York City. Mrs. Bechtold's husband is also serving in Vietnam.

Funeral arrangements, which are presently incomplete pending arrival of the body in the United States, are in charge of the E. O. Curry Funeral Home.

WHY ONE BRITISH SOCIALIST TURNED CONSERVATIVE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for many years John Braine, the British novelist and author of the novel, "Room at the Top" was a member of Britain's Labor Party and a Socialist. As late as 1964 he was a member of the left establishment and in the course of his activities had been associated with the Fabians, the United Nations Association, the Council for Civil Liberties, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament—CND, all "approved associations," as he puts it, for those with a Socialist bent.

During his prolonged adventure in leftist circles, Mr. Braine acquired beliefs and policies not entirely unknown to some elements here in our own country. As an internationalist, he despised patriotism; he was anti-American, anti-West Germany, and anti-NATO. Crime was a disease to be treated and not a personal misdemeanor, although the mass-guilt principle made Braine partly responsible for Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Bel-sen, and Dachau.

Author Braine over the years became increasingly disenchanted with socialism, and upon his conversion came to identify it as the antithesis of freedom:

It's difficult to say exactly when I rejected Socialism and progressive ideology in general. But this was the key log, this was the beginning of freedom.

A lecture tour of 3 months in the United States delivered the coup de grace to his Socialist experience. Although there were many aspects of American life which he disliked, "there would be regular visitations of absolute happiness of a kind which I had never previously experienced."

Like countless others before him he finally had the answer:

Towards the end of the trip I worked it out: the name of the happiness was freedom.

John Braine's account, as it appeared in the New York Times of March 2, ends with the hope that others may benefit from his experience:

And I only hope that I've been able to assure them that freedom isn't a cheat; that indeed on the other side of the barbed wire is a better country.

To help John Braine better tell his story, I place the article, "Why One Brit-

ish Socialist Turned Conservative," in the RECORD at this point:

WHY ONE BRITISH SOCIALIST TURNED CONSERVATIVE

(By John Braine)

LONDON.—There was no sudden conversion, no instant rejection of one set of beliefs and instant adoption of another. But as recently as 1964 I was a member in good standing of the Left Establishment and now I am a rebel against it.

I very much dislike writing about myself, for as I grow older, I become less and less real to myself. I want only to stand outside, recording and recreating. I don't want to become involved. Whether I'm a good or bad writer isn't for me to judge, but I am nothing else except a writer. And I am nothing else except a novelist. I am not quick-witted enough or robust enough for ordinary living. I take no pride in this; it's simply that I've long ago ceased to struggle with my own nature.

Most of all I want to be left alone. To be quiet, to be still, to remember the past: this is how for me a novel begins. I say *the* past and not *my* past, because what I can remember, what I can eventually give shape and life to, isn't my direct experience. The person to whom things happen is someone else, the person who remembers what happened is someone else again.

In fact, there is no sort of explanation for the whole process, except that a phantom talks to a liar. Both phantom and liar devour my time greedily and shamelessly. They don't take the whole of it, but there's always the temptation to give in entirely to their demands. I do this for a period of about six weeks every three years when I'm nearing the end of a novel, working late at night and over the weekend, answering no letters, accepting no invitations, abandoning myself entirely to an existence which is, as far as possible this side of the grave, perfect pleasure—one awakes to the prospect of satisfaction without satiety, of complete and controlled and continuing fulfillment.

Happiness is a dog asleep in the sun. No, it isn't. A dog asleep in the sun is a dog asleep in the sun. This stage of work—or shouldn't one say *labor*?—is happiness. What it isn't is politics.

I grew up a Socialist—was in fact born one—because I grew up in Bradford between two wars. Add to this the fact that I am of the working classes, and it's difficult to see what other choice there was. Bradford was a Socialist city in a decent, old-fashioned, nonconformist sort of way.

More important than this was the fact that virtually every living writer of any consequence was a Socialist. I didn't come to Auden and Isherwood and Spender and the rest until about 1942, when attitudes were already beginning to change. But I could hardly have been expected to know this. W. H. Auden, for instance, was for me still the W. H. Auden of "The Orators," Stephen Spender still the Stephen Spender of "Forward From Liberalism." And E. M. Forster was always saying that in Communism he saw hope. (I didn't ask myself when or under what circumstances he said this, or whether now he might have changed his mind.)

Even George Orwell was enlisted by me under the Socialist banner. Whenever he was critical of Socialism and specifically of Communism, I simply skipped. He was one of us, he was an engineer of the soul (a phrase I was very fond of) with a paid-up union card, and he was entitled to be wrong-headed occasionally.

There was, of course, some sort of idealism behind my beliefs. I was genuinely convinced that Socialism was the only way out of the mess in which the world had found itself. It was all so splendidly lucid; it was only necessary to understand that Left was good

and Right was bad. Communism was, of course, on the extreme Left, and Fascism (which by about 1942 naturally included National Socialism) on the extreme Right. The Labor party was mid-Left, the Conservative party mid-Right. There can rarely have been in any society a more inaccurate way of delineating political differences. That the accident of the seating of the political parties in the Chambre des Députés should now have firmly established itself as the basis of political terminology doesn't surprise me, but it more and more frightens me.

If only I had seen active service during the war, I might have grown up earlier. I remember a young man at the Leeds Library School describing a Russian village to me. "A few broken-down huts," he said, "and a gallows and a communal latrine." We were arguing about Communism, which at the time (1947) I was in support of; but all that he could associate it with was the gallows and the communal latrine. That clinched the argument for him, as indeed it does.

But my war service consisted of eight months' training in Portsmouth and a month of waiting at Chatham, after which I was invalided out. For the rest of the war years I was a librarian in the West Riding; and for some reason my part of it was never bombed. I lost nothing, I suffered nothing. I worked at the library, I studied, I began to write, I fell in and out of love. All my waking hours were filled; and at the same time I felt increasingly isolated. I needed the isolation, but part of me had to have some contact with the human race, had to belong to something outside myself.

Socialism filled the gap. It was the high-quality, ready-made suit, with a great variety in cloth and fittings. To have got through to the truth about the causes of the war and what was really happening, to make for myself a mental attitude that would have been mine and no one else's would have been difficult but not impossible.

The Nazi-Soviet pact and the invasion of Finland, for example, were facts which the British propaganda machine, after the invasion of the U.S.S.R., didn't go out of its way to remind the public of; but their record wasn't suppressed or their discussion forbidden.

I chose, however, to accept the official Socialist view that the war was the intensification of the struggle between Left and Right, good and evil, that in the nick of time there was a Popular Front against the Fascist beasts. I even managed to fit the Spanish Civil War into the pattern. And I justified the great purges of the thirties as being directed against those who would have collaborated with the Nazis. Indeed, I asserted that there weren't any collaborationists in the U.S.S.R.

To be fair to myself, I didn't know how many Russians had at first welcomed the Nazis as liberators. Nor did I know how many Russians, even after the Nazis had begun the business of genocide, continued to actively collaborate, being particularly and enthusiastically helpful in hunting down the Jews. It goes without saying that I was completely unaware of the existence of active and state-approved anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R. (So are the overwhelming majority of Socialists even to this day.)

I'm not standing on the penitential stool, monstrously misguided though my beliefs were. At least my instincts were sound enough to keep me from joining the Communist party. I did attend some of their meetings and social evenings, but the atmosphere of humorless fanaticism was too much to bear.

Nearly a quarter of a century later my memories of those encounters with the Communist party are distorted and fragmentary. The men, young or middle-aged, seem to have been stamped from the same die—short, thick-set, with brutally short hair,

and loud inflexible voices, given to cardigans and the wearing of pens in the breast pocket. This is my impression; but I can't be certain whether I didn't, after reading Arthur Koestler's "Darkness at Noon" much later, graft on to them most of the characteristics of the inquisitor Gletkin with his shaven head and his inhumanly monotonous voice.

The women were uniformly drab, thin and shapeless or fat and shapeless. I remember only two, a dark-haired girl with an undeniably middle-class profile, and a red-haired girl with a very white face, which would color patchily whenever she talked about the horrors perpetrated by the Fascists. I didn't get anywhere with either of them; the dark-haired one wore a permanent frown which intensified into a ferocious scowl if any friendly approach was made and the red-haired one, though brightly comradely, was incapable of discussing any subject except the class struggle.

I ceased to attend party meetings finally because of Sir Oswald Mosley. He had been released from detention, ostensibly on medical grounds but actually, one suspects, because the Government wished to illustrate the difference between us and the Nazis. The Bradford branch of the party at a public meeting in the Mechanics' Institute one Sunday afternoon (I can still see that dingy little room) moved a resolution deploring Mosley's release and recommending his immediate execution.

I didn't vote against the resolution because I wasn't brave enough to be in a minority of one. There was an excitement in the faces around me which I felt might easily change into something else. But neither could I approve of executing anyone, particularly a slightly comic middle-aged Englishman with phlebitis, without trial. So I didn't vote for the resolution either, hoping that I wouldn't be noticed. But I was noticed, muttering began, heads turned in my direction, I recognized the group manifestation described by Soviet reporters as "Stir in hall." I had a seat at the end of a row next to the door, and was able to make my exit quickly and without fuss.

That was the end of my connection with the Communist party, if connection it may be termed. But I continued to think of myself as a Socialist and a progressive and in general to accept what James Burnham has called the liberal package deal.

The most important item in the package was the belief in progress, not simply towards a better society but towards a perfect society. This could only be achieved through Socialism which, through eradicating the profit motive, would release the creative energies of mankind. There would be no war, no crime, no poverty, no neurosis, no racism, no class division, and only the irreducible minimum of ill-health.

I saw this perfect society as being already alive in the minds and hearts of the people (that being the sort of phrase to which I was addicted). I couldn't imagine that there were any deep-rooted human instincts which would always prevent this perfect society from coming to full term; it was alive as the Sleeping Princess was alive, waiting only for the Labor party's awakening kiss.

Even six years of Labor Government didn't alter this simple faith. The reason for the Princess not being, so to speak, fully conscious, was that the kiss had been brief and respectful on the hand instead of long and passionate on the mouth.

I didn't, however, join the Labor party in an attempt to reform it from within; I was, being a local government officer, discouraged from political activity. In any case, all my observations of constituency politics led me to suppose that there I should find only boredom and drudgery. (The Young Conservatives appeared to be the only local political organization which had any fun.)

My disillusionment with the parliamen-

tary Labor party steadily grew almost from the first day of its taking office. My belief in what I called pure Socialism became almost religious. It's odd to look back some 20 years to my disgust and horror as the late Hector McNeill at the main meeting hall of the Mechanics' Institute explained why the British Government had to help the Greek Government to put down the Communist uprising. McNeill wasn't notable for brilliance or charm, but he was an honest man who, like Ernest Bevin, loved his country. At question time he lost his temper with the Bradford Communists who were, of course, there in full force.

That evening was the first occasion in which I heard the word Fascist employed not merely descriptively, but to clinch an argument. It was, then as now, one of the Left Wing's magic words. Once it was used to describe the Greek Government, anyone who supplied the Greek Government or who even suggested that they might not be entirely in the wrong, was a Fascist, too.

Another magic word was Resistance. The Greek Communists had resisted the Nazis. Unquestionably they had been resisting evil, unquestionably they had been fighting for their country. Therefore their attempt to forcibly take over the Government of Greece now was quite clearly a continuation of that struggle. The enemy was now Greek Fascist instead of German Fascist.

What made the Communist case particularly convincing to me was the fact that the word Fascist as enunciated that evening sounded so sibilantly evil. I didn't ask myself what precisely was meant by Fascist, or why the fact of their having fought against the Germans should give the Communists the right to form a new Government, or whether there hadn't been Greeks fighting the Germans who weren't Communists. It goes without saying that I presumed the Greek people were behind the Communists. The people always were.

Even now I don't like to recollect my gullibility at the period and, indeed, for long afterwards. Not that I was alone. These brutally obvious questions which I failed to ask myself weren't asked by the majority of British and American journalists. And they didn't have the excuse of being young, totally inexperienced, totally untraveled, and incompletely educated into the bargain.

I'm sure that Hector McNeill stated the British Government's case firmly and clearly enough, and that the Government for once had a case. I'm equally sure that I didn't listen. If I had listened, I would have had to start thinking afresh, and not simply about Greece. For by the end of the war I had built myself a cosy and weathertight little dwelling in which I could shut out all unpleasant realities. But if I took one brick out, the whole structure would fall apart.

In my personal relationships I was an individual, judging each issue on its own merits. Politically, my judgment almost always conformed with Socialist ideology. The enemy, to use James Burnham's phrase, was always to the right. For example, I did once personally boycott South African goods, but it never occurred to me to extend the boycott to Polish goods. Yet if to buy South African fruit juice was to support apartheid, then to buy Polish salami was to support Soviet tyranny. The only tenable argument that can be used against this kind of boycott is also one against boycott in general.

But it was unthinkable not to trade with the Soviet bloc. No Communist country was ever really morally in the wrong; or when it was, it was less so than the villain countries—South Africa, Portugal, Greece, Spain, the U.S.A.

The excuse for the misdeeds of the U.S.S.R. was, if I remember correctly, necessity. This very nicely covered the Soviet-Nazi pact. Bear in mind that Soviet propaganda was exclusively directed at me. That is, at the

Western intelligentsia (using the term in its broadest sense) of my generation. Those in charge of the British division wouldn't have advanced any explanation for the pact which even mentioned idealism or the suffering masses. The excuse for the continuing subjugation of Eastern Europe and the attempted subjugation of Yugoslavia, and the Berlin Blockade and later, the Berlin Wall, was fear of a revived Germany and American imperialism. I suppose that this fear was a subdivision of necessity.

I managed to accept this while at the same time thinking of the U.S.A. as holding down Western Europe by sheer force. The word (if so it may be termed) NATO had for me the same sinister ring as once had the Axis. That the U.S.A. had a monopoly of the nuclear bomb in 1945 and didn't extract the least advantage from it, never, I honestly believe, even occurred to me. If it ever did, it didn't seem of the least significance. I could never have allowed the Government of the U.S.A. the virtue of idealism; the U.S.A. was, as I have said, permanently cast as villain.

Along with this I managed to maintain a hero-worship for Tito as a champion of freedom. He was no more a champion of freedom than the managing director of a small firm resisting a take-over bid is a champion of Socialism; but I contrived to classify Yugoslavia as being one of the nations which couldn't be morally in the wrong without, however, classifying the U.S.S.R. as a villain. This isn't really important, but it does help to illustrate the deep-rootedness of the enemy-is-always-to-the-right syndrome.

It isn't amazing that someone who was (as I was for most of my 20's) working a full 40-hour week, studying for examinations, trying to learn how to write, falling in and out of love, reading voraciously and taking small parts in amateur plays with the notion of being a playwright, should be rather muddled politically. There is, when all is said and done, only so much time in the day. But the extent to which I was muddled appals me even now. It might have been that I had some inkling, even in the late forties, that the Left was the winning side. But Labor's victory in 1945 was merely an electoral victory, the protest vote of the forces. The Right Establishment was apparently as firmly seated as ever.

And in 1951 the Labor party was defeated. I had a job as a filing clerk at the time, having resigned my safe job as a librarian in Yorkshire to live on my earnings as a writer in London. The day that the election results were announced was the day on which I had realized that something was seriously wrong with my health. The job wasn't demanding; there was plenty of leisure in which to think. It seemed on the face of it that the Labor party was finished, as I was finished. And just as it was necessary for me to cling to a belief in myself, so it was necessary for me to cling to a belief in Socialism.

And cling to that belief I did for the next 13 years, on the winning side though I didn't know it. And when I was at last in a position to do so I joined all, or nearly all, the approved associations; it was as if I were grooming myself as a charter member of the Left Establishment. The Fabians, the United Nations Association, the Council for Civil Liberties, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (C.N.D.) and, naturally, the local Labor party; I was so thoroughly establishment in my thinking that I was savagely glad when, under Gaitskell, Labor was defeated in the general election of 1959.

I hated Gaitskell almost as much as, if not more than, Macmillan. For he was betraying Socialism. He was against C.N.D., and C.N.D. was a Socialist organization. That he was against C.N.D. because with all his faults he loved his country was yet another black mark against him.

For I despised patriotism as a motive. I

was an internationalist, ready to proclaim my love of all mankind at the drop of a petition form or editorial request from behind the Iron Curtain. I spoke frequently for C.N.D. all over the country, generally managing to bring tears to my own eyes, if not to the audience's. I varied the speech to bring in the latest announcement of some politician or general or scientist, and I was adept at pressing quotations from authors like Chekhov into service, but essentially it was always the same speech.

It was above all anti-American. And anti-West Germany and anti-NATO. Curiously enough, it wasn't 100 per cent pacifist. I wasn't in favor of total disarmament but only of nuclear disarmament. Unilateral, I should add, this word was very important. It was exact, concise, and had a professional diplomatic flavor, as if one were already in the council chamber into which the late Aneurin Bevan didn't wish to go naked. I had a shrewd idea that most people weren't quite sure what it meant, so I would always, without being too obvious about it, devote at least five minutes to explaining it.

The argument wrapped up inside this rather cheap wrapping was that this country by giving up the nuclear bomb and closing down the American bases would both set a moral example and make herself safer. I can only say in extenuation that I honestly and passionately believed this. What shocks me now is to hear this sort of argument still advanced not only by the younger generation but by my contemporaries. The arguments they use against the American action in Vietnam are exactly the same as I used against the American action in Korea.

I was to grow more and more disenchanted with C.N.D., the disenchantment beginning with the demonstration against Queen Frederika of Greece which ended with her having to hide from her pursuers. It wasn't only the sheer nastiness of this near-lynching which upset me. It was that such a demonstration could only be for the benefit of the Communist party. It had nothing to do with unilateral nuclear disarmament. If the leaders of C.N.D. knew that they were being used, then C.N.D. had become yet another Communist front organization. If they didn't know, they were so stupid that one couldn't possibly follow them any longer.

Nor was I enthusiastic about the sit-ins. Deliberately to put oneself in jail struck me as being not only immature but downright perverted. It should, I reasoned, be our opponents we should be planning to send to prison—if, indeed, anyone had to be sent to prison at all.

But my activities in C.N.D. had always been confined to speaking. I had never taken part in the Aldermaston March or any other demonstration. Instinctively I felt nothing but revulsion on the two occasions when I observed the long procession make its way into Trafalgar Square. Hysteria wasn't very far away, these people had lost their individuality; and, though I agreed with them, nothing on earth would have persuaded me to join them. I might not, I thought, amount to much as a person, but my individuality was all I'd got, I couldn't give it up even temporarily in a good cause.

Nor did I write for C.N.D. That would have meant writing for nothing, or for very low rates, which I am literally incapable of doing. I have always felt that if what I write isn't worth paying for it isn't worth writing. Or, to put it another way, I would give £100 to a cause which I supported but I wouldn't write a free article worth £100 for that cause.

These reservations aside, I continued as a professing Socialist until the beginning of 1965. There is an article of mine supporting the Labor party published just before the general election to prove it.

But at the same time as the article was published I was beginning to reject certain important items of the Left package deal. I

looked at the statistics for crimes of violence and for murder, for instance, and realized that I didn't really believe that crime was an illness to be treated, and that the function of prison was to reform. As I looked at the statistics I could come to only one conclusion: the humanitarian approach to crime had vastly increased the sum of human suffering. It wasn't, properly speaking, humanitarian at all but ideological. The principle of deterrence—including capital punishment and the "cat"—was the genuinely humanitarian one, simply because it demonstrably decreased the sum of human suffering.

I went further, slowly and painfully. Severe punishment wouldn't reform anybody, it wouldn't make anyone behave well. But to make the people behave well wasn't the function of the criminal law. Its function was to prevent people from behaving badly in certain specific ways. I went further, aided by an essay of the late C. S. Lewis. The concept of crime as a disease to be treated and not a personal misdemeanor to be punished is essentially evil.

If a man commits a crime, is jailed for the allotted time, and serves his sentence, then his debt is paid. Punishment is finite. If his crime is to be regarded as an illness, then the treatment may take any form which the ever-changing fashions in psychiatry direct—including lobotomy, electric shocks, and castration—and may take any length of time. It might indeed be decided that the patient was incurable; and euthanasia is also part of the Left package deal. In short, the criminal is no longer a man to be punished, a debtor paying his debt, but a faulty machine to be repaired, remade, or scrapped.

The Pennine Moor murder case in 1965–66 rid me forever of the belief in another Left article of faith, to be summed up in the phrase "We are all guilty." (A variation of this, especially popular with hard-pressed journalists, is the use, or rather misuse, of the passage from one of John Donne's sermons beginning "No man is an island. . .")

I had used this approach as much as anyone, most of all in my C.N.D. days. I had declared myself guilty of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Belsen, Dachau so often that I'd almost come to believe that I had a direct share of responsibility in what had happened in these places. But when I was told, in one article, that those who wished to hang Myra Hindley and Ian Brady were guilty in exactly the same way, then something snapped inside my brain. I hadn't murdered those children. I would literally (and I never use this word lightly) rather have died than commit such foul and beastly atrocities. Above all, I wasn't there. And I wasn't at Belsen or Dachau either.

I could only be held guilty for actions which either I had personally committed or which I had given my authority for or which I had allowed to be committed having the authority to prevent them. And my desire to see Hindley and Brady hanged was activated not by my emotional kinship to them, but by my utter detestation of their crimes. I, and the majority of the population of Great Britain, was making the sort of moral judgment which has to be made if any civilized society is to survive.

It's difficult to say exactly when I rejected Socialism and progressive ideology in general. But this was the key log, this was the beginning of freedom.

The thinking—and I cannot emphasize often enough how abhorrent thinking in the abstract is to me—began in America in the autumn of 1964 when I made a lecture tour of three months. I missed my wife and children. I found the traveling more tiring than I had bargained for, and it wasn't really financially profitable. There were many aspects of American life which I disliked, and cities like Detroit I found especially depressing. But, nevertheless, throughout the trip there would be regular visitations of absolute

happiness of a kind which I'd never previously experienced.

Towards the end of the trip I worked it out: the name of the happiness was freedom. This was still a country in which you could be anything you wanted to be from beatnik to millionaire. This was a country in which still the state existed for the people not the people for the state. The name of the system the people lived under was capitalism. It was often cruel, often unjust, often inefficient, often wasteful, but it gave everyone, even if in an arbitrary and confused way, the chance to be what he wanted to be. Above all, it didn't care. It left people alone. One could, as long as one was prepared to pay the price, contract out of it. And, for all its faults, it gave the majority of people a far higher standard of living than did either Communism or its ugly little sister Socialism.

There were pockets of devastating poverty but, given time, those would be wiped out. There was a racial problem alongside the poverty problem but, given time, that would be wiped out, too. The profit motive would do the job; for what poverty represents to capitalism is not so much an evil as an untapped market. The desire to make a profit out of one's fellow man is a more reliable and decent motive than the desire to do him good, to change his way of life, to make him a better person.

For eventually he may find himself being made a better person in the torture chamber or the prison camp or—for the good of the greatest number—on the gallows. The capitalist sells him something which, by and large, has to be reasonable value for money if he wants to make another sale. But he doesn't care what the customer believes or what color he is as long as he gets his money. Money, as Caligula said when he taxed the contents of public urinals, doesn't stink. And it only enslaves those who allow themselves to be enslaved by it. The richest man in the U.S.A. has not the power of life and death. The most minor bureaucrat in the Soviet secret police can exercise it a hundred times a day.

I don't think that I worked it out quite as coherently as this in America: the happiness was quite enough. When I returned I eventually resigned from the Council for Civil Liberties, C.N.D., the Labor party, the Fabians, and the U.N.A. I don't for one moment suppose that any of these organizations were in the least affected by my defection.

There was no new set of beliefs to replace the old, no new package deal, no new ideology. One is naturally a member of the Conservative party because it represents the only effective opposition to the Labor party. But the essence of my attitude now is that I judge each issue on its own merits and not in relation to any philosophical system. One isn't a member of any sort of establishment and one isn't ruled by any sort of establishment either. In my middle age I have become free.

And in my middle age I have been sustained by love. I have been able to acknowledge at last what I have always felt instinctively. I don't care about the well-being of any other country except my own. I can say quite shamelessly, *I love my country*, and, in saying it, be no less an individual, but find myself more closely in touch with the majority of people than ever before. There's another source of strength for me to draw upon now. I am more myself, whoever I am, than I ever was before, but I am not alone.

I have found the writing of this article extremely arduous. I have no business to write about myself, because I am of no importance except to my wife and children and friends. What I have had to say I have said only to record my escape route. I only hope that someone else may be able to use it. And I only hope that I've been able to assure them that freedom isn't a cheat; that indeed on the other side of the barbed wire is a better country.

LIBERALISM STIFLES
INDIVIDUALISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. William Gaedtker has prepared a thought-provoking paper he calls "An Introduction to Leftism," which differentiates between the true liberal and the totalitarianistic ideals of the modern liberal.

Present-day liberals have become conformists—all marching in step to the tune of a new form of nationalism called one-worldism.

Mr. Gaedtker says:

Liberalism today is the vanguard of communism, preparing the means by which nations are conquered while they sleep. Liberals are the most powerful weapon in the Communist arsenal—they are a deadly breed and those who ignore the machinations of the Liberal, do so at their peril.

Mr. Speaker, "An Introduction to Leftism," by E. William Gaedtker, and a chapter from Henry Hazlitt's book "The Man Versus the State," follow:

AN INTRODUCTION TO LEFTISM

(By E. William Gaedtker)

An interesting and most heartening reaction to the forces of one-worldism is to be seen in the growing mistrust of party politics throughout the nations of the free world. Like the man who claimed that he found religion only on leaving the church, public opinion indicates an enlightened awareness that party politics are seldom allied to any sense of patriotism; that the party-political machinery is a convenient means of achieving power to further the aims and ambitions of lesser beings.

Political leaders, in the best sense, are rare gems in the national treasury, but even the "bright, shining star," as exemplified by patriotic leadership, requires the right dynamic force to keep it positioned in a dark firmament. Graft, self-aggrandisement and opportunism within a party-political machine pose an ever-present threat to the strength of the force on which national leadership must rest.

The infiltrator wastes no time in moving in on the political plane, subverting, distorting and adding to the confusion and political intrigue. He knows that he may rely on the self-seekers and the army of white ants in the form of the Liberal to undermine and stir it up.

As Thomas J. Anderson puts it, "Most politicians are neither dedicated Leftists nor dedicated Rightists. They are dedicated to stay in there—it becomes an obsession with them that overrules everything else. Some cynics say that the answer to the professional politician is to elect rich people—that they won't have to steal. Of course, stealing has no connection with riches—most thieves don't want bread, they want power to move. Most politicians are like cockroaches—it's not what they steal and carry off—it's what they fall into and mess up."

AMBITIOUS POLITICIANS

The power behind the international Conspiracy relies—entirely—on the ambitious politician and the Liberal to provide the conditions which must ultimately result in the economic and political control of the world under a central government.

Since the unscrupulous politician and the Liberal are wittingly or unwittingly promoting the one-world ideology, it becomes increasingly difficult to define present day political philosophies; increasingly dangerous

to be associated with any political party, unless one understands the techniques of Leftist infiltration and intent. World political trends suggest that it matters little under what label a political party functions—if infiltration has taken place the end result will be the same—whether or not the policies are intended to promote liberalism, socialism, conservatism or any other ism.

A classic example of this technique may now be seen in the United States, where the Fascist Party—so-called Rightwing—evokes in genuine Right-wingers an emotionalism to the point of extremism and acts of violence. In order to produce the necessary degree of chaos and confusion, the Communists are in control on both sides in the forces opposing each other. In this instance the Communists are actually creating the illusion of opposing each other for the purpose of achieving the same objective. This is a well-known technique to which the Liberal lends himself.

In an effort to define liberalism—either as an individual, inherent characteristic, or as a political philosophy, it is important to remember that one follows naturally on the other. In present day terms "liberalism" takes on many forms—Fabianism, socialism, fascism, nationalism (in its worst sense) and even conservatism which once signified the balanced thinking associated with the Right-wing.

LIBERALISM TODAY

Liberalism today—and in the light of world events—is the master-ism lying behind all revolutionary movements and to which Communism is the natural but contradictory extension, since the latter stands for oppression while liberalism—in its old-world senses—stood for freedom of thought and the liberty of the individual. With the introduction and clever manipulation of semantics, the internationalists were able to foster and further the concept of so-called Christian "humanitarianism" through the philosophy of Dickensian "liberalism" which provided the necessary Rabelaisian swamps in which the Liberals wallow.

Everyman's Encyclopedia defines liberalism as follows:—

"Liberalism in modern times stands for such government by the people as will maintain individual liberty to the maximum extent compatible with social order. Hence it is that L. and liberty are intimately bound up with one another, though the exact connotation of the latter terms is notoriously difficult to determine." Asquith took it to mean, "The power of initiative, the free play of intelligences and wills, the right, so long as a man did not become a danger or a nuisance to the community, to use as he thought best the faculties of his nature, or his brain, and the opportunities of his life."

Today one recognises liberalism as being—basically—the philosophy of compromise—the "easy-out" for the uncommitted—and the very antithesis of individual God-fearing, liberty. As a philosophy it appeals to the herd-instinct of the masses who delight in being "a danger or a nuisance to the community." In this they have "initiative" in abundance!

LIBERALISM: OLD STYLE

In drawing the distinction between old and modern concepts of liberalism, Collier's Encyclopedia has this to say of it—old style:

"Liberalism, as it developed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and flowered in the nineteenth, put major emphasis on the freedom of individuals to control their own destinies. Individualism was its creed: collectivism and tyranny its enemy. . . . In politics, liberalism expressed itself as a reaction against authoritarian regimes. Liberals favoured limiting the rights or hereditary rulers, establishing parliamentary institutions, extending the franchise, and guaranteeing civil rights, and liberties. They favoured such measures both for their own

sake, as a direct expression of essential political freedoms, and as a means of bringing about the adoption of the economic measures they advocated."

But it is interesting to note that even "old-style" liberalism appeared to favour a policy of internationalism in that they aimed at "free trade among nations" as a means for preventing war!

In a lengthy exposition Collier's continues: "The twentieth century liberal will usually resolve the same doubt in favour of increasing the power of the central government at the expense of local government. His main objective is to strengthen the power of the government to do "good" for the people. And adds, "Twentieth century liberalism puts less faith in the market in all its manifestations and favours widespread government intervention in, and control over, economic activity. . . . Twentieth century liberalism sometimes favours collective means while advancing individualist objectives. And its objectives are individualist in a different sense; its keynote is welfare." This typifies the formless cerebral peregrinations of the Liberal "intellectual!"

LIBERALISM "THE VANGUARD OF COMMUNISM"

Liberalism today is the vanguard of Communism, preparing the means by which nations are conquered while they sleep. Liberals are the most powerful weapon in the Communist arsenal—they are a deadly breed and those who ignore the machinations of the Liberal, do so at their peril.

Liberals fall into two categories—the dedicated Queen ants (the "intellectuals") and the army ants. They are the carefully indoctrinated perverts of our age—stupid, vicious, arrogant. Wherever trouble exists the Liberal may be found—egged on by the "invisible" Communist pal, manipulating him like a puppet on a string from the wings.

Liberals are intellectually sick, labouring under delusions of self-importance. They have the diabolical cunning of the mentally unhinged; living in a world of grotesque phantasy devoid of spiritual light or Divine purpose; a world of lies, distortion and irrationality. Basically, Liberals are cowards, but sufficiently courageous—as with the "courage" of the suicide—to spurn God and country, while they spit venom at all who oppose them. They are a living plague on the face of the earth. In their feverish efforts to gratify the unconscious death-wish in themselves, they seek to engulf all of humanity under a cloud of stinking decay.

The white-anting Liberals are the misguided do-gooders, the politically unconscious in the patriotic sense; the instruments for agitation and revolution. They are the conspiratorial tool for applying the dialectic on all fronts in the life of an unsuspecting nation and for waging war against resistance. They have no morals, principles or scruples.

The real tragedy of the effects of liberalism may be seen more clearly in countries where these disciples of Darkness are at liberty to poison the minds of a nation's youth in teaching institutions.

If a nation is to survive the Liberal onslaught and prevent a Communist takeover, it must be alerted to the ramifications of Liberal intrigue and deceit. A healthy and vigorously progressive nation requires good, clean air, which spells death for the Liberal and Life for the nation.

FROM SPENCER'S 1884 TO ORWELL'S 1984

(By Henry Hazlitt)

(NOTE.—Mr. Hazlitt is the well-known economic and financial analyst, columnist, lecturer, and author of numerous books.)

(This article will appear as a chapter in a forthcoming book, *Man vs. the Welfare State*, to be published by Arlington House.)

In 1884, Herbert Spencer wrote what quickly became a celebrated book, *The Man Versus the State*. The book is seldom referred to

now, and gathers dust on library shelves—if, in fact, it is still stocked by many libraries. Spencer's political views are regarded by most present-day writers, who bother to mention him at all, as "extreme *laissez faire*," and hence "discredited."

But any open-minded person who takes the trouble today to read or reread *The Man Versus the State* will probably be startled by two things. The first is the uncanny clairvoyance with which Spencer foresaw what the future encroachments of the State were likely to be on individual liberty, above all in the economic realm. The second is the extent to which these encroachments had already occurred in 1884, the year in which he was writing.

The present generation has been brought up to believe that government concern for "social justice" and for the plight of the needy was something that did not even exist until the New Deal came along in 1933. The ages prior to that have been pictured as periods when no one "cared," when *laissez faire* was rampant, when everybody who did not succeed in the cutthroat competition that was euphemistically called free enterprise—but was simply a system of dog-eat-dog and the-devil-take-the-hindmost—was allowed to starve. And if the present generation thinks this is true even of the 1920's, it is absolutely sure that it was so in the 1880's, which it would probably regard as the very peak of the prevalence of *laissez faire*.

THE SEEDS OF CHANGE

Yet the new reader's initial astonishment when he starts Spencer's book may begin to wear off before he is halfway through, because one cause for surprise explains the other. All that Spencer was doing was to project or extrapolate the legislative tendencies existing in the 1880's into the future. It was because he was so clear-sightedly appalled by these tendencies that he recognized them so much more sharply than his contemporaries, and saw so much more clearly where they would lead if left unchecked.

Even in his Preface to *The Man Versus the State* he pointed out how "increase in freedom on form" was being followed by "decrease of freedom in fact":

"Regulations have been made in yearly growing numbers, restraining the citizen in directions where his actions were previously unchecked, and compelling actions which previously he might perform or not as he liked; and at the same time heavier public burdens . . . have further restricted his freedom, by lessening that portion of his earnings which he can spend as he pleases, and augmenting the portion taken from him to be spent as public agents please."

In his first chapter, "The New Toryism," Spencer contends that "most of those who now pass as Liberals, are Tories of a new type." The Liberals of his own day, he points out, had already "lost sight of the truth that in past times Liberalism habitually stood for individual freedom versus State-coercion."

So the complete Anglo-American switch of reference, by which a "liberal" today has come to mean primarily a State-interventionist, had already begun in 1884. Already "plausible proposals" were being made "that there should be organized a system of compulsory insurance, by which men during their early lives shall be forced to provide for the time when they will be incapacitated." Here is already the seed of the American Social Security Act of 1935.

Spencer also pays his respects to the anti-libertarian implications of an increasing tax burden. Those who impose additional taxes are saying in effect: "Hitherto you have been free to spend this portion of your earnings in any way which pleased you; hereafter you shall not be free to spend it, but we will spend it for the general benefit."

Spencer next turns to the compulsions that labor unions were even then imposing on their members, and asks: "If men use their

liberty in such a way as to surrender their liberty, are they thereafter any less slaves?"

In his second chapter, "The Coming Slavery," Spencer draws attention to the existence of what he calls "political momentum"—the tendency of State interventions and similar political measures to increase and accelerate in the direction in which they have already been set going. Americans have become only too familiar with this momentum in the last few years.

Spencer illustrates: "The blank form of an inquiry daily made is—'We have already done this; why should we not do that?'" "The buying and working of telegraphs by the State" [which already existed in England when he wrote], he continued, "is made a reason for urging that the State should buy and work the railways." And he went on to quote the demands of one group that the State should take possession of the railways, "with or without compensation."

The British State did not buy and work the railways until 64 years later, in 1948, but it did get around to it, precisely as Spencer feared.

It is not only precedent that prompts the constant spread of interventionist measures, Spencer points out, "but also the necessity which arises for supplementing ineffective measures, and for dealing with the artificial evils continually caused. Failure does not destroy faith in the agencies employed, but merely suggests more stringent use of such agencies or wider ramifications of them." One illustration he gives is how "the evils produced by compulsory charity are now proposed to be met by compulsory insurance." Today, in America, one could point to scores of examples (from measures to cure "the deficit in the balance of payments" to the constant multiplication of measures to fight the government's "war on poverty") of interventions mainly designed to remove the artificial evils brought about by previous interventions.

ONE TURN DESERVES ANOTHER

Everywhere, Spencer goes on, the tacit assumption is that "government should step in whenever anything is not going right . . . The more numerous governmental interventions become . . . the more loud and perpetual the demands for intervention." Every additional relief measure raises hopes of further ones:

"The more numerous public instrumentalities become, the more is there generated in citizens the notion that everything is to be done for them, and nothing by them. Every generation is made less familiar with the attainment of desired ends by individual actions or private agencies; until, eventually, governmental agencies come to be thought of as the only available agencies."

FORMS OF SLAVERY

"All socialism," Spencer concludes, "involves slavery. . . . That which fundamentally distinguishes the slave is that he labors under coercion to satisfy another's desires." The relation admits of many gradations. Oppressive taxation is a form of slavery of the individual to the community as a whole. "The essential question is—How much is he compelled to labor for other benefit than his own, and how much can he labor for his own benefit?"

Even Spencer would probably have regarded with incredulity a prediction that in less than two generations England would have rates of income tax rising above 90 per cent, and that many an energetic and ambitious man, in England and the United States, would be forced to spend more than half his time and labor working for the support of the community, and allowed less than half his time and labor to provide for his family and himself.

Today's progressive income tax provides a quantitative measurement of the relative extent of a man's economic liberty and servitude.

Those who think that public housing is an entirely new development will be startled to hear that the beginnings of it—as well as some of its harmful consequences—were already present in 1884:

"Where municipal bodies turn housebuilders (wrote Spencer), they inevitably lower the values of houses otherwise built, and check the supply of more. . . . The multiplication of houses, and especially small houses, being increasingly checked, there must come an increasing demand upon the local authority to make up for the deficient supply. . . . And then when in towns this process has gone so far as to make the local authority the chief owner of houses, there will be a good precedent for publicly providing houses for the rural population, as proposed in the Radical program, and as urged by the Democratic Federation (which insists on) the compulsory construction of healthy artisans' and agricultural laborers' dwellings in proportion to the population."

One State intervention Spencer did not foresee was the future imposition of rent controls, which make it unprofitable for private persons to own, repair, or renovate old rental housing or to put up new. The consequences of rent control provoke the indignant charge that "private enterprise is simply not doing the job" of providing enough housing. The conclusion is that therefore the government must step in and take over that job.

What Spencer did expressly fear, in another field, was that public education, providing gratis what private schools had to charge for, would in time destroy the private schools. What, of course, he did not foresee was that eventually the government would provide free tuition even in tax-supported colleges and universities, thus more and more threatening the continuance of private colleges and universities—and so tending more and more to produce a uniform conformist education, with college faculties ultimately dependent for their jobs on the government, and so developing an economic interest in professing and teaching a statist, pro-government and socialist ideology. The tendency of government-supported education must be finally to achieve a government monopoly of education.

ANCIENT ROOTS OF TYRANNY

As the "liberal" readers of 1969 may be shocked to learn that the recent State interventions which they regard as the latest expressions of advanced and compassionate thought were anticipated in 1884, so the statist readers of Spencer's day must have been shocked to learn from him how many of the latest State interventions of 1884 were anticipated in Roman times and in the Middle Ages. For Spencer reminded them, quoting an historian, that in Gaul, during the decline of the Roman Empire, "so numerous were the receivers in comparison with the payers, and so enormous the weight of taxation, that the laborer broke down, the plains became deserts, and woods grew where the plough had been."

Spencer reminded his readers also of the usury laws under Louis XV in France, which raised the rate of interest "from five to six when intending to reduce it to four." He reminded them of the laws against "forestalling" (buying up goods in advance for later resale), also in early France. The effect of such laws was to prevent anyone from buying "more than two bushels of wheat at market," which prevented traders and dealers from equalizing supplies over time, thereby intensifying scarcities. He reminded his readers also of the measure which, in 1315, to diminish the pressure of famine, prescribed the prices of foods, but which was later repealed after it had caused the entire disappearance of various foods from the markets. He reminded them, again, of the many endeavors to fix wages, beginning with the Statute of Laborers under Edward III (1327—

77). And still again, of statute 35 of Edward III, which aimed to keep down the price of herrings (but was soon repealed because it raised the price). And yet again, of the law of Edward III, under which innkeepers at seaports were sworn to search their guests "to prevent the exportation of money or plate."

This last example will uneasily remind Americans of the present prohibition of private gold holdings and gold export, and of the Johnson Administration's attempt to put a punitive tax on foreign travel, as well as the actual punitive tax that it did put on foreign investment. Let us add the still existing prohibitions even by allegedly advanced European nations against taking more than a tiny amount of their local paper currency out of the country!

THE FEDERAL BULLDOZER THEN

I come to one last specific parallel between 1884 and the present. This concerns slum clearance and urban renewal. The British government of Spencer's day responded to the existence of wretched and overcrowded housing by enacting the Artisans' Dwellings Acts. These gave to local authorities powers to pull down bad houses and provide for the building of good ones:

"What have been the results? A summary of the operations of the Metropolitan Board of Works, dated December 21, 1883, shows that up to last September it had, at a cost of a million and a quarter to ratepayers, unhoused 21,000 persons and provided houses for 12,000—the remaining 9,000 to be hereafter provided for, being meanwhile, left houseless. This is not all. . . . Those displaced . . . form a total of nearly 11,000 artificially made homeless, who have had to find corners for themselves in miserable places that were already overflowing."

Those who are interested in a thorough study of the present-day parallel to this are referred to Professor Martin Anderson's *The Federal Bulldozer* (M. I. T. Press, 1964; McGraw-Hill paperback, 1967). I quote just one short paragraph from his findings:

"The federal urban renewal program has actually aggravated the housing shortage for low-income groups. From 1950 to 1960, 126,000 dwelling units, most of them low-rent ones, were destroyed. This study estimates that the number of new dwelling units constructed is less than one fourth of the number demolished, and that most of the new units are high-rent ones. Contrast the net addition of millions of standard dwelling units to the housing supply by private enterprise with the minute construction effort of the federal urban renewal program." (p. 229)

There is an eloquent paragraph in Spencer's book reminding his readers of the eighties of what they did not owe to the State:

"It is not to the State that we owe the multitudinous useful inventions from the spade to the telephone; it is not the State which made possible extended navigation by a developed astronomy; it was not the State which made the discoveries in physics, chemistry, and the rest, which guide modern manufacturers; it was not to the State which devised the machinery for producing fabrics of every kind, for transferring men and things from place to place, and for ministering in a thousand ways to our comforts. The world-wide transactions conducted in merchants' offices, the rush of traffic filling our streets, the retail distributing system which brings everything within easy reach and delivers the necessities of life daily at our doors, are not of governmental origin. All these are results of the spontaneous activities of citizens, separate or grouped."

AGGRAVATED WASTE

Our present-day statisticians are busily trying to change all this. They are seizing billions of additional dollars from the taxpayers to turn them over for "scientific research." By

this compulsorily subsidized government competition they are discouraging and draining away the funds for private scientific research; and they threaten to make such research, in time, a government monopoly. But whether this will result in more scientific progress in the long run is doubtful. True, enormously more money is being spent on "research," but it is being diverted in questionable directions—in military research; in developing greater and greater superbombs and other weapons of mass destruction and mass annihilation; in planning supersonic passenger airplanes developed on the assumption that civilians must get to their European or Caribbean vacation spots at 1,200 or 1,800 miles an hour, instead of a mere 600, no matter how many eardrums or windows of groundlings are shattered in the process; and finally, in such Buck Rogers stunts as landing men on the moon or on Mars.

It is fairly obvious that all this will involve enormous waste; that government bureaucrats will be able to dictate who gets the research funds and who doesn't, and that this choice will either depend upon fixed arbitrary qualifications like those determined by Civil Service examinations (hardly the way to find the most original minds), or upon the grantees keeping in the good graces of the particular government appointee in charge of the distribution of grants.

But our Welfare Statists seem determined to put us in a position where we will be dependent on government even for our future scientific and industrial progress—or in a position where they can at least plausibly argue that we are so dependent.

A DENIAL OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Spencer next goes on to show that the kind of State intervention he is deploring amounts to not merely an abridgement but a basic rejection of private property: A "confusion of ideas, caused by looking at one face only of the transaction, may be traced throughout all the legislation which forcibly takes the property of this man for the purpose of giving gratis benefits to that man." The tacit assumption underlying all these acts of redistribution is that:

"No man has any claim to his property, not even to that which he has earned by the sweat of his brow, save by the permission of the community; and that the community may cancel the claim to any extent it thinks fit. No defense can be made for this appropriation of A's possessions for the benefit of B, save one which sets out with the postulate that society as a whole has an absolute right over the possessions of each member."

In the final chapter (just preceding a Postscript) Spencer concluded: "The function of Liberalism in the past was that of putting a limit to the powers of kings. The function of true Liberalism in the future will be that of putting a limit to the power of Parliaments."

In endorsing some of the arguments in Spencer's *The Man Versus the State*, and in recognizing the penetration of many of his insights and the remarkable accuracy of his predictions of the political future, we need not necessarily subscribe to every position that he took. The very title of Spencer's book was in one respect unfortunate. To speak of "the man versus the State" is to imply that the State, as such, is unnecessary and evil. The State, of course, is absolutely indispensable to the preservation of law and order, and the promotion of peace and social cooperation. What is unnecessary and evil, what abridges the liberty and threatens the true welfare of the individual, is the State that has usurped excessive powers and grown beyond its legitimate functions—the Super-State, the socialist State, the redistributive State, in brief, the ironically misnamed "Welfare State."

But Spencer was certainly right in the main thrust of his argument, which was essentially that of Adam Smith and other clas-

sical liberals, that the two indispensable functions of government are first, to protect the nation against aggression from any other nation, and second, to protect the individual citizen from the aggression, injustice, or oppression of any other citizen—and that every extension of the functions of government beyond these two primary duties should be scrutinized with jealous vigilance.

We are deeply indebted to Herbert Spencer for recognizing with a sharper eye than any of his contemporaries, and warning them against, "the coming slavery" toward which the State of their own time was drifting, and toward which we are more swiftly drifting today.

It is more than a grim coincidence that Spencer was warning of the coming slavery in 1884, and that George Orwell, in our time, has predicted that the full consummation of this slavery will be reached in 1984, exactly one century later.

DRUG USAGE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE STUDENTS

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years schools and colleges over the Nation have become greatly concerned over the encroachment of the use of drugs such as marihuana and other stimulants by our American youth. The spread of this unfortunate epidemic among our youngsters has increased in alarming proportions in all metropolitan areas throughout our land, and particularly where many students are concentrated in high schools, colleges, and so forth.

Ed Zuckerman, Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune staff reporter has devoted considerable time making a personal survey and investigation of this awful scourge which was visited upon many youngsters who do not know or realize the physical and mental repercussions to their health and future by flirting with the devastating use of drugs and stimulants. And this applies to human beings of all ages.

I hereby submit two of several articles written by reporter Zuckerman on findings, discoveries, and conclusions he has made in his survey of the drug use among a small percentage of youngsters in the Calumet region of Indiana. The articles are designed to inform parents and other adults, to protect families and schools, and to provide authorities with every possible assistance in coping with a major problem.

The articles referred to follow:

(By Ed Zuckerman)

Youngsters in every city of the nation, including Gary and its environs, are experimenting with drugs and smoking marijuana in ever-increasing numbers.

It's an aftereffect of the "psychedelic explosion" that was brought to public attention when the hippie invasion brought drugs and marijuana to San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district.

The district was a mecca for troubled youth. It was highly glamorized in that it generated mountains of publicity. And, if not joined by every sympathetic youngster, at least some of the Haight-Ashbury experience could be made a part of each youth—the mind-expanding drugs.

But the hippie cult was by no means the inventor of the mind-expanding agents.

As early as 1956, The Post-Tribune was publishing pictures of wildly flourishing marijuana patches in Lake County and within the Gary city limits!

The problem existed then, as it does now, but the problem has been greatly magnified by the growing number of youngsters who are learning about the psychedelic explosion from their friends who, in turn, have learned about it from other friends.

Police officials and school authorities have long been involved with the search for drug and marijuana abusers and, quite often, their work has been done quietly.

But the emergence of the psychedelic explosion, which has fanned the imaginations of so many young people, has put the quiet investigation on a new level—the loud roar.

Just how many youngsters in this area have lined themselves up with the "turned on" generation, or are on the verge of doing so, defies a clear-cut statistical report.

Gary Public Schools will attempt to demonstrate that drug use and marijuana smoking are problems in this city when the Gary School Board meets March 11. The report will describe the problem, citing several examples of drug abuse, but it will not be able to define the problem in terms of statistical evidence.

According to Carl Durkel, a Gary Public Schools social worker who is helping to prepare the report:

"Statistical evidence will be difficult to provide. But all we have to do is prove that the problem exists. No matter how small it is, it is still a problem."

Durkel has good reason to believe that drug abuse is a widespread problem and that many teen-agers are capitalizing on their teachers' and parents' lack of wisdom in this regard.

Durkel offers an example that gives him reason to believe that many youngsters are carrying on undetected by their teachers:

"I was called in by a school nurse who told me she found a student who showed all the symptoms of being a drug addict. She told me she rolled up his sleeve but couldn't find any telltale needle marks on his arm."

"I asked her to show me where she looked. She took my right arm and rolled up my sleeve. That was the extent of her examination," he recalled.

Durkel had reason to be disappointed . . . but he's an expert on drug usage and the nurse wasn't.

Examining the right arm for needle tracks is one way of finding if a person is injecting drugs. But only if he is left-handed. A right-handed person injects into the left arm.

Another thing, most addicts now inject into their thighs because there the needle marks can be covered by clothing. Addicts who shoot in the arm cover the marks with long-sleeved clothing.

Many of today's teen-age drug abusers shun injected drugs altogether. He or she is a pill-popper; that is, they are taking them orally.

If the school nurse couldn't recognize the symptoms properly, then how can a parent be expected to know if the sons or daughters are involved with drug experimentation?

Some people, to be sure, will be angered by what they read in the following series. They will label the series as providing an education for the youngsters as well.

We remind everyone that this information already is available to youngsters through a variety of channels—although not all sources of information are entirely accurate.

Years ago the experiments were in smoking and alcohol. Today the older generation is paying the price of smoking and alcohol in heart attacks, cancer, emphysema and a myriad of other ailments that might have been avoided.

This series will educate parents and adults; the youngsters already are getting their education, some of it accurate and some of it not.

But, in any case, the youngsters are knowledgeable and have access to all the drug and dope information—something parents and adults do not have and must have if they are to cope with the problem.

The greater good of the public can be served by everyone—not just the youngsters—becoming aware of what is going on. Those who protest and concentrate on objecting, but fail to recognize what exists, can and will do greater harm than any method of exposing the problem.

Here's what's coming: Next, we'll look at some of the reasons for the youngsters' eagerness to experiment with drugs, how they've built a secret culture which is masked by what they call the "generation gap" and how its information is disseminated by a clandestine newspaper system.

From there, we'll examine the types of drug abusers and how experts argue against marijuana and pills.

Next, we'll present a study of LSD, marijuana and other hallucinogens; then, an examination of amphetamines and barbiturates.

The final installment is a "no holds barred" conversation with two drug experts who usually don't have an opportunity to speak on their subject. They are Smokey Joe, a college student who sells drugs and marijuana, and Groover, another college student who has used drugs and has made a study of them.

(By Ed Zuckerman)

It goes without saying that not all Gary youngsters are members of the "turned on" generation.

But pot-smoking (marijuana), acid-dropping (LSD) and pill-popping (amphetamines and barbiturates) do exist in this city. And the phenomena is not unique in Gary. It is happening in every city of the nation.

While not all Gary youngsters are deeply involved in the mainstream of the "turned on" generation, a great majority of them are "hip" to it.

The purpose of this series is educational. It can be a primer on drug abuse, so parents may better understand the nature of the problem and how to recognize its symptoms.

A good starting place for this survey on drug abuse is to explore some of the reasons why the "turned on" generation has been so readily adopted by teen-agers, how it openly exists in places not easily recognized by adults and how its information is distributed.

For most youngsters involved with drug experimentation, it's merely a new kick . . . an adventure. Others address the situation philosophically.

"Many kids feel they have to try drugs and find out for themselves because of the unrealistic way the subject is treated by adults, educators in particular," claims one oracle of the "turned on" generation.

She is Shirley Poston and she writes for Teenset Magazine.

"A perfect example is the drug films which are shown to young teen-agers in most cities throughout the country.

"In case you aren't familiar with the best known of the films, it is about a lot of thug-like-looking teen-aged characters who scruff about in leather jackets and go directly from one puff on a joint to dope addiction, murder and other similar pursuits.

"This and other films like it should be against the law instead of supposedly for it. They're not scary. They're so overdone that they're funny—and whatever message they hoped to contain is completely lost through over-emphasis and just plain lies.

"Everyone who smokes a marijuana cigarette does not turn into a raving dope fiend. A teen-ager already knows better because most kids know someone who has smoked it (if they haven't already tried it themselves). They also know that said smoking isn't limited to the black leather jacketers.

"Drug use has a lot of pitfalls and any boob with half a brain knows this. But until someone starts presenting them with taste and honesty, I rather doubt that very many people will bother to listen," she claims.

In short, she professes that scare tactics are laughed at by a generation that has lived its life in a scary world. Fear of nuclear holocaust, strangulation by polluted air and Communist subjugation are far more fearful than drugs.

It's a case of setting your own values . . . which problem do you fear most—death by fallout or death by overdose?

The author also lends insight to the problems of sex which have been greatly exploited by the "turned on" generation, also to the dismay of an older generation.

"What I've known of sex education in school was mostly a class where a few oafs sat around and tittered while an old maid laid a dried-up, watered-down version of the facts of life on us," she says.

"Why on earth they allow such an urgently important class to be taught by anyone but an experienced empathetic human being is beyond me. You'd think that adults would have enough brains to know that a lot of kids are either being left ignorant or unnerved by these ill-conducted classes."

Members of the "turned on" generation have their own subculture and, in order to join, you must be under 30 years old. If you're any older than that, then you're part of another generation . . . one they feel has been partly responsible for many of today's serious world and domestic problems.

And, the youngsters contend, anybody who can identify with that can't possibly be trusted.

While the use of drugs is a clandestine facet of the "turned on" generation, the phenomena has become openly manifested in another part of its sub-culture—the music.

They call their music acid rock. It is electrifying and mind-expanding. It's sort of a psychedelic experience without drug influence and, with a hallucinogenic aid, it's the music to "blow your mind" by.

The music is played by a host of groups such as the Jefferson Airplane, the Vanilla Fudge, the Cream, the Jimi Hendrix experience, the Beatles and many others.

The records get wide play on radio stations because the teenagers still spend the money that keeps the record industry humming.

Oftentimes, the music has a message but it's clouded in code or slang—and understood only by hip teen-agers.

Here's a few examples of acid rock's musical message:

Not long ago, British singer Donovan made a hit recording called "Mellow Yellow." Every "turned on" teen-ager knows that Mellow Yellow is a strain of marijuana that grows in Mexico and is smuggled into this country through the border station at Tijuana.

Pot-smoking hippies place a premium on Mellow Yellow because it produces a good, lasting "high." Other good hybrids, for the record, are Acapulco Gold and Panama Gold.

The Beatles recently made popular a song called "Day Tripper." (A "trip" is a mind-expanding experience.)

Another song, "White Rabbit" by the Jefferson Airplane, is a song about a pill they call White Rabbit. The pills is LSD.

The Rolling Stones cut a record called "Mother's Little Helpers." An innocuous title? You bet it was, but the lyrics revealed that "Mother's Little Helpers" are the "upsies and downsies" that mom takes to get her through the day. The "upsies" are the pep pills she takes when she wakes up and the "downsies" are the tranquilizers she takes before going to bed.

The Temptations, another group, sing a song entitled "Cloud Nine." It is about a youngster who leaves home when he can't cope with life with parents. Things still don't work out when he's on his own but, he says, "I'm doing fine . . . on Cloud Nine" (presumably, a cloud of marijuana smoke).

Many parents may wonder how their children come to learn these things. Mostly, it's passed by word-of-mouth. But there is a point of origin for all this information.

The "turned on" generation has a pretty good grapevine called the underground press. In this region, youngsters who forage to Chicago's Old Town and Hyde Park (University of Chicago) districts can easily pick up copies of *The Seed*, *Second City* or *Kalaidoscope*—three underground newspapers.

"The underground press is the mammal devouring the eggs of the dinosaur," describes Jeff Shero, editor of *The Rat*, a New York City periodical that is the best known of the underground press.

"We lay bare the deformed nature of be-hemoth America and pierce its scaly armor—the national media. We are the future, an expression of the youth revolt determined to liberate ourselves and all men."

The *Rat* received national attention last August when it published a special issue in time for the National Democratic Convention in Chicago. The *Rat* printed maps and listed hotel addresses where delegates would be staying. They also published addresses of a CIA office and the U.S. Armed Forces Induction Center.

Gary school officials have confirmed that several Gary students were in Chicago during the time of the convention and participated in some of the confrontations that pock-marked that gathering.

The underground press also has close ties through the country, especially since the 1967 formation of the Liberation News Service (LNS) which supplies stories to approximately 200 subterranean newspapers in this country.

LNS, according to Jean Strouse writing in *Eye Magazine*, provides information unavailable to the established media such as detailed reports of peace movement activities, drug busts (arrests), tales of police harassment and brutality, long diaries and articles from Hanoi and Havana and muck-raking pieces about things like U.S. involvement in Latin America.

Of special interest is a new LNS service called HIP—the High School Independent Press Services—which started a year ago and sends out weekly news packets to about 100 high schools around the country. Students use the information in publications they print away from school authority and then distribute clandestinely.

"Most of these articles," Strouse reveals, "focus on immediate high school issues such as dress codes and free speech."

"But they are moving toward the larger issues of college revolt, the draft, school strikes, questions of academic freedom, school decentralization and racism."

Several of the underground newspapers have printed stories about new psychedelic drugs and even formulas for homemade LSD and tips on "How does your grass (marijuana) garden grow?"

So when asked how he's come to know these things, the hip youngster need only say:

"All I know is what I read in the papers."

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing local governments have been studied by the Congress and scholars for many years. The main objective, which we are all striving to accomplish, is to keep government close to the people. As a result, we find a proliferation of mu-

nicipalities and political subdivisions around our major cities; and, often we find also that these subdivisions and municipalities duplicate services because of their overlapping jurisdictions. Inefficiency abounds.

The standard remedy proposed to solve this problem is "metro" government. However, I believe this solution to be unacceptable. Under a gigantic metropolitan government, services must be provided to sometimes 2 or 3 million people. Yet it is obvious that in major urban areas, the people desire local control of local institutions. A prime example of the inadequacy of this solution is the school decentralization struggle in New York City. Furthermore, each area in an urban complex demands different types of sanitation facilities, police protection, social services, and educational systems. I do not believe that a gigantic metropolitan government can provide this needed variety.

On the other hand, there is a possibility that the efficient services provided by large metropolitan governments can be used by smaller subdivisions while allowing local governments to exist. The basic idea is incorporated into a plan developed in Lakewood, Calif., which provides for the political subdivision to contract with the larger unit of government. The political subdivision would purchase whatever services it needed.

Prof. J. F. Freeman, of Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., has recently submitted an essay to me explaining the above-mentioned concepts. For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert this essay into the RECORD:

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT RECONSIDERED

(By J. F. Freeman)

Since the 1902's reformers have proposed the adoption of "metro" government for our larger urban areas. The situation that attracted the attention of these reformers is now well-known to the public. In the 19th century the city limits usually enclosed the entire population of an urban area; the government for most urban areas had a simple structure—one compact urban area, one municipal government. However, with the rise of automotive transportation and lower cost housing in the 20th century, the situation changed. The population of most urban areas rapidly spread far beyond the old city limits, extending to other municipalities and crossing county and even state boundaries. This demographic change had governmental consequences. Instead of the pattern of one compact urban area with one municipal government, a new pattern of a sprawling urban area with a number of units of government developed. The best known examples of this are the New York and Chicago regions; each has approximately 1500 units of local government. By comparison, Atlanta is a piker with fewer than 80 units of government in its area.

The reaction of reformers to this situation has been repeated for over 40 years: we must, they declare, recreate as nearly as possible the 19th century pattern of one urban area, one government. The reasons cited for this are varied; frequently they include arguments that the various units of government in a metropolitan area are "at war" with one another, that essential governmental services are therefore not provided, and that inefficiency, duplication of services, and excessive overhead expenses abound. Additionally, voters are so confused by the jumble of governmental units, the reformers argue, that they cannot control the government.

The widely-prescribed remedy for this is rather simple: merge the units of government or pass their responsibilities along to a unit with a greater jurisdiction. With a unified government, administrative inefficiency will disappear, costs will go down, and on election day the voters will be able to control a simpler unit of government.

As persuasive as the reformers' case sounds, it has not been widely accepted. Far more efforts to establish "metro" governments have failed than have succeeded. Only three such governments exist in the United States: in Miami, in Jacksonville, and in Nashville. "Metro" was established by referendum in each of these places, but studies of these elections seem to show that voters approved of "metro" to get rid of unpopular officials, not necessarily because the reformers' arguments struck a responsive note. Toronto, Canada, has a "metro" government that was imposed by the provincial legislature in 1953. The record of these governments is not long enough to assess fairly, but Toronto's performance may indicate the value of "metro". Because of its broader tax base, Toronto metro has been able to capitalize improvements that the older units of government could not finance. Whatever the objections to "metro" that may exist in the minds of many voters, it seems clear that large units of local government can raise more revenue.

In recent years, scholars have criticized the reformers' arguments for "metro." One frequently made criticism has been that reformers have concentrated their attention only on the structure of government and not on how it works. For example, one study of the St. Louis area revealed that adjacent independent units of government were not "at war" over zoning; in only one instance along a 23-mile strip were zoning practices of adjacent units of government incompatible. It is doubtful whether "metro" leads to the tax reduction that many efficiency arguments lead one to expect, and, furthermore, governments may get too big to operate efficiently, as New York City's school problems suggest. Finally, the claim that voters could more easily control a larger unit of government with a small number of elected officials is questionable. Studies of voting behavior have shown that voter choices on election day are influenced by a multitude of things besides campaign platforms or records in office. The vote on election day cannot direct public policy with any precision; the reformers attribute to the vote a "rifle" accuracy, when in fact election results have at best a "shotgun" effect. A "metro" government may be simpler from the point of view of textbook explanation, but from the point of view of the ordinary citizen, "metro" means decreased personal contact with elected officials and the need to unravel the organization of a complex bureaucracy if government is to be understood at all. Perhaps these are some of the reasons "metro" has not gained wide popularity.

Is there a way to arrange government in our metropolitan areas so that the financial advantages of large-scale production of services can be combined with the values of local control and widespread participation? The establishment of the "Lakewood Plan" in Los Angeles County indicates the outlines of a possible answer to this dilemma. In 1954 the city of Lakewood was incorporated, but, instead of setting up its own departments to provide all city services, Lakewood contracted with Los Angeles county to provide certain services to the city in specified amounts. In this way, Lakewood could provide the services its citizens wanted without having to undertake unnecessary capitalization. A number of other cities have followed Lakewood's example; they have incorporated and retained control over their neighborhoods but have contracted with the county for the supply of some or all of the municipal

pal services. Scholars studying the operation of the Plan have noted that the same unit of government must both produce and distribute a given service, but Lakewood shows that this is not so. A large unit of government can produce services, realizing economies of scale, and distribution of the services can be left to smaller units where each citizen has a greater opportunity to affect the decision-making process.

Arguments are frequently heard that today's cities can no longer afford to be governed by units of government that are unable to make decisions for the entire urban area; it is said that centralized, professional government must be substituted to deal with today's problems. The arguments are plausible, but even more plausible arguments can be suggested for encouraging the development of small units and broader popular participation: If our technology is freeing more time for leisure, why discourage citizens from participating in government and politics? If the educational level of the population is rising, why be reluctant to encourage citizen participation? If our metropolitan areas are a new form of urban settlement, why subject them to the old pattern of urban government? The measure of a good government is not, after all, how efficiently it produces this or that service; the true measure of government is the environment it provides for the development of citizenship.

BLACK ARM BANDS FOR A BLACK DAY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope all readers of the *Record* will take the time to carefully read David Lawrence's editorial "Is Treason Permissible as Merely Free Speech?" in the March 10, 1969, issue of *U.S. News & World Report*. It is a significant indictment of yet another demonstrably harmful decision from the U.S. Supreme Court from which the American people are apparently to have no relief until the membership of the Court is changed.

In this most recent judicial crusade a majority has held black arm bands to be a constitutionally protected right of defiant students in the classrooms of the land, despite the contrary order of supervisory school authorities. Having pierced the political thicket, the Warren Court now boldly enters the academic thicket in perhaps its most sensitive area, the classroom; thus lowering morale and further diminishing reasonable supervisory authority in school at a time when a lack of order on campus and in our Nation's classrooms is a major concern.

As David Lawrence suggests, decisions imposing such new interpretive requirements of the first amendment, far from being required, should be the subject of judicial restraint. The classroom is no place for the Court. When decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court are allowed to become conceptualistic fiat conceived in an ivory tower of unreality from which there is no appeal, our whole system is in danger of disintegration.

Of all the vitally important responsibilities our new President has, none is more important to the future of America

than whom President Nixon selects to fill vacancies as they occur on the Supreme Court of the United States. These simply must be men whose feet are firmly on the ground. There must be an end to the continued encouragement of defiance, anarchy, lawlessness, pornography, and subversion by loose decisions from the High Court.

The Founding Fathers never intended the Constitution of the United States to mean anything remotely resembling what the Warren Court has repeatedly interpreted it to mean. The situation is truly alarming and President Nixon holds the key.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

IS TREASON PERMISSIBLE AS MERELY "FREE SPEECH"?

(By David Lawrence)

The Constitution defines treason as "levying war" against the United States or "adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

This country today is engaged in a war in which our adversaries are supplied with money and armament by two Communist governments. We have sent more than 500,000 men to defend the people of South Vietnam against aggression. Casualties have been heavy.

Is it not a violation of the Constitution for anyone in our midst to participate in a "demonstration" which takes the enemy's side of the argument and demands, in effect, that the United States withdraw from the battlefield? Doesn't such an attitude encourage the enemy to prolong the war and keep on killing American troops as well as thousands of civilians?

The Supreme Court has just rendered a decision proclaiming as a denial of "free speech" a regulation issued by school authorities in Des Moines, Iowa, prohibiting students from wearing black armbands in the classroom. This form of "demonstration" was previously publicized as a means of expressing opposition to the Vietnam war. The Court says:

"The action of the school authorities appears to have been based upon an urgent wish to avoid the controversy which might result from the expression, even by the silent symbol of armbands, of opposition to this Nation's part in the conflagration in Vietnam."

The High Court, however, rules that school officials do not have absolute authority over their students and that the pupils "are possessed of fundamental rights which the State must respect." This is tantamount to saying that the supervisors in our school system—a part of the governmental structure itself—are no longer free to make their own regulations concerning the conduct of students from the time they enter until they leave the school grounds.

Seven Justices affirmed the opinion, and two were opposed. The Court confines itself primarily to the argument that the wearing of armbands did not disrupt classwork or involve "substantial disorder or invasion of the rights of others." The opinion declares:

"If a regulation were adopted by school officials forbidding discussion of the Vietnam conflict, or the expression by any student of opposition to it anywhere on school property except as part of a prescribed classroom exercise, it would be obvious that the regulation would violate the constitutional rights of students, at least if it could not be justified by a showing that the students' activities would materially and substantially disrupt the work and discipline of the school."

But what about the poisoning of the minds of other students by those who openly express their opposition to the war in Vietnam?

The protest "demonstrations," the burning of draft cards, and now restrictions preventing school authorities from squelching "symbolic" free speech could stimulate the spread of "symbolic" treason.

Justice Black, in his dissenting opinion, asserts that when the Court says the wearing of armbands is "symbolic" speech, it "arrogates to itself, rather than to the State's elected officials charged with running the schools, the decision as to which school disciplinary regulations are 'reasonable.'" The Justice points out that the armbands took the students' minds off their classwork and diverted them to thoughts about the highly emotional subject of the Vietnam war. He adds:

"If the time has come when pupils of State-supported schools, kindergarten, grammar school or high school, can defy and flout orders of school officials to keep their minds on their own school work, it is the beginning of a new revolutionary era of permissiveness in this country fostered by the judiciary."

What has really happened is that the "right to teach"—hitherto presumed to be inherent in the functioning of our public schools—is being brushed aside as subordinate to "free speech." The students now could wear in the classroom even the hammer and sickle to express a "symbolic" support of the Communist cause in the war.

How, in the face of the High Court's new decision, can the schools effectively teach patriotism and a love of country? Must they submit to the type of protests which have already led the North Vietnamese to believe that the United States is willing to pull out its forces and accept "peace at any price"?

It is regrettable that the Supreme Court saw fit to ignore the true significance of the dissent being expressed by certain students in the Iowa school.

There certainly is no justification for a ruling by the highest court in the land which takes away the right of school authorities in a government-supported institution to bar "symbolic" treason. We are telling the world that we permit students in our public schools to indicate, in effect, that they are "adhering to the enemies" of the United States and "giving them aid and comfort."

TONGUE-TIED JUSTICE

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, James Earl Ray has pleaded guilty to murdering the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and has been sentenced to 99 years in prison. I am not questioning the procedure that brought about this result; however, it leaves unanswered the vital question of whether or not Ray was part of a conspiracy.

We are left wondering who procured a duplicate driver's license for Ray in Alabama when he was in California, and where Ray got the more than \$15,000 that he spent during the year after his escape from the Missouri State Penitentiary. These and many other questions have not been satisfactorily explained by the various investigating groups, the Memphis attorney general, P. M. Canale, or by Ray's counsel, Percy Foreman.

The issue has further been raised by Ray's actions in court, when he leaped to his feet and declared that he did not intend that his plea of guilty should in-

clude a finding that there was no conspiracy. The questions raised by this statement and by the other unanswered queries are well put in the following editorial from the New York Times:

TONGUE-TIED JUSTICE

The aborted trial of James Earl Ray for the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is a shocking breach of faith with the American people, black and white, and of people the world over still numbed and puzzled by the gunfire that struck down this international leader.

Ray is entitled by all legal means to avail himself of the defenses open to him under the law. But by no means, legal or pragmatic, should the doors of the courtroom and the jail be slammed shut on the facts, the motives and the doubts of this horrible murder.

And yet that is just what has occurred with stunning suddenness in a Memphis courthouse. By pleading guilty, Ray has been sentenced to 99 years in prison. The jury had to go along with this prearranged deal between the prosecution and the admitted killer's attorney. Circuit Judge W. Preston Battle went along with this deal, treating the whole matter as if it were a routine murder case.

Nothing but outrage and suspicion can follow the handling of this long-delayed and instantly snuffed-out trial. Percy Foreman, the defense lawyer, tells the public that it took him months "to prove to myself" that Ray was not part of a murder conspiracy. Ray himself acquiesces in the deal made on the guilty plea—then says publicly that he refuses to go along with the statement that there was no conspiracy.

Why should this assassination case be tried by statements instead of formal legal procedures, subject to examination and cross-examination, the presentation of all the evidence by the prosecution, the appearance of the accused in open court? What in either sense or jurisprudence does it mean that the defense attorney convinced himself? In the ghetto and in the world outside the ghetto, the question still cries for answer: Was there a conspiracy to kill Dr. King and who was in it?

The state's case has been read to the jury. But that is hardly enough in a case of this magnitude. This was not a street crime but, on the surface, a racist or quasi-political assassination. It was not enough to say that the state accepted the guilty plea and agree to end the case because the death penalty has not been used since 1961 in Tennessee.

No one was demanding blood; everyone is demanding fact. Are we going to get the facts from Ray's lawyers, past or present, one of whom is trying to peddle the story to magazines? Are we going to get the facts from William Bradford Huie, the author who has "bought" the "rights" to Ray's story? What a mockery of justice for the facts to emerge in marketed justice!

Unless proceedings are convened in court—Federal, if not state—we shall never know the adjudicated truth. There should be no Warren Commission necessary—a month or a year from now—to still our doubts and do what a Tennessee court has failed to do.

I do not doubt the good faith of the State of Tennessee nor of the FBI. I merely urge them to continue their investigation to determine whether or not this heinous crime was the product of a conspiracy and, if there is evidence to that effect, to place such evidence before a court of law. It is important for the integrity of the people of the United States that his issue be as firmly resolved as possible.

Regardless of the results of this investigation, I reaffirm my belief that almost

all of us must share the blame for this action. As I said last April 8, 1968:

It is this senseless animosity, this irrational hatred that tears at the very fabrics of our national life. Few are without blame. For if we do not share the hatred, and most of us do not, we accept it in our midst. We abhor the violence but we tolerate the animosity which feeds upon itself until the seeds of violence are sown.

It is important that all of the facts of this case be uncovered. However, regardless of their particularities, the greatest tribute that we can pay to this departed man of peace is to work in our daily lives to eliminate the animosity that breeds such senseless violence.

TENNESSEE HAILS A NATIVE SON

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee House of Representatives has adopted the following resolution, honoring a native son whose skill and dedication have brought credit to his State and earned him well-deserved recognition. I was privileged to know Bill Timmons well, and to witness his ability first hand during the 6 years he served as my administrative assistant. Now, as a key member of President Nixon's staff, Bill Timmons will enjoy an opportunity to bring his talents to bear on an even wider scope in the service of his country. Because of its timeliness, I include the following resolution in the RECORD:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 7

A resolution to congratulate William E. Timmons on his appointment to the staff of President Richard M. Nixon

Whereas, President Richard M. Nixon has assigned a capable and dedicated staff to assist him in the execution of his duties; and

Whereas, William E. Timmons of Hamilton County has been named by the new President to the White House staff; and

Whereas, Mr. Timmons served as an aide to former United States Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin and was named Outstanding Young Republican of the Year in 1965; and

Whereas, Mr. Timmons served from January 1963 to November 1968 as administrative assistant to United States Representative William E. Brock III rendering great service to the people of Tennessee's Third Congressional District in particular and to all the people of the State of Tennessee in general; and

Whereas, Mr. Timmons was always willing and anxious to help and assist any Tennessean who came to Washington, D. C. or who telephoned or wrote a letter; and

Whereas, Mr. Timmons has a brilliant mind, a keen insight into the legislative process and an uncanny ability to assess and evaluate the pressing issues of our time; and

Whereas, This fine outstanding Tennessean has been assigned by the President to assure good working relations between the legislative and executive branches of our national government; and

Whereas, All the people of Tennessee may now feel that they have a proven friend and fellow citizen on the White House staff who is willing and anxious to assist Tennessee;

Be it hereby resolved by the House of Rep-

resentatives of the Eighty-Sixth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, That we commend President Nixon for his wisdom for selecting such a talented citizen and that we congratulate William E. Timmons on his appointment and wish him well in his new assignment; and

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. William E. Timmons, The White House, Washington, D.C.; United States Representative William E. Brock III, United States Congress, Washington, D.C.; and President Richard M. Nixon, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Adopted February 27, 1969.

WILLIAM L. JENKINS,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING: TO CAPTURE ONE GENERATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Lavrentia Beria, the Bolshevik psychopolitician, head of the Soviet secret police under Stalin, talked of a master plan to conquer the world:

Give us one generation and you'll never be able to catch up.

It becomes more obvious that his plan is now underway in the United States to destroy one generation by removing from our youth the desire to be an individual resulting in loss of the will to resist—lawlessness, immorality, the warping of society, and consequently cultural destruction.

By now most people should understand that the term "human relations" is a "sliding-off" of identity to camouflage sensitivity training once called brainwashing.

Unless the parents of America become aroused and organize—"sensitivity training" or "group therapy" can well be the weapon to deliver the young generation.

So that our colleagues may know there are concerned Americans already trying to awaken the mothers and fathers I ask these documents follow my remarks: "Sensitivity Training" from National Defender for March 1969, "Sensitivity Training" from Blackboard Power, "NEA Threat to America" by Dr. Gordon V. Drake, and "Sensitivity Training: Boon or Menace" by Donna Gill from Chicago Tribune January 26, 1969, and an excerpt from Beria's address to American students in the Lenin University prior to 1936:

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Sensitivity Training is a form of group criticism which is being introduced in high schools, colleges and universities, churches, Police Departments, YMCA groups, summer camps, etc. Described by its advocates as "group therapy," it has aroused widespread opposition wherever it has been used because it employs almost the same method that was used to brainwash American prisoners of war in Korea—organized "group criticism."

Group criticism compels the participant to bare his soul before 10 or 15 other persons who are required to do likewise under the direction of a group leader. The individual is pressed to seek out real or fancied shortcomings in his personality and thinking, to humble himself and give up his independence of mind and judgment, to make himself

dependent upon the good opinion of the leader and others in the group.

The individual's "problems" become group property and, as the talk progresses and the group tries to work out solutions, any or all of the following results may take place:

1. After hearing 10-20 others confess their "faults," one is inclined to feel that his own are not so bad, thus encouraging him to accept lower moral standards.

2. Discovery that one's own or family standards are different from those of the group creates doubts as to whose standards are correct.

3. Discourages, in fact penalizes, individual responsibility and decision-making, causing one to feel inadequate and unable to make decisions without approval of the group or group leader.

4. Encourages participants to bring problems to the group instead of to family and church.

5. Causes one's family to seem pretty "square" compared to the consensus of the group.

Since all such programs are "geared to change," they tend, unless one is of unusual integrity and character, to realign loyalties away from home, family and the church, and cause the individual to conform more nearly to the standards and ideals of the group. This is perhaps an oversimplification, but it is difficult to dispute the fact that group criticism or sensitivity training is a form of brainwashing.

Some years ago, Edward Hunter, author and foreign correspondent who originally introduced the term "brainwashing" into the English language, pointed out:

"The United States is being conditioned to accept military defeat . . . the objective now is to bring about, by a sophisticated Pavlovian approach, consent by the American people and Government for what we have always refused to discuss—battlefield defeat. . . . A long, highly skilled campaign has been going on to soften up our people for it. The immediate objective in this war is American acceptance of defeat at the hands of the Vietnam communists. But Vietnam is only one sector of a worldwide front. The long range objective, for which defeat in Vietnam is supposed to soften us up, is our acceptance of defeat by the Soviet Union."

Is Sensitivity Training part of this program? And is there anyone who can say that it is calculated to strengthen the moral fiber of this Nation?

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

(NOTE.—The following resolution was adopted by the DAR Pennsylvania State Conference, October 1968:)

Whereas, so-called "Sensitivity Training" or "Group Dynamics" is a well developed psychological technique whereby a leader of a group promotes each individual's self-criticism or confession and directs the group to criticize each for the purpose of "self-improvement" through throwing off old values and supposedly becoming more sensitive to other people; and

Whereas, Sensitivity Training or Group Dynamics has been perfected and long practiced in communist countries for the purpose of directing opinions in desired paths and at the same time destroying the capacity for independent thought—this having been the means by which communists caused GI prisoners to defect in the Korean war; and

Whereas, this same technique is being advocated by many groups and movements in the United States to make youth, the police, the military, church groups, etc., more sensitive—possibly to the particular (often unsavory) views and attitudes they would like to see universal; therefore

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Society, Daughters of the American Revolution urge its members to study, then expose "the Sensitivity Training Program" or any pro-

gram which undertakes to change basic human characteristics—no matter under what attractive title it masquerades.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

It has been suggested that one of the main goals of sex education programs such as SIECUS, is to break down the barriers of privacy; to free children to speak about the most intimate subjects in their own lives and to bare their most secret thoughts. This technique is used in the current "rage" of liberal brain pickers, which they call "sensitivity training." Sensitivity training is also used in Communist countries as a device to make people reveal all personal feelings, thoughts, desires, and fears. This self and group criticism may be traced to the 1920's in Russia where it was regularly used to spot agitators or potential trouble makers and bring them into line. The Russian people (children and adults) thereby created their own police state and controlled one another.

Sensitivity training is called by various names such as group criticism, group dynamics, management development, group process, and T-group training. Dr. Carl Rogers of the Western Behavioral Science Institute, illogically concludes that "if therapy is good for people in trouble, then it is bound to be as good or better for people who function well." Woe be unto the medical doctor who would prescribe drugs and surgery for the hale and hearty, because he subscribes to Roger's philosophy.

Three main points of the Group Criticism technique are as follows:

1. The atmosphere helps participants to open up their behavior to examination by themselves as well as by others.

2. The first step is to unfreeze the old values.

3. Gradually members unlearn the inappropriate reactions and find the courage to experiment with new responses.

Of course the immediate thought that comes to mind is, Who will tell the "patients" what the appropriate response should be—Dr. Kirkendall?

The National Training Laboratory organized in 1952 by the NEA, has developed sensitivity training techniques which have been taught since 1956 to groups of church leaders, industrial and educational administrators, executives of volunteer organizations, social scientists, police, judges, and other key personnel in America.

The National Training Laboratory (NTL) has been amply financed through grants from many organizations and foundations, as well as the federal government. In 1965-66, 32 awards went to NTL for major projects in human relations training. For this, both the NEA and WCOTP of which NEA is a member, received grants from the Vernon Fund, a fund heavily contributed to by the federal government's Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). WCOTP apparently received approximately one million dollars from the Vernon Fund to "develop leadership" among educators.

The SIECUS Sex education program is working hand in hand with the sensitivity program as supported by the NEA, WCOTP, UNESCO, and the U.S. Office of Education. It is therefore a matter of most serious consequences to learn that the SIECUS program is presently being used in schools throughout America from California to New York. Public schools are using SIECUS coordinated materials for kindergarten through twelfth grade. Many teachers welcome this type of program since they have long held that parents are inadequately trained to teach their own children about sex. All phases of instruction, they stoutly maintain, should be left to the professionals.

The teachers in this instance are dead wrong. No sex education is better than the kind offered by SIECUS. It is not the role

of the school to teach amoral sex education intended to present to the "youngster all the alternatives that he or she could take in regard to sex and sex relationships." In a suit filed in Sacramento by two fathers, the program is described as one which "fosters and teaches immorality."

Other opponents of the program charge the sex education course with being an expression of secular humanism in which man is closely identified with animals in reproduction function without any attempt to interrelate the higher ideals of marriage.

In addition, I strongly question the omission of a study of venereal disease. As the Executive Director of SIECUS, Dr. Mary Calderone explained, "Venereal disease happens to be infectious diseases that are transmitted by sexual contact, but I don't think they are a part of sexual education." This is an astoundingly stupid statement and obviously eliminates from the desire of SIECUS to glorify sex, and ensnare students into sexual promiscuity. Dr. Calderone's position that sex education should include neither moral attitudes nor knowledge of the dangers of infection are indefensible in the light of statistics on V.D.

According to the latest national figures, venereal disease is a major public health problem. The National Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service says that venereal disease has reached epidemic proportions in nearly all metropolitan areas. But most significant in reference to Dr. Calderone's statement, is the fact that teenagers account for most of the increase. "In 1964 and 1965 syphilis among U.S. teen-agers rose 12.4 percent while the overall national incidence remained constant. And in 1965 the rate of infection per 100,000 in the 15-19 group for syphilis and gonorrhea was more than double the rate for all age groups combined."

Parents are in grave danger of losing control of their children's secular and moral education. Moral values are being taught in the schools which are diametrically opposed to our traditional standards based on the Hebraic-Christian heritage. The practice is increasing because educational leaders such as Dr. Kirkendall—who rejoices at any public acceptance of homosexuality and sexual perversion—are determining the school curriculum.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING: BOON OR MENACE?

(By Donna Gill)

Sensitivity training.

This is a term that is misunderstood, hard to define, hailed as the savior of education by some, thwarted as a so-called brainwashing technique by others, and generally controversial.

It's been around for a few years now, in one form or other, but it stirred widespread interest in Chicago only this week. Sensitivity training sessions were held in private homes and directed by a teacher from Evanston Township High school, the not sponsored by the school. People wrote and called *The Tribune* to seek information on sensitivity training itself.

The techniques of such training vary. There is no one set pattern, and much of it depends on the "trainer" himself. It can vary from discussion groups or self-criticizing and group-criticizing sessions, where the mood itself varies from talk to heated argument, to more than 100 games to be played.

ORANGE PASSING, CHANTING

The games themselves have many aspects: passing an orange around a circle, chanting arm in arm, crawling around and touching each other as you are wrapped in sheets or blankets, swimming nude in groups, bathing together, mimicry, and just staring eye to eye with another person.

At its best, its supporters say, sensitivity training is a form of group experience that

will make the individual lose his hangups and become innovative, more of an individual, loving, more aware of himself and his true feelings, more sensitive of the feelings of others, and more creative.

At its worst, its detractors say, sensitivity training becomes a form of group pressure and brainwashing that makes the subject accept the lowest common denominator in morals, be vulnerable to anti-church and anti-family beliefs, destroys individuality, could lead to sexual promiscuity, creates neurotics, and reduces people to vegetables unable to do anything but accept the group's orders.

There are also those who take a middle view. They say sensitivity training is good—if handled by a competent professional, preferably a psychiatrist, and if the persons involved are suited to such sessions and have no deep problems.

MAY BECOME AUTISTIC

"If someone feels very alienated, out of touch with other people, feels remote, and you put him in a group whose members are playing each other, he may move away even more and become completely autistic," said Dr. Jules Masserman, co-chairman of the Northwestern university psychiatry department.

"If you have someone already fairly well-balanced, and he feels he wants to explore other horizons and knows where the limits are and how to keep his maturity and sanity in limits, then it's fine," he said.

"But you have to individualize it, and it takes a great deal of experience and training on the part of the leader. A swimming teacher knows you don't throw the whole class into the pool at once because someone might not know how to swim and might drown or get hurt."

The danger of such sessions in the elementary or high schools, he said, is that "you cannot generalize on any of it and a great many of these teachers just are not trained. You cannot take just a general class of teen-agers who have all sorts of individual characteristics and just willy-nilly subject the class to any one procedure."

HAS HOLD ON COUNTRY

Whatever the dangers or procedures or good points, sensitivity training has a foothold on the country and is used, in one form or another, in business or management training, in churches, youth groups, and schools. It is in great use in California.

For part of its research, *The Tribune* contacted two professors at Chicago Theological seminary. Both have worked extensively in group therapy sessions.

Dr. Arthur Foster, a professor of theology and personality, admitted that parents upset by the sessions involving their children were not unusual.

While some of the Evanston parents said the sessions helped their children, most complained that after the sessions their children were rebellious, engaged in shouting sessions, woke up not knowing where they were, suffered mental set-backs, cried continuously, and were generally confused.

"In the process, sensitivity training is going to shake a lot of people up," Dr. Foster said. "If the parents feel that way about the training, they ought to be in a T-group (training group) with their kids. The answer to the generation gap is to get together. That type of response on rebellion is inaccurate. It won't give rebellion, but it might bring it out in the open. The kids are in a much clearer position on this than their parents."

PARENTS FIGHTING IT

The parents did not think so. And throughout the Country, small and large groups of parents and other groups are springing up to do battle against an activity they say is ruining their children.

Dr. Foster said sensitivity training is a loosely-used term that also includes forms of

group dynamics. T-group training, auto-criticism, human relations training, Synanon Games clubs, basic encounter groups, self-honesty session, self-examination, and human potential workshop. Much of the trend originated in the National Training laboratories in Bethel, Maine.

"It is a study in the processes of change and the dynamics of planned change in society," he said. "It studies the dynamics of change in society, and what it takes to maintain a group, a society, or an institution, while at the same time bringing about change, or innovation."

He believes it will lead to good changes in education. He also believes it will lead to changes in people.

OPEN TO BRAINWASHING?

The critics believe the changes will mean that the person is open to the type of brainwashing used by the North Koreans on American prisoners of war during the Korean conflict?

Dr. Foster said the technique pretty well strips a person to the core, which is a common denominator of both brainwashing and sensitivity training.

He said that then, when the person is rather emotionally-stripped, if you were to brainwash him, you would apply coercion and threat.

But in sensitivity training, you rebuild and help the individual see himself as such. He said it is a matter of motive. Many of the groups who wrote *The Tribune* said that it is dangerous to get a person in such a vulnerable position at what they termed the "mercy of the leader."

Foster admitted there is possible danger, but said that something so "innovative and with such potential" should not be discontinued because of a fear of a possible abuse.

MOVING IN RIGHT DIRECTION

"I think it is the most innovative educational thing going on," he said. "I wouldn't indorse everything, but it's moving in a fresh kind of direction."

He said there is always a danger with an unqualified leader. He described some T-group sessions as taking about 12 persons and building a little society. He said it is always possible to come up with the demonic society the boys constructed in William Golding's "Lord of the Flies," but that the leader should be there "to see nothing is destroyed that shouldn't be."

"This little community could turn into a tyranny of group," he said. "It often happens in the process. At a certain moment, you get the whole group zeroing in on one person to try to make him think what they think. Then you get a wolf pack effect. Then it is time for the leader to zero in and get the group to see what they are doing to Joe. Since no leader is perfect, sometimes he doesn't pick up what's happening."

MANY USES SEEN

But, he said, he himself has not experienced it as a "dangerous thing." He said he could see much use of it to promote black-white understanding, for management to understand the role of labor, to increase church understanding and participating, and for couples.

His colleague, Dr. Ross Snyder, professor of religious education and pastoral psychology and a pioneer in group dynamics, did not always agree.

"There are great dangers that can be done by people who do not know what they are doing," he said. "You get things roused up that you might not have the knowledge to really cope with. You often end up with people who have learned a new way of being impersonal to each other."

"You've learned a new bag of tricks. You've learned new ways to be hostile and still appear to be friendly. For many, it just equipped them better to be hostile to each other and feel superior to those who had not had sensitivity training."

"Part of the problem is that people need to stay in the therapeutic group. All these very short term things may finally leave people more lonely than they were before they entered it."

MANIPULATING IS A VIOLATION

He said one might learn how to manipulate other people, "but that's violating the rules." He also does not think sensitivity training should be done on teenagers.

"Potentially it could be very dangerous to teens," Dr. Snyder said. "It is clear that nobody, including the psychiatrists, know how to work with teen-agers. With them, you should stick with communications skills and some of the basics of getting along with people. A teen-ager's identity is very fragile. You may tear him apart without knowing that you are. What they need is experience in being in places where they are treated as human beings."

"In some sessions, everybody will go after one person for what he's doing or not doing for the group. No holds are barred, in some forms. This is more than most teen-agers can take."

Dr. Snyder said sessions that lead to table thumping, shouting, and crying, need leaders "who know how to get contact back with these people."

HELP DISCOVER FEELINGS

But if it's done right, and with the right people, Dr. Snyder believes such sessions would "help people discover what their own feelings and attitudes are toward other people and what strategies they have used toward others."

But to Edgar C. Bundy, executive secretary of the Church League of America, Wheaton, "the main purpose appears to be the breakdown of all inhibitions, moral and physical, of the participants." He believes it is "turning some people into manipulated zombies."

The League's News & Views newsletter of October, 1968, attempted to describe some of the things done in sensitivity training and give its views on their merits.

It described nonverbal communications exercises in which people held hands for two hours without speaking and were instructed to allegedly "get really acquainted with your group. Let them realize that you are interested in them."

COMMUNAL KISSING MILL

The newsletter went on to say that what followed was a "communal kissing mill." It described reports of other sessions with five men rocking a girl like a baby, men hugging each other, and people wrestling on the floor and slapping each other to awaken sensory awareness.

The newsletter writer admitted there is no traceable link among all groups practicing sensitivity training, but added the opinion that "this does not negate the historical fact that self-criticism is a step in the communist brainwashing technique."

But parents who wrote *The Tribune* were not talking about communistic influences. Some said they were concerned because a person had to "tell all" in such a session, and eventually told all the family troubles and gave others ammunition to use against them. Others said they believed that those controlling the sessions could thus control the minds and opinions of the children and mold them for a cause.

SELECTED QUOTES FROM THE LAVRENTIA BERIA RUSSIAN TEXTBOOK ON PSYCHOPOLITICS

(Prepared by Marilyn A. Angle, registered nurse, in her affidavit before the Santa Monica Board of Education, Jan. 13, 1969.)

I have selected quotes which relate especially to children, as the "one generation", the "important person" to which Beria refers:

"You must labor until we have dominion over the minds and bodies of every important person in your nation."

"You can change their loyalties by psychopolitics. . . . However, you labor under certain dangers. It may happen that remedies for our 'treatments' may be discovered. It may occur that a public hue and cry may arise against 'mental healing.' It may thus occur that all mental healing might be placed in the hands of ministers and be taken out of the hands of our psychologists and psychiatrists. But the Capitalistic thirst for control, Capitalistic inhumanity and a general public tempor of insanity can be brought to guard against these things. But should they occur, should independent researchers actually discover means to undo psychopolitical procedures, you must not rest, you must not eat or sleep, you must not stint one tiniest bit of available money to campaign against it, discredit it, strike it down and render it void. For by an effective means all our actions and researches could be undone.

"... you are aided on all sides by the corruption of the philosophy of man and the times. You will discover that everything will aid you in your campaign to seize, control and use all 'mental healing' to spread our doctrine and rid us of our enemies within their own borders.

"Use the courts, use the judges, use the constitution of the country, use its medical societies and its laws to further our ends. Do not stint in your labor in this direction. And when you have succeeded you will discover that you can now effect your own legislation at will and you can, by careful organization of healing societies, by constant campaign about the terrors of society, by pretense as to your effectiveness make your Capitalist himself, by his own appropriation, finance a large portion of the quiet Communist conquest of the nation. (Emphasis supplied.)

"By psychopolitics create chaos. Leave a nation leaderless. Kill our enemies. And bring to Earth, through Communism, the greatest peace Man has ever known."

From Chapter I . . . "In view of the tremendous advance of Russian Culture in the field of mental technologies, begun with the glorious work of Pavlov and carried forward so ably by later Russians, it would be strange that an art and science would not evolve totally devoted to the aligning of loyalties and extracting the obedience of individuals and multitudes.

"Thus we see that psychopolitical procedures are a natural outgrowth of practices as old as Man, practices which are current in every group of men throughout the world. Thus, in psychopolitical procedures there is no ethical problem, since it is obvious and evident that Man is always coerced against

his will to the greater good of the State, whether by economic gains or indoctrination into the wishes and desires of the State.

"Basically, Man is an animal. He is an animal which has been given a civilized veneer. Man is a collective animal, grouped together for his own protection before the threat of environment. Those who so group and control him must have in their possession specialized techniques to direct the vagaries and energies of the animal Man toward greater efficiency in the accomplishment of the goals of the State.

"The definition of Psychopolitics follows: Psychopolitics is the art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties . . . and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through 'mental healing' . . . children normally furnish the best targets, and these can be operated against without restraint . . . it is of utmost importance that the psychopolitical operatives infiltrates the healing arts of a nation marked for conquest.

"In rearranging loyalties we must have a command of their values. In the animal the first loyalty is to himself. This is destroyed by demonstrating errors to him, showing him that he does not remember, cannot act or does not trust himself. The second loyalty is to his family unit, his parents and brothers and sisters. This is destroyed by making a family unit economically non-dependent, by lessening the value of marriage, by making an easiness of divorce and by raising the children wherever possible by the State.

"Denying a Capitalist country easy access to courts, bringing about the supporting propaganda to destroy the home, creating and continuous juvenile delinquency, forcing upon the state all manner of practices to divorce the child from it will in the end create the chaos necessary . . .

"Under the saccharine guise of assistance to them . . . the child can be driven in his teens into revolt. Delinquency will ensue.

"By making readily available drugs of various kinds, by giving the teen-ager alcohol, by praising his wildness, by stimulating him with sex literature and advertising to him or her practices as taught at the Sexpol, the psychopolitical operator can create the necessary attitude of chaos, idleness and worthlessness into which can then be cast the solution which will give the teen-ager complete freedom everywhere . . .

"Should it be possible to continue conscription beyond any reasonable time by promoting unpopular wars and other means the draft can always stand as a further barrier to the progress of youth in life, destroying any immediate hope to participate in his nation's civil life . . .

"If we could effectively kill the national pride and patriotism of just one generation we will have won that country. Therefore there must be continual propaganda abroad to undermine the loyalty of the citizens in general and the teen ager in particular.

"The ride of the psychopolitical operator in this is very strong. He can, from his position as an authority on the mind, advise all manner of destructive measures. He can teach the lack of control of this child at home. He can instruct, in an optimum situation, the entire nation in how to handle children—and instruct them so that the children, given no control, given no real home, can run wildly about with no responsibility for their nation or themselves.

"The misalignment of the loyalty of youth to a Capitalistic nation sets the proper stage for a realignment of their loyalties with . . . Creating a greed for drugs, sexual misbehavior and uncontrolled freedom and presenting this to them as a benefit . . . will with ease bring about our alignment . . . the character of the girl or boy must be altered carefully into criminal channels and a control by blackmail or other means must be maintained.

"Thus the subject of loyalties and their realignment is in fact the subject of non-armed conquest of an enemy.

"Psychoanalysis has the very valuable possession of a vocabulary, and a workability . . . It can be made fashionable throughout mental health organizations, and by learning its patter, and by believing they see some of its phenomena, the members of mental health groups can believe themselves conversant with mental health. Because its stress is sex, it is, itself, an adequate defamation of character, and serves the purposes of degradation well.

"If a group of persons interested in suppressing juvenile delinquency, in caring for the insane, and the promotion of psychopolitical operatives and their actions can be formed in every major city of a country under conquest, the success of a psychopolitical program is assured, since these groups seem to represent a large segment of the population.

"Constant pressure in the legislature of the United States can bring about legislation to the effect that every student attending a high school or university must have classes in psychology.

"... we had to destroy, after many, many years of the most arduous work the Church, so we must destroy all faiths in nations marked for conquest . . . We have battled in America since the century's turn to bring to nothing any and all Christian influences and we are succeeding."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 12, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three: but the greatest of these is love.—1 Corinthians 13: 13.

O Thou eternal source of wisdom, power, and love, lead us through all the changes of this life upon earth to rest our spirits upon Thee. Help us to see Thee more clearly, to think about Thee more frequently, to pray to Thee more earnestly, and to do Thy will more faithfully. In Thee may we find confidence and courage for the living of these days.

In our minds we name before Thee those near and dear to us, and others whose lives have blended with ours and bring to us a sense of privilege and

responsibility. Do Thou bless them mightily and sustain them in Thy service. Lay Thou Thy hand upon all those who are sick, comfort those who are sad, give courage to the discouraged, strength to the weak, light to those who sit in darkness, and love to those who would keep bitterness in their hearts.

We pray for our beloved land that we as a nation of free people may choose wisely, live worthily, relate ourselves to others affirmatively, and dare to be pioneers in brotherhood, strengthening the hands of those who would lead us in the paths of peace. Together may we go forward to build the kingdom of justice and truth and love among the children of men.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDER TO PAY TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK BOYKIN, OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, early this morning one of our former colleagues, Frank Boykin, passed away.