

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT LIVES LIFE OF THE BLIND FOR A WEEK

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have long been a staunch supporter of our country's young people. I believe the vast majority of them are serious minded, responsible individuals who have a genuine concern for their fellowman.

Occasionally, one of them does something so outstanding that it deserves special attention. Such is the case with David Doepken, a student at Triadelphia High School, in Wheeling, W. Va. This young man placed patches over his eyes and for a week lived the life of the blind. He then reported his experiences in a moving article published in his school newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column by Don Daniels on this experiment, published in the Wheeling News-Register of April 11, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT LIVES LIFE OF THE BLIND FOR A WEEK

(By Don Daniels)

This is not an inside job.

If anyone else had done it, I would feel the same.

It just happens that the performance we are about to examine was made by David Doepken. Dave is the son of my good friend, my colleague, my compatriot and my dog's aunt, Kate J. Doepken who is known in social circles as Kitty Jefferson Doepken.

Kate deserves Dave. Anyone as nice as she is entitled to a blessing now and then.

I have a sort of fondness for Dave because even in a short time I think I and the Small Tiger watched him grow up. And that kid grew plenty up, I'll tell ya. But we watched him become transformed from a snotty kid to a man of stature and that, I say, is a rare privilege. I sort of hope Dave gets into the newspaper business and becomes one of the talented poor or into some other racket and someday owns his own golf cart.

Dave did this . . . he went blind for a week.

I wish you would get the April 9 issue of the Triadelphian, the school newspaper. In it, Dave tells how it was to be sightless. And he tells it well. And he gives old, blase gaffers like me pause. He makes me think.

Now I know Dave did this and because he is the kind of man he is he did it in total honesty. He put patches over his eyes and kept them there. Even at home. He lived in darkness and groped his way through dressing and meals and harrassed his mother and found a few whole truths that will last with him forever.

He went to school blind and was led around by classmates and some fool teacher was unhappy with it and said he should have completed his sightless project in a single day. It was the teacher who was blind.

I wish you to get the Triadelphian and read what David wrote but now, because it is important, I am going to repeat some of the things he said . . .

He went to an oil painting class and his mother said if he were really blind, painting would be the first thing he'd give up. David said, "Beethoven did his best composing when he was stone deaf . . . if I were really blind I would paint for even if I could not see I could imagine and even though I could not get pleasure from seeing what I had created, I still would have created it and that is pleasurable . . ."

What he created was a picture of a clown and it is magnificent.

Pay strict attention to this paragraph: "When you are blind, everybody is beautiful. After thinking about it I realized that was not true. The senior boy who scared me by swatting me in the nose was not beautiful, but ugly. So, when you are blind you judge people by what they do and say, not by how they look. For this reason someone considered ugly and offensive to look at can be beautiful to a blind person. Perhaps, in this way, we should all be a little more blind . . ."

Now citizen, ponder that. Dave made himself no hero in his experiment. He admits he got "nervous and irritable." That he had a "chip on my shoulder because others could see and I could not." Dave is a total male and the sonofagun is taller than I am and it would not be his nature to have anything less than a chip on his shoulder.

Dave doesn't quit easily. He doesn't quit at all.

And the thing I would like you to consider, my friend, in all of this, is that Dave Doepken did a wildly wonderful thing. On his own. He conducted an experiment in tragedy and boy, it makes me proud that he is around. That there are so many of him.

Young people continually astound me. Not the ones with the beards and one string guitars. The ones like Dave who want to take an inside look at life. The ones who see through blindness. I think it was a stirring thing this young man did. And a splendid thing that his fellow students would abide by his self imposed affliction.

I believe it shows that these young people have imagination and energy and a thought process considerably beyond the wounded outcries of rock and roll singers. Dave showed me something and he made me a little ashamed. I never did a thing like that.

Once, during his blindness Dave met a tree. He wrote this:

"I wrapped my arms around the tree. Squeezed it. Hugged it. For five days I had been in darkness; for five days I had been more alone than ever in my life and for five days I had been insecure. Suddenly I had hold of something firm, strong and bigger than I. I thought it was a wonderful, kind and beautiful tree . . ."

That wasn't a tree Dave embraced, it was God and I think he knows it.

I have read David's story in the Triadelphian and I hope you will too. I'll tell you this . . .

It made me see a little.

ENGINEERING AT ARLINGTON

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas at Arlington last month was recognized for its excellent school of engineering by the establishment there of a doctoral program in the field of en-

gineering. This action by the board of regents of the University of Texas system is extraordinarily gratifying in view of the fact that it was only 10 years ago, in 1959, that the University of Texas at Arlington was advanced from a 2-year to a 4-year college.

The regents' chairman, Frank C. Erwin, Jr., of Austin, in urging approval of the new doctoral program, noted that Arlington already had "one of the outstanding engineering schools in the country."

Located in one of our Nation's fastest growing centers of science and technology—North Texas—the university is destined to exercise an ever more significant role in Texas and the entire United States.

The achievement of the University of Texas at Arlington is such as to make Texans and all Americans proud of such dedicated and vigorous pursuit of excellence in education.

I here insert excerpts from an article from the Texas Times describing the achievement of the University of Texas at Arlington.

ENGINEERING AT ARLINGTON

(By Ken Whitt)

Organized in 1959 when the institution was advanced from junior college to four-year status, UT Arlington's School of Engineering has received the Engineers' Council for Professional Development (ECPD) accreditation, a nationally coveted stamp of approval, for all its programs.

No one recognizes the engineering developments at UT Arlington more fully than the school's chief engineer and architect, Dr. Wendell H. Nedderman, an Iowan who served on Iowa State University and Texas A&M University faculties before coming to Arlington almost 10 years ago as the school's first dean of engineering. Today he also serves as vice president for academic affairs and associate dean of graduate studies.

Dr. Nedderman and his department heads have recruited a young, dedicated faculty totaling 49 full-time personnel teaching in degree-granting departments with 37 of them holding earned doctoral degrees. How does a young engineering school without a graduate program attract an outstanding faculty?

BUILT-IN LOCATION

"We couldn't offer the ivory-covered wall concept of an established, prestigious engineering school," Dr. Nedderman says, "so we stressed the school's built-in location and future prospects for graduate work. Now when we look at our list of faculty, we're saying we are in the graduate business because we have recruited a diversified group of individuals with Ph. D. background from graduate schools coast-to-coast."

Among the school's other impressive credentials are:

A long list of faculty publications and research accomplishments, even before the graduate program was developed.

Baccalaureate degree production equal to two-thirds of the total North Texas output, and growing rapidly.

Graduates scoring almost 200 points above the national average on the Graduate Record Examination.

A strong group of student technical societies which have won more than their share of state and regional awards.

Because of the school's outstanding faculty and facilities, and an engineering enrollment

of approximately 3,000 students with a better-than-average scholastic aptitude, UT Arlington has been able to receive ECPD accreditation in almost record time.

"In the past it has taken most engineering schools 10 to 15 years to achieve accreditation," Dr. Nedderman explains. "We did it in four to six years."

FIFTY PUBLICATIONS

UT Arlington's engineering faculty, representing a coast-to-coast spectrum of 21 different engineering schools, presently holds more than 30 offices and committee positions at state and national levels in technical and professional societies. As a group they were credited with more than 50 publications last year.

The School of Engineering's total enrollment last fall was 3,306, which includes about 100 graduate students and another 600 enrolled in two-year engineering technology program and pre-architecture. UT Arlington has 2,598 engineering majors, only three less than the undergraduate enrollment at UT Austin, which ranks second in the state behind Texas A&M. UT Austin and UT Arlington rank 19th and 20th in size, respectively, in the nation.

Despite national and state trends toward declining numbers of engineering graduates, UT Arlington has increased its total student credit hours in engineering at a remarkable rate, almost doubling since 1962. Dr. Nedderman says the upward trend at Arlington should continue because of transfer students from junior colleges in Dallas and Tarrant Counties.

"A conservative estimate is that the annual number of bachelor's degrees granted here will double within the next five years," he says.

ABOVE NATIONAL AVERAGE

For the past few years, all graduates of UT Arlington have taken the Graduate Record Examination. The average total aptitude score for engineering graduates last year was 1,142. The national average was 963. Almost 80 per cent of the senior engineers scored about 1,000, the minimum required for admission to graduate school in the UT System. Ninety-six per cent of the seniors scored above the national average on the mathematics portion of the exam.

UT Arlington graduates have been accepted and completed graduate degree programs at prominent engineering institutions all over the United States. The dean of a leading out-of-state engineering school recently commented:

"In recent years we have had the good fortune to attract Arlington graduates to our program and their performance has been more than satisfactory. Their capabilities demonstrate the excellent scholastic background that is expected from graduates of a respected university; we would like to have more."

Arlington student technical groups have distinguished themselves in state and regional contests. An electrical engineering student submitted the best paper in Region V (includes 13 states) competition in 1964 and 1968. Civil engineering students have won the state student paper contest three times and placed second twice in six years of competing.

NATIONAL COMMENDATION

In addition, the Arlington chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers has won the state attendance award four times and a national commendation once in five years of competition. The student chapter of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics won third place in national competition for the 1967 Bendix Award. An aerospace engineering student placed second in national student paper competition last year, and the chapter of the Society of Automotive Engineers was named the outstanding student branch in the nation last year.

Earlier this year UT Arlington received a chapter of Tau Beta Pi, the national engineering society. A chapter of Eta Kappa Nu, national electrical engineering honor society, was formed in 1966, and a chapter for Chi Epsilon, national civil engineering honor society, also has been granted.

Among the 13 student technical and honor societies at Arlington are the Society of Women Engineers (first in Texas) and American Helicopter Society (first in the nation).

DOUBLES EACH YEAR

UT Arlington's graduate program, which got under way in the fall of 1966 with master's degree offerings in electrical engineering and engineering mechanics, has doubled each year. This spring 29 graduate courses are being taught in fields of electrical, civil, industrial and mechanical engineering and engineering mechanics with 217 students enrolled.

Classes are taught in the school's 127,999-square-foot, four-floor Engineering Building constructed in 1960 for about \$2 million. The 30 engineering laboratories, totaling about 50,000 square feet, contain more than \$1 million in specialized instructional equipment. Dr. Nedderman emphasizes that, partly due to timing, the labs are equipped with the most modern equipment.

Back in 1960 a national report indicated that engineering education across the country had changed its course drastically. Emphasis was being placed on "building block courses" rather than "state of the art courses," the report said. Instead of "how to do" courses, students were given "tools to do" and labs had to have new equipment.

ENVIABLE POSITION

"We found ourselves in a very enviable position," Dr. Nedderman says. "We were not holding the bag with obsolete equipment or white elephants. We developed our labs with the new look—instrumentation, not stereotyped machinery."

"Today we have dual-purpose labs equipped for instruction purposes and research. If we had started before 1960 we would have had single-purpose labs. Dual-purpose labs allowed us to develop our research capabilities," he said.

Obviously one of the major factors in the growth and development of the engineering programs at Arlington is the location of the institution. The campus is near the center of Dallas-Fort Worth's two million population centroid.

ADDRESS BY DR. HARRY M. PHILPOTT, PRESIDENT, AUBURN UNIVERSITY

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ALLEN, Mr. President, Auburn University is one of the Nation's outstanding universities. We in Alabama are extremely proud of Auburn and equally proud to have the services of Dr. Harry M. Philpott, one of the Nation's best qualified and most respected educators, in the office of president of the university.

On March 13, 1969, Dr. Philpott delivered the winter-quarter commencement address at Auburn and used the occasion to review the origin of the now famous Auburn Creed and to expound on the tenets of that creed in a truly inspiring message.

Dr. Philpott's address and the tenets of the Auburn Creed are particularly relevant today in a period characterized by tensions and turmoil on some college campuses throughout the Nation. I commend the significant address to the thoughtful consideration of all who are genuinely interested in the development of a sound commonsense philosophy of higher education.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WHAT ARE YOU FOR?

(Address by Dr. Harry M. Philpott)

It is from lines found in Oliver Goldsmith's poem, "The Deserted Village," that this community and this University received its name. I wonder how many of you, with all the many interests and activities you have had here, have read the poem and are familiar with its viewpoint. Perhaps at some future date you may turn nostalgically to the opening words and recall with affection your experiences here:

"Sweet Auburn! loveliest village of the plain;
Where health and plenty cheered the labouring swain,
Where smiling spring its earliest visit paid,
And parting summer's lingering blooms delayed:
Dear lovely bowers of innocence and ease,
Seats of my youth, when every sport could please,
How often have I loitered o'er thy green,
Where humble happiness endeared each scene!"

Goldsmith wrote the poem in 1770 as a protest against the expanding industrialization of England, its preoccupation with trade and commerce and the assumed decline of the pleasant rural life he had known. Some of his warnings are timeless in their applications, such as:

"Ill fares the land, to hasten ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

On the whole, however, it was a plea to stop the flow of progress and return to a more bucolic existence. Some of the evils he described were real but many of his dire warnings were against imagined adversaries. In a time of great change he followed the futile path of trying to stop or turn back the clock. Perhaps he might have been better advised to heed the words of the immortal Satchel Paige: "Never look back—somebody may be gaining on you."

I am sure that among the members of this graduating class, facing the great opportunities of the future in an age of dynamic change, there is little tendency to look back to a former imagined golden era. You know that even "Sweet Auburn, Loveliest Village of the Plain" will not be the same when you return in the future. Rather than resistors of change, yours is a generation that both embraces it and, in many cases, avidly seeks it. Your awareness of the things that are wrong in our society today and your determination to do something about these has never been more manifest in any younger generation.

It is against this backdrop that I wish to share a final word of counsel and caution with you. Rightly or wrongly, I have the feeling that many people today know all too much about what they are *against* and all too little about what they are *for*. This has been impressed on me recently as I have traveled about the state in an effort to improve our educational system in Alabama. Individuals will begin by saying, "I am for a better program of education, but . . ." and

then will proceed to talk at great length about their opposition to certain educational programs, policies, and particularly additional taxes needed to enhance the quality of our system. We have seen it also nationally in the small group of students who seem bent on destroying the university as we know it today but who have nothing positive to offer in its place. Some have been described by a keen observer as "sad young men who throw dead cats into sanctuaries and then go roistering down life's highway." My ear still aches from a recent airplane trip when I had the misfortune to be sitting by an individual who effectively opposed almost every aspect of our national policy for a solid hour without suggesting a single positive alternative. The outlook I speak of was once effectively described by one of my former professors as "trying to live on negatives."

This temptation faces each of us. It is much easier to criticize someone or some policy than it is to be positively constructive. Perhaps you have had the experience of a broken love affair. Can you recall how difficult it was to find the words to express your affection and appreciation to another person and after the breakup how easy it was to condemn and revile? Words of love come slowly while words of condemnation flow forth like a never-ending stream. One recalls the words of Jesus that it is much easier to go about taking the specks out of the eyes of other people than it is to deal with the planks that we have in our own eyes.

Your mothers and fathers who are here today will remember a song that was popular in some of their own courting days. The lines went like this: "Accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, latch on to the affirmative, don't mess with Mr. Inbetween." The advice is still appropriate today. Confronting a world that desperately needs solutions to its problems, never be content with simply the role of a critic. Tennyson once said that in his poetry, he tried to take the hiss out of the English language. I submit to you that this is a worthy purpose for your own lives and service.

Auburn University has been built by people who were for something positive. Our American democracy rests upon statements of positive principles. Our human rights are of little value as negatives but must find positive expression. It does little good to have freedom of speech if we have nothing to say, to enjoy freedom of the press if there is nothing worth printing, and to have freedom of worship unless there is the experience of genuine worship.

My plea is that you may leave Auburn with a positive faith and some firm convictions. Throughout the existence of this institution, no purpose has had more importance than this. In 1944 a group of Auburn students expressed the desire to capture in verbal form the essence of the Auburn spirit. They enlisted the aid of Dr. George Petrie, beloved teacher and administrator for over fifty-five years, who expressed it in a series of positive statements that we know as the Auburn Creed. I have always been impressed by the fact that these positive statements find similar expression in the tenets of our religious faith. In the words of the late Professor William E. Hocking of Harvard, "There are no rights of man that are not grounded in the conception of the divine value of man. All so-called rights of man which are based only on reason are at the mercy of opportunism."

As a guide for your positive approach to the problems ahead of you, and in contrast to the carping negativism that we hear so often, let me remind you once more of the statement so loved by Auburn men and women, and with the affirmation of this Creed suggest additional undergirding from the Holy Scripture:

I believe that this is a practical world and that I can count only on what I earn. Therefore, I believe in work, hard work.

Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.—Ecl. 9: 10.

I believe in education, which gives me the knowledge to work wisely and trains my mind and my hands to work skillfully.

Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.—2 Timothy 2:15.

I believe in honesty and truthfulness, without which I cannot win the respect and confidence of my fellow men.

Remove from me the way of lying; and grant me thy law graciously. I have chosen the way of truth; thy judgments have I laid before me.—Psalms 119: 29, 30.

I believe in a sound mind in a sound body and a spirit that is not afraid, and in clean sports that develop these qualities.

Glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.—I Corin. 6: 20.

I believe in obedience to law because it protects the rights of all.

Think not I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.—Matt. 5:17.

I believe in the human touch, which cultivates sympathy with my fellow men and mutual helpfulness and brings happiness for all.

Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.—Matt. 7: 12.

I believe in my Country, because it is a land of freedom and because it is my own home, and that I can best serve that country by "doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with my God."

Let the words of my mouth, and the meditations of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer.—Psalms 19: 14.

And because Auburn men and women believe in these things, I believe in Auburn and love it.

With such positive affirmations, or similar ones, we are confident of your great contributions to building a better world in the future.

Today marks the beginning of enlarged responsibilities and greater challenges than you have ever known before. Take pride in what you have achieved but recognize that the greatest challenge lies ahead. In 1577 Sir Francis Drake set sail around the world in the "Golden Hind" and four other ships. Buffeted by gales and storms, only the "Golden Hind" survived the Straits of Magellan, the journey around Cape Horn and up the western coast of South and North America. Landing at what is now San Francisco and which was called New Albion by Drake, the crew faced great discouragement and fear. The unknown Pacific and its perils as well as other unknown waters lay ahead. On that occasion, Drake records that he turned to a prayer in the Book of Common Prayers, I would like to conclude with the same prayer for you today:

"O Lord God, when Thou givest to Thy servants to endeavor any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning but the continuing of the same until it be thoroughly finished which yieldeth the true glory."

GREAT SOCIETY: WHAT IT WAS,
WHERE IT IS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Government which the Nixon administration

inherited from President Johnson has taken on a vastly different character since the Republicans last occupied the White House. Some of these changes were described in an article by Clayton Knowles in the New York Times on December 9, 1968. Because Mr. Knowles' article offers an especially succinct summary of the many areas of Federal involvement that have evolved since 1960, I include his article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

GREAT SOCIETY: WHAT IT WAS, WHERE IT IS—FEDERAL DOMESTIC ROLE HAS INCREASED TENFOLD IN THE JOHNSON ERA

(By Clayton Knowles)

WASHINGTON, December 8.—"Dick Nixon is going to be taking over a government one hell of a lot different than the one he left in January, 1961."

These words, spoken by a departing White House aide, dramatize the change in the Federal domestic role in the last five years because of Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society program.

Joseph A. Califano Jr., President Johnson's man Friday in nurturing the Great Society, said in an interview that President-elect Richard M. Nixon would find that a tenfold growth had occurred in governmental activities designed to "make life better for all Americans."

THERE WERE 45 THEN, 435 NOW

"There were about 45 domestic social programs when the Eisenhower Administration ended," Mr. Califano said. "Now there are no less than 435."

As the Johnson Presidency nears an end, it is possible to look at the Great Society with some perspective and examine a few of its programs.

The larger government role described by Mr. Califano involves more than new laws, though they are counted in the hundreds. Much of the change stems from a new direction of old programs, imparted either by Congressional or administrative action, to meet broader objectives.

Topsy-like at times, the program has grown and in many directions, though authorizations and funding were often cut well below Administration requests. A drumfire of criticism frequently attended a grudging acceptance of principle.

It was said that inflation watered down the dollar value of benefits to the poor, that waste and duplication threatened achievements, that over-promises created problems bigger than those up for solution.

Conservatives urged that the Federal obligation be discharged through general area grants to the states for programs developed at the state level.

The enormous cost of the war in Vietnam limited the amount that could be spent on the social programs. The fact that the war was being accelerated while the Great Society program was being developed made what progress there was all the more remarkable.

Many of the new programs have virtually become household words—Medicare, model cities, the Job Corps, the war on poverty, truth in lending, Head Start and Upward Bound.

PROGRAMS REDIRECTED

Others, such as the insured mortgage loan program of the Federal Housing Administration that spawned the nation's suburban growth, are now being redirected to the cities.

To put a price tag on the vast, somewhat amorphous Great Society is difficult, though it is clear that it represents a national commitment entailing billions of dollars.

Excluding Social Security payments, Mr. Califano estimates that the Great Society

is a \$25.6-billion enterprise, compared with the \$9.9-billion social budget of 1960 and \$12.9-billion of 1963. If Social Security costs are included, he says, \$49-billion is being spent today against \$22-billion eight years ago.

This turnabout in national policy on the homefront, signaled in a speech by President Johnson at University of Michigan commencement exercises on May 22, 1964, constitutes a recognition of mushrooming urban problems as an essential matter of Federal concern.

Though a descendant in many ways of the New Deal, Fair Deal and New Frontier, the Great Society established a new approach to problems that accented working relationships with the region, the state and the city more than direct Federal aid to the individual.

In five years, something of a national consensus has developed in support of comprehensive aid to cities. The recognition is now general that the cities, lacking a broad tax base other than real estate, do not have the resources to meet the many problems in a nation 70 per cent urbanized.

Even an economic conservative such as Representative Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, House Republican leader, acknowledges that huge Federal outlays are needed to meet the urban crisis. He argues only that the money go directly to the states in "broad problem area grants."

President Johnson described the Great Society as "a challenge constantly renewed" in his University of Michigan speech.

"The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all," he said. "It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time. But that is just a beginning.

"The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcomed chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body but the desire for beauty and the hunger for enrichment.

"It is a place where man can renew contact with nature. It is a place which honors creation for its own sake and for what it adds to the understanding of the race. It is a place where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quality of their goods."

Threaded through the address ran the promise of a broad attack on the problems of the poor and underprivileged—housing, education, equal rights and equal opportunity—as well as a drive for environmental improvement—conservation beautification, clean air and clean water—that would benefit all.

The programs that emerged can be grouped under general headings despite constant interaction among elements in different categories, particularly in the cities.

The highlights of the Great Society, by general category:

Cities

Antipoverty Campaign: Begun in 1964 with the Economic Opportunity Act and a one-year authorization of just under \$1-billion, stepped up greatly in later years with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, set up in 1965, increasingly involved.

Transportation: Urban Mass Transportation Acts of 1964 and 1966.

Model Cities: Act of 1966 proposing grants to cities, supplemental to those available from other Federal sources, to fight urban problems in the most blighted areas, including housing, health, education, jobs, welfare, transportation, and public facilities. Funded with \$312-million in the fiscal year 1968. Its

appropriation has been doubled for the coming year.

Rent supplements: Started in 1966 to provide better housing for low-income families, funded far below Administration requests.

Crime Control: Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968, providing block grants to improve state and city law enforcement.

Civil rights

Segregation: Act of 1964 outlawing discrimination in hospitals, restaurants, hotels and employment; authorizing shutoff in Federal aid used in a discriminatory manner.

Voting: Act of 1965 protecting voting rights at the national, state and local level.

Housing: Act of 1968 protecting civil rights workers and initiating fair housing requirements nationally.

Community Relations: Transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce to the Justice Department.

Conservation

Water Pollution: Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 under which \$5.5-billion in grants have been made for water purification and sewage treatment plants.

Air Pollution: Clean Air Act and Air Quality Acts of 1965 and 1967 seeking air cleansing through regional grants.

Waste: Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965.

Roads: Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to cover 75 per cent of the cost of removing roadside eyesores.

Recreation: Urban beautification under the Urban Renewal Act, including the creation of vest pocket parks in congested areas.

Parks: Expansion of the national park system by 2.2-million acres.

Consumer protection

Meat: Meat Inspection Act of 1967, requiring states to enforce Federal standards or yield to Federal inspection.

Poultry: Poultry Inspection Act of 1968.

Fabrics: Establishment of Product Safety Commission in 1967 to study dangerous household products and flammable fabrics amendments to a 1953 act directing the Secretary of Commerce to fix safety standards in clothing.

Farm Prices: Food Marketing Commission set up to study farm-to-consumer prices.

Truth In Lending: Act of 1968 requiring dollar-and-cents accounting of actual costs under "easy credit" and other financing plans.

Packaging: Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

Electronics: Hazardous Radiation Act designed to reduce possible harmful effects of television and other electronic house devices.

Traffic: Traffic and Highway Safety Act setting standards to be met by manufacturers for automobile safety.

Education

Elementary Schools: Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, strengthened in 1966, providing stepped-up aid to 100 per cent in 1970 for quality education, including text books for public and private schools, with a \$9.2-billion authorization for the next two years.

Higher Education: Act of 1965 providing liberal loans, scholarship and facility construction money.

Teacher Corps: Act of 1965 to train teachers.

Aid to Poor: Educational Opportunity Act of 1968 to help poor go to college.

Adult Education: Act of 1968.

Job opportunity

Training: Manpower Development and Training Act of 1964 to qualify persons for new and better jobs.

Job Corps: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 setting up Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps and new careers programs.

Business: Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, which, under the leadership of the National Alliance of Businessmen, seeks 500,000 jobs for hard-core unemployed.

Appalachia: Program of 1965 seeking economic development and jobs in 11-state economically depressed area.

Wage: Increase in minimum wage by 35 cents to \$1.60.

Health

Medicare: Set up in 1965, insurance for 20 million citizens at 65 under the Social Security system to cover hospital and doctor costs.

Medicaid: Act of 1965, providing medical care for the needy, with 7.7 million people in 43 states now getting aid.

Doctors Training: Health Professions Act of 1963-65 seeking to train 1,700 doctors.

Nurses Training: Act of 1964, which has already provided 65,000 loans for schooling.

Mental Health: Program of 1965-66, providing centers for treatment and training.

Immunization: Program for preschool children against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus and measles, under which, for example, the annual incidence of measles dropped from 450,000 in 1963 to 62,000 last year.

Health Centers: Heart, cancer and stroke regional centers.

Child Health: Improvement and Protection Act of 1968 for prenatal and postnatal care.

CLIMATE RIPE

Much of all this legislation had been sought for years, and when Mr. Johnson took office after the assassination of President Kennedy, the climate was apparently ripe for breakthroughs.

President Johnson moved quickly, and kept up the pace after the landslide election in 1964 brought him large majorities in the House and Senate.

Negro rioting in the slums in 1966, capped by a Republican gain of 47 seats in the still-Democratic House, slowed the Great Society.

The election strengthened the Southern Democrat-conservative Republican coalition that had repeatedly blocked many of these projects in the past.

The Administration sought \$662-million for the fiscal year 1968 ending last June 30 to fund the model cities program. It got \$312-million. It sought \$1-billion for 1969 and got \$625-million.

However, observers considered it significant that a modest expansion of the Great Society was nevertheless made during the 90th Congress.

While noting that the Vietnam war intensified during the developing stages of the Great Society, Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said recently that the choice was "not between guns and butter."

"There is a third factor—quality of life," he said. "It is a decision every American must face. A third of our families have two or more cars, 15 million of us own yachts. There is a lot of money for liquor and cigarettes. We've got the money but we've got to establish our priorities."

He said that "the United States can eliminate poverty in the coming decade and go on to assure adequate income for the overwhelming majority of Americans."

THE POVERTY LINE

Mr. Cohen noted that since 1960 the Government had "lifted 18 million out of poverty." He defined the poverty line as \$3,300 annually for a city family of four. Still below the poverty level are 21.9 million Americans.

There are other Administration claims of progress, such as 10.5 million jobs created in seven and a half years, salaries and wages up 72 per cent in the period, corporate profits after taxes up 61 per cent, three record years with unemployment below 3.8 per cent,

the Federal education budget up \$12-million, \$5.5-million spent for housing and community development.

Many impartial observers find it hard to disagree with most claims, which are accompanied with details on the job still to be done.

During the recent national campaign, Mr. Nixon did not reject any significant facet of the Great Society but at various times suggested that the drive for a better America could be achieved more effectively by other means.

He favored, for example, tax incentives to draw business more actively into the campaign against poverty and related programs.

But the country will probably have to wait until the new President's inaugural address Jan. 20 for a clearer idea of the course of the Great Society.

DIFFICULTIES THAT FACE PRESIDENT PUSEY, OF HARVARD

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, writing in the New York Times of Sunday, April 13, 1969, James Reston put in perspective the difficulties facing President Pusey, of Harvard.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's excellent article, captioned "The Harvard Faculty: Tactics or Principles?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE HARVARD FACULTY: TACTICS OR PRINCIPLES?

(By James Reston)

Somebody should say a few plain words in support of President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard before he too gets swept away by the moral confusions of our time.

He is a political innocent and not a popular president with the students or the faculty—never has been—but his record in defending the integrity of a free university cannot be seriously challenged. He defended it from Joe McCarthy's attacks on the right when many more "popular" men ducked the issue. And he defended it from the onslaughts of the militant wing of the Students for a Democratic Society in the recent riot in University Hall.

THE FACULTY DIVISION

In all these confrontations between the S.D.S. and the administrators of the universities, there are always hard choices about calling the police to quell the riot, but one would have thought the facts of the original aggression in the Harvard case were so clear that the faculty, at least, would have been able in four hours of debate to draw a clear distinction between the morals and the tactics of the incident.

It is true that the faculty did not actually repudiate Pusey, but they sure did hesitate. On two occasions they rejected resolutions which would have been a clear vote of "no-confidence" in his handling of the attack on the university. But they waffled and divided narrowly on the issue—about 250 to 200—first on a resolution saying his calling the police was "unwise and ill-considered," and the other resolution tabling a clear vote of confidence in him which might have been defeated.

Maybe this was their way of embarrassing

the president for other reasons, but if they want to get rid of him on his stewardship in general, they have the means to face that issue squarely. His record in this particular case and in other cases involving the rights of students and the integrity of free inquiry, however, scarcely justify this kind of grudging support in a moment of crisis.

HARVARD'S FREEDOM

Nobody can complain about lack of freedom or abuse of administration authority at Harvard. It is even harder to get kicked out of the place than to get into it, which may have been what the S.D.S. had in mind. There is no secret alliance between Harvard and the Pentagon. Mr. Pusey may have been unwise in giving the impression, after denying academic credit for R.O.T.C. courses, that he was trying to perpetuate the R.O.T.C. system at Harvard anyway, but his record of freedom is not only plain but is the cause of much muttering among the alumni about his "permissiveness".

Of course, it is repulsive to have cops on any university campus, and tactically, the damage to the university might or might not have been less if he had let the S.D.S. burglar the files and print the loot in the underground's press. But what do you do when students take over buildings, steal documents, and throw deans to the photographers?

If the faculty, which is responsible for discipline, will not speak out clearly on this plain issue of the original affront and humiliation to the university and its purposes, how will they ever defend the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes?

The principle of peaceful change and of opposing the using of force of political ends has been fought out in this country for many generations. Lincoln faced the agony of a Civil War to defend it. Teddy Roosevelt challenged the "robber barons" when they sought to defy the principle early in the century. Labor defied the principle with the first sit-ins in Detroit in the thirties and now we are facing the same challenge from S.D.S. on the left.

This is not to say that force is never justified. We became an independent country by using force against the constituted authority. The blacks in this country have many grievances that are not removed by peaceful debate. And even at Columbia University there were appalling stupidities that no amount of polite discourse seemed to change.

GABBIEST PLACE—HARVARD

But Harvard? Who is muzzled there? It is the gabbiest place in Christendom, and so free that even its faculty sometimes gives the impression that it would rather talk about tactics than think about principles.

The Harvards have been telling us for generations that they were just like other people, only better. And now both points are in dispute.

THE CONSUMER CRUSADE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the 90th Congress in consumer protection have led some observers to conclude that the consumer's problems are being adequately handled through piecemeal legislation. In fact, a number of these laws are not being properly executed or have been largely diluted as a result of weak enforcement procedures.

The following article, "The Consumer

Crusade," by Nick Kotz in the April 1969 issue of the Progressive, identifies the need to provide consumers with proper representation in Federal agencies. I personally believe that a Department of Consumer Affairs is the best way to insure that the steadily increasing body of consumer laws is effectively administered.

I am happy that over 100 Members of the Congress have sponsored legislation like my bill to create such a Department.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE CONSUMER CRUSADE

(By Nick Kotz)¹

When Presidential candidate Richard Nixon talked about consumer issues during the 1968 campaign, he hinted he would not need a White House adviser on consumer affairs. The consumer would have to protect himself in the Republican free enterprise market place. When, as President, Mr. Nixon first ventured into the consumer arena, he confirmed the worst fears of consumer advocates by appointing as his consultant Willie Mae Rogers, keeper of the Good Housekeeping "Seal of Approval."

The appointment of Miss Rogers brought joy mainly to private-interest trade groups such as the Grocery Manufacturers of America. But this achievement of their continued alliance against truth-in-packaging and mandatory standards on product safety did not last long. Mr. Nixon heard the outcry of conflict of interest and took just four days to realize that consumer protection was no longer a mini-issue; he terminated Miss Rogers' appointment.

The "keeper of the Seal" episode is a good point from which to begin assessing the consumer movement—for it is a "movement" which must be calculated in terms of its strengths and weaknesses, its enemies and advocates, and, for the next four years, in terms of what support it may get from the Nixon Administration.

Mr. Nixon now knows from his abortive appointment of Willie Mae Rogers that consumer issues can be political dynamite and that the public can learn quickly of any subtle Government efforts to downgrade consumer activities. His second choice for his adviser on consumer affairs will be watched carefully. So will his appointments to the regulatory agencies and so will the crucial White House policy positions taken on the numerous consumer issues now before Congress and the regulatory agencies.

For example, will the Nixon Administration move to enforce effectively the mass of consumer legislation enacted during the Johnson years? This legislation itself could become "a deceptive practice" if it is not funded and enforced.

The first signs have not been promising, especially the appointment of Georgia State Agriculture Commissioner J. Phil Campbell as Undersecretary of Agriculture. A Democrat recently turned Republican, Campbell led the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture in a bitter fight against the meat and poultry inspection legislation enacted by Congress in 1967 and 1968. Moreover, Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin has given Campbell the job of negotiating inspection regulations "acceptable" to the

¹ Nick Kotz is a Washington correspondent for the Des Moines Register. He won both a Pulitzer Prize and the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award in 1968 for his reporting of improper conditions in the meat packing industry which led to passage of the Wholesale Meat Act. In 1966 he won the Clapper and Sigma Delta Chi awards for his Washington correspondence. He is now completing a book on the politics of hunger.

latter's cronies in state agricultural agencies. These state officials fought strict regulation and still decline to accept the evidence that state-inspected plants under their jurisdiction constituted a national scandal.

Hardin now says he has no plans to seek change of these laws, but two consumer-oriented Democrats, Representatives Neal Smith of Iowa and Thomas Foley of Washington, authors of the legislation, are watching Campbell's guarded moves. They would be encouraged, for example, if the U.S. Department of Agriculture were to follow through on the proposal it made during the Johnson Administration to limit fat content in meat, such as hot dogs, to thirty per cent. The industry is angrily protesting even this mild proposal.

Discussing the fragile characters of recent consumer victories, Ralph Nader picked out auto safety, flammable fabrics, and pipeline safety as examples where "promises of consumer legislation can become fraudulent if the legislation cannot deliver because lobbyists successfully go to work on the appropriations and rule-making process."

Nader pointed out that the auto safety law suffered a setback because appropriations were slashed so sharply that there are no funds to develop a prototype safety car and a proving ground facility needed to upgrade safety standards.

"The flammable fabrics act still has not been implemented," said Nader, "and the petroleum industry is now opposing proposed pipeline safety standards that the industry claimed it was voluntarily following before passage of the safety bill." This is often the case with so-called voluntary industry standards when they become, or threaten to become, law.

Other new consumer laws which still await appropriations and enforcement include the truth-in-packaging and truth-in-lending laws. "Packaging" is endangered by weak Federal rule-making which permits too many package variations, and the "lending" law by a proposed "uniform consumers credit code" at the state level. This proposed code, designed to supersede the Federal law, would, among other evils, permit a thirty-six per cent interest rate. It was denounced by Representative Wright Patman as "legalized usury and an attempt to wipe out truth in lending."

The clinical laboratory improvement act, the hazardous radiation act, and the interstate sales disclosures act (against fraudulent land sale schemes) are other examples of hard-won consumer protection victories. Whether these will be implemented still remains to be seen.

Senator Edmund Muskie underscored the gulf between promise and performance when he recently warned the Consumers Assembly that new antipollution laws cannot become effective if Congress and the Executive branch continually slash appropriations needed to make the measures meaningful. He offered these 1969 examples: Water pollution, authorization \$836 million, appropriation \$302 million; water and sewer grants, \$420 million reduced to \$165 million; air pollution, \$185 million cut to \$88.7 million.

Consumer attorney Nader takes this realistic view of the burst of consumer legislation during the final period of the Johnson Administration: "Certain consumer values were articulated. Something was done and will be done because the laws are on the books. But you can't grow a rose on top of a garbage can. The consumer movement is going to reflect and be limited by the political environment in Washington—from the corporate law firms to the appropriations committees that give billions for defense and pennies for protection against death, injury, and swindles."

The flimsy nature of the protection given the consumer becomes clear in any recital of the dangers he faces every day. The stakes

can be counted in terms of human lives in some of these issues before Congress this year:

Cigarettes—50,000 die from lung cancer every year, and millions are estimated to die from heart disease and emphysema, related to smoking.

Household appliance injuries—100,000 persons are injured annually by sliding glass doors, 125,000 by faulty heating devices, and 300,000 by poorly designed stoves, washing machines, and power lawn mowers.

The National Commission on Product Safety, whose creation was a consumer victory in 1967, is now seeking to determine whether industry's voluntary safety standards offer sufficient consumer protection. On the basis of testimony received and comments from a variety of sources ranging from *The Wall Street Journal* to Admiral Hyman Rickover, the answer is a resounding "No!"

Dr. Julian A. Waller of the University of Vermont told the Commission that each year about 60,000 persons, mostly children, are partially "barbecued" by the 350-degree-hot grilles on gas-fired floor furnaces used in homes in the South and Southwest. Dr. Waller and two safety specialists from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare testified that they had tried vainly, for ten years, to get the American Gas Association (AGA) to adopt voluntary safety standards to eliminate this ghastly hazard.

Frank E. Hogdon, AGA director of laboratories, confirmed this testimony and praised the Commission-sponsored firm which in three weeks, with an outlay of \$800, developed an inexpensive fiberglass shield to protect infants from burns. An industry committee on safety standards "simply did not know of any technology and apparently couldn't think of any; and didn't perhaps have enough incentive," Hogdon said, to remove the hazard.

If the sufferings of maimed children cannot provide sufficient "incentive," then possibly widespread and damaging publicity that names hazardous products can produce the proper incentive to adhere to adequately safe voluntary or mandatory, Government-enforced standards.

On the same day that this unnerving testimony was presented, Nader told the Commission about the report of Dr. Carl Walter, Harvard Medical School, that 1,200 Americans are accidentally electrocuted annually by faulty medical equipment while receiving "routine diagnostic tests" or treatment. Again, voluntary standards have not been sufficient.

Auto and tire repairs and warranties—No one knows how many of the 53,000 annual auto fatalities and four million injuries are caused by defective, improperly designed, or improperly repaired parts. But testimony before the Federal Trade Commission and Senator Philip Hart's Anti-trust and Monetary Subcommittee indicated that the economic cost is staggering. For example, Edward Daniels, claims manager for the Inter-Insurance Exchange of the Automobile Club of Michigan, has estimated the multi-billion dollar annual auto repair bill could be reduced twenty per cent by a simple change in design to provide bumpers functional enough to withstand a crash at a mere five to ten miles per hour. His testimony was typical as safety engineers, auto dealers, labor union members, and insurance firms testified that the auto giants use their warranties more as sales devices than for customer service and do not compensate dealers to make proper repairs.

Drugs—Senator Gaylord Nelson continues his probe into drug costs, safety, and the crucial question of whether the drug firms exert an unhealthy influence on the medical profession and command exorbitant prices.

Fish—The evidence indicates that the situation in fish processing is far worse than in meat or poultry; only a fraction of the fish processing industry receives any inspection.

In addition to this partial catalogue of potential or actual threats to human life and safety, there are many deceptive practices in the market place which simply cheat consumers on value received. The sheer complexity of the threats to life, limb, and pocketbook constitutes the heart of the dilemma of the consumer movement today. Consumers simply lack enough trained, dedicated personnel committed to the primary goal of representing the "consumer" as these issues are decided in Washington. The regulatory agencies seldom hear consumer views and often demonstrate an inherent conflict between their role as safety regulator and their role as promoter of an industry's products.

Although most industry spokesmen and many conservative politicians argue derisively that "consumerism" has been produced by the combined action of power-seeking Federal bureaucrats and sensationalizing by Ralph Nader, publicity-seekers, and journalists, the facts belie this explanation.

Searching for an underlying explanation, I believe that the individual citizen feels increasingly frustrated by the lack of representation for his best interests in an increasingly complex, technical, and corporate society. A confidential nationwide survey made by Opinion Research Corporation in 1968 concluded that "seven Americans in ten think present Federal legislation is inadequate to protect their health and safety and a majority believes more Federal laws are needed to give shoppers full value for their money."

Most advocates of consumer rights have now concluded that institutional reform is necessary to provide consumers with the same power in Washington that the special interests enjoy through their army of well-paid lawyers and lobbyists.

Most of those who have been involved in consumer crusades of the last few years would agree at least partly with the assessment by Ralph Nader of consumer strength: "The attack on corporate irresponsibility which produced the recent flurry of legislation in Congress has not, it must be said, been the work of a broad movement but rather of tiny ad hoc coalitions of determined people in and out of Government armed with little more than shocking facts."

Victory on most issues in the real world of Washington power often hinges on a chance fact pounced upon and turned to one's favor. If he is to succeed, the consumer advocate, as well as the General Motors lobbyist, must know when Representative Jones has become the decisive, swing vote in the pertinent subcommittee. This is the intelligence function that industry (which knew who represented the decisive vote), and not consumers, capitalized on when Representative William S. Stuckey of Georgia held the balance of power on a mutual funds regulation bill last year.

This intelligence function—getting the facts on who holds the real power on Capitol Hill on a given issue—simply cannot be provided by the enthusiasts who gather in Washington annually for the Consumer Assembly, a meeting of delegates from cooperatives, trade unions, women's organizations, and other consumer-oriented groups. They can be experts at home, but in the minute-by-minute power struggle on issues in Washington, they are amateurs. That is what Federal Communications Commissioner Nicholas Johnson had in mind when he told the Assembly:

"You are wasting your time if you think these meetings make the voice of the consumer louder. Don't kid yourselves. Get some dollars behind you and put someone in Washington to represent you who isn't beholden to the President or Congress or the regulatory agencies. And until you do that, you can hold all the meetings you want, but you won't change anything."

The meetings are valuable because they

pull consumer issues together and provide new contacts for more ad hoc "little coalitions" on specific issues. However, Johnson was emphasizing that amateurs cannot provide the skills of intelligence-gathering, consumer advocacy, or public relations.

The still-thin ranks of skilled advocates are growing as more young Congressmen take up consumer causes either out of political motive or sincere belief. The Democrats will be free to be more effectively critical of the Executive agencies with a Republican as President, and Republican consumer advocates now can command their day of glory by persuading the Nixon Administration to back their causes.

In considering the various proposals to provide more consumer power, one can evaluate their strengths and weaknesses by understanding some of the keys to Ralph Nader's phenomenal success. Apart from his steel-trap mind and sixteen-hour work days, Nader is a virtual genius at fact-finding, advocacy, and public relations. But beyond this he is a lone operator, beholden to no one, and this gives him unusual strength. Throughout the meat inspection fight Nader argued for the strongest possible bill. When Congressional consumer advocates finally had to agree to a plan with foes who outnumbered them ten to one, they first checked with Nader. Nader is not bound by any permanent alliances, and any Congressional proponent of consumer legislation worries that Nader will criticize a compromise as a sellout of consumer interests.

Aside from these attributes one must understand Nader's fervent ethical philosophy to grasp his strength. Most people in the so-called establishment apparently do not. I am amazed that most friends of mine, including lawyers and newspapermen, seem obsessed with finding out what makes Nader tick. They are tortured to uncover his "angle"—one that squares with the median values of our society. Are his work so bizarre and his ethical values so unusual in our contemporary society that our principal concern is to search out ulterior motives? Nader is not superhuman; he has the same power drives that possess many strong, talented men, but he is the ultimate example of the idealistic younger men who now seek to reshape our institutions.

The unanswered question is how idealists can be effective, if they desire to work in the consumer movement in Washington or elsewhere. Thus, the suggestions are pouring in to institutionalize "Naderism."

Nader's own idea is a non-profit firm of lawyers, engineers, doctors, and accountants which would represent the highest ethics of their professions in behalf of the consumer in Washington power struggles. In more than two years of trying, Nader has been unable to finance this project. With his high visibility, foundations afraid of political investigations and reprisals from their financial backers have shied away from him.

Numerous Congressmen are recommending creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs which would consolidate Federal consumer protection now scattered among a number of agencies, and represent consumers in the regulatory process. Transferred into the new department would be existing agencies dealing with both truth in packaging and lending, food grading, home economics research, and cost of living statistics. In addition, a consumer counsel would represent the public interest before other regulatory agencies, Federal departments, and the courts. An office of consumer safety would study measures to protect consumers from hazardous household products.

This idea has merit in that it would place primary responsibility for consumer protection and representation in a department-level agency, would provide a central department where all consumers could address their complaints, and could prod those other Gov-

ernment agencies which are slow to respond to the needs of the consumer.

The proposed department would not meet Nicholas Johnson's criteria of freedom from either Congress or the President. Representative Benjamin Rosenthal, New York Democrat, who is a leading sponsor, agrees that big business pressures would still exist but believes industry is far less likely to capture an agency whose only function is consumer protection than one, such as the Department of Agriculture's food inspection unit, whose consumer function is far outweighed by the Department's obligations to the food industry. A Presidential adviser on consumer affairs, such as Esther Peterson or Betty Furness, obviously is even more tightly restricted by one man's politics.

Aside from private ventures of the Nader variety, perhaps the best hope for increased representation lies in the people's counsel idea approved by the U.S. Administrative Conference and Senator Philip Hart's proposal for a quasi-public consumer counsel. In both cases there would be some insulation from more obvious political pressures.

Arthur Bonfield, the University of Iowa law school professor who wrote the much-neglected Administrative Conference report, advocates a people's counsel operated much like the Public Broadcast Corporation. The people's counsel would be created as a completely independent Federally-chartered corporation. Its board members would be appointed by the President with consent of the Senate but otherwise the organization would be independent of Federal control. This proposed office would represent the views of the poor before the Federal agencies considering matters affecting their welfare as consumers.

Few people know that the U.S. Administrative Conference, which consists of the major administrative agencies of government, acknowledged that the consumer, particularly the poor citizen, is vastly under-represented in the regulatory process. Although the Conference approved the Bonfield report, there has been scant action from the various agencies to implement their own joint recommendations to seek out the views of the poor and to provide the poor with a role in regulations that affect them.

After questioning the agencies about their practices, Bonfield deduced that one-third make no effort to solicit the views of the poor in rule-making. He described efforts of the remainder as so haphazard, unsystematic, and sporadic as to be "totally inadequate." Incredibly, the Department of Agriculture admitted it never consulted the poor in drafting guidelines for the food stamp plan.

Gilbert Cranberg, an unsung Ralph Nader who writes editorials for the *Des Moines Register*, stated the issue clearly: "A fundamental premise of democracy is that agencies of government will be responsive to the needs and wishes of the people. But theory conflicts with reality when some groups have ready access to government and others have only limited access."

If Mr. Nixon downgrades consumer issues or is hostile to consumer protection measures, then the consumer movement will have lost a most effective and powerful ally—the White House. But the consumer movement will not be powerless. It should be remembered that the Johnson White House did not stake out its position on consumer issues until after Nader publicly blistered the President and Miss Furness for failure to take a strong position on the meat inspection issue.

If the issues are real and the public is aroused, then Mr. Nixon will be vulnerable to the same sort of backlash that swiftly followed the Willie Mae Rogers appointment.

If consumer advocates can agree on one or several approaches to increased consumer representation, then their problem will be to lobby their plans through Congress. A

majority of Congress may share Mr. Nixon's concern about unwarranted meddling with the free enterprise system. But as the public keeps on learning from bitter personal experience—and from reading—how poorly private enterprise is meeting its responsibilities on product safety, durability, and honesty, there will be a rising clamor for "warranted meddling" to protect the consumer. Consumer protection will then attain a popularity with politicians that it never has achieved before. When it does, let the seller beware.

TAX REFORM—STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL-CIO, BEFORE HOUSE COM- MITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on April 1, George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of tax reform. Mr. Meany's statement provides an excellent analysis of the urgent need for prompt legislative action in this session of the 91st Congress.

Mr. President, so that other Senators may have the benefit of Mr. Meany's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL-CIO, ON TAX REFORM, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 1, 1969

My name is George Meany and I am president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The 13.5 million members of the unions of the AFL-CIO are, almost without exception, taxpayers. They pay their taxes regularly, payday after payday, through the payroll withholding program. They are loyal Americans; they appreciate the value of government, the services of government, the need for paying for government.

They are willing to pay their fair share. But they are tired, Mr. Chairman, of having to pay the share of other Americans. They are specifically tired of paying the share of those Americans whose incomes are greater and whose taxes are lower—the "loophole set" in today's society.

So it is on behalf of the largest organized group of taxpayers in America, Mr. Chairman, that we come here today with proposals we believe are based on the doctrine of fair play. There are some who call the measures before this Committee "tax reform." We think "tax justice" is a better description and that is what we are seeking here today—tax justice.

The federal income-tax structure has drifted far afield from the American standard of fair play. It is rigged against income from work and against wage and salary earners. It is rigged in favor of unearned income. Because of these facts, confidence in our tax system has eroded. This erosion must be ended. Fairness in federal taxation must be restored.

In our appendix statement we have catalogued what we believe to be the most glaring abuses—the loopholes and gimmicks which lighten the tax burdens of those who have both huge amounts of unearned income and great ability to pay and yet who unfairly

rig the nation's tax structure against those whose livelihood depends on a paycheck.

The program of tax justice we urge is ambitious and far-reaching, long overdue and critically urgent. There is no longer time for pause, delay, gestures or tokens.

Our program—fully adopted—would close loopholes currently costing the federal Treasury about \$15 to 17 billion. We would put back \$6.7 billion of this in much-needed and long overdue tax relief to those of low, moderate and middle incomes. There would be a net gain in revenue of \$8 to 10 billion—to enable full funding of essential federal programs to strengthen society—and a priceless, immeasurable gain in public confidence in the nation's tax structure and the federal government itself.

Our program would eliminate the preferential treatment the tax system gives to unearned capital-gains income, the loophole which means that a married taxpayer with \$8,000 in capital gains pays a tax of \$354 while an \$8,000 married wage earner is taxed at \$1,000.

Our program would tax the \$15 billion in capital gains that is passed on annually to heirs without ever being mentioned on the individual-income tax form.

The AFL-CIO reform proposals would eliminate the special provisions which permit oil operators, real-estate investors and hobby farmers to write off nonexistent costs. Under these provisions:

The nation's 20 oil giants pay an 8.5% average tax rate.

A real-estate operator with a total income of \$7.5 million pays taxes at the same rate as a \$10,000-per-year married wage earner with two children.

101 individuals capable of making over \$1,000,000 in other endeavors claim \$7.6 million in tax write-offs for farm losses.

We would end the wasteful, back-door, tax-exempt-interest federal subsidy to state and local governments and replace it with a federal grant program that would help these financially pressed governments to meet their rapidly growing needs.

We would eliminate both the 7% investment credit and extra-fast depreciation write-offs except for those investing in the construction of housing for low- and moderate-income families.

Under our proposals, tax-exempt foundations would no longer be able to use their privileged tax status as a means of avoiding estate and gift taxes while maintaining control over wealth and the power that goes hand-in-hand with such control. It is, of course, power which has been used to affect stock prices, reward friends and relatives, and help advance the foundations donors' other business interests.

In our opinion, that's hardly "fair play" and we would eliminate it. In addition, we would see to it that those who pay little or no taxes because of the "unlimited charitable-contribution gimmick" could no longer defate their taxable income through donations that yield far greater benefits to the donor than the receiver.

And we would curb another abuse—those large corporations which exploit a privilege geared to help small business and spin off into subsidiaries. They can take full advantage of the much-reduced tax rate on the first \$25,000 of corporate income and can cut their tax bill by more than half.

We are critically concerned with the alarming growth of conglomerates. We urge a thorough reexamination of those tax provisions which serve to spur the corporate take-over movement. Furthermore, the effects of these giant economic and financial power centers upon prices, competition, collective bargaining, and the political and economic system itself must become known. We believe appropriate action must be taken—whether through legislation or administrative action by such government

agencies as the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission or the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice.

In the event that it is not possible to quickly adopt all of our proposals to tax in full presently exempt income—such as half of all capital gains and interest from state and local bonds—we urge immediate enactment of a 25% minimum tax on exempt income.

Furthermore, we urge that individuals and corporations with substantial amounts of tax-exempt income be required to allocate certain deductions between taxable and non-taxable income so that all income is taken into account before deductions are allowed.

Though loophole closing is utterly essential to tax reform, justice cannot be fully achieved unless the tax load simultaneously is eased for those who for too long have borne the brunt of the inequities in the tax structure.

Our tax-relief proposals would remove from the tax rolls the majority of those taxpayers whose incomes are below government poverty-income levels, and provide relief to those of moderate and middle incomes.

We recommend a substantial increase in the present minimum standard and standard deductions and a sharp reduction in the tax rates that apply to the first two income-bracket levels.

The tax system must now provide for the interests and needs of a nation of over 200 million people who are demanding more and better public facilities. Yet many of the flaws that have existed since the federal government first began to tax incomes still exist and many new ones have been added.

The costs of government are not being shared fairly. An unwarranted limitation is placed on the effectiveness of tax policy in promoting broad goals of balanced economic growth and full employment, and public confidence is decaying.

When tax revenues are to be spent, the legislative and executive branches appropriately study and evaluate every outlay of public funds to assure that national interests will be forwarded and priorities balanced. Yet, on the revenue-raising side, tax policy is all too frequently considered only in terms of need for more dollars or fewer dollars.

The temporary surtax, adopted in 1968, is a prime example. A flat percentage tax on top of the existing tax is a fair way to divide the burden of an increase in taxes—but, only if the original burden is fair.

Since a tax on a tax cannot be collected if no taxes are paid, those who are rich enough to avoid their fair share of taxes through capital gains, depletion, accelerated depreciation, tax-exempt interest and other tax-escape routes, pay no surtax on such exempt income. Because of this, others pay more and the basic inequities are compounded.

What is more, many of the inequities cause the taxation system to run in direct opposition to the objectives sought through public tax-spending programs.

For example:

While the nation is being burdened with inflationary pressures and high interest rates, the task of easing these burdens is made more difficult by the tax system. Privileges such as the 7% investment credit and accelerated depreciation on real estate fuel the fires of the only source of inflationary demand in the national economy—business investment in plants, machines and equipment.

\$935 million in federal funds are being spent on low- and moderate-income housing; yet \$800 million worth of tax loopholes go to real-estate operators constructing motels, office buildings, plants and high-rise, high-rent apartment complexes.

\$4.5 billion is spent to "stabilize farm incomes;" yet wealthy nonfarmers are encouraged, through the tax system, to disrupt and distort the farm economy.

The large and growing concentrations of wealth and economic power are a source of growing national concern; yet the income-tax system allows \$15 billion in appreciated assets to accumulate and be transferred to heirs without ever entering the tax base. At the same time, tax-exempt status is given to certain types of family foundations set up for avoiding taxes and perpetuating control of family and industrial financial dynasties. \$8 million is spent enforcing anti-trust laws; yet the tax system provides incentives for those who would merge and "conglomerate."

Oil, gas and other depletion allowances are justified largely on the basis of encouraging development of domestic productive capacity; yet similar tax benefits flow to those bolstering the productive capability of foreign nations.

Some \$25 billion in federal categorical grant-in-aid funds will go to the states and localities in 1969; yet the amount of federal money available to hard-pressed state and local governments is diluted by allowing interest on state and local bonds to go tax-free, since this exemption costs the Treasury more than the states and municipalities gain.

The nation is committed to alleviating the plight of its 22 million poor; yet many of these families pay federal income taxes while many of the wealthiest legally ignore the federal tax collector.

Though the case for reform is compelling and perhaps conclusively demonstrated by these incongruities and paradoxes, there is another too frequently overlooked aspect.

Federal income taxes are not the only taxes Americans must pay. In fact, though federal income-tax revenues have grown and still loom largest among the taxes paid by most individuals, state and local taxes have grown at a far faster pace. What's more, the increases in state and local taxes have in the main resulted from levies on property and sales to consumers which take their toll from those whose ability to pay taxes is the least.

In the 1969 *Economic Report of the President*, data was presented showing that the combined federal, state and local tax systems converge in such a manner as to redistribute income "away from the poor." At the same time, those of modest and middle incomes are bearing a disproportionately high share of the tax burden while those with wealth and ability-to-pay escape their fair share.

Thoroughgoing federal income-tax loophole closing and reform would make a substantial contribution toward compensating for the unfair manner in which the burden of other taxes fall.

Furthermore, it is the federal income-tax system that most states look upon as the standard for a good and fair way to allocate the costs of public services. A number of states that do use income taxes use the federal definitions and standards as models for their own systems, and three states now "piggyback" their taxes directly upon the federal taxes that their residents must pay.

Yet, as the inequities in the federal system grow and become more and more notorious, the basic principles of taxation based on income and ability-to-pay become suspect and fair-minded state and local legislators find it increasingly difficult to convince those they represent of the advantages of fair taxation methods.

The AFL-CIO has three objectives in mind to achieve fair play in the nation's tax structure:

1. The loopholes of special tax privilege for wealthy families and businesses must be eliminated.
2. The impoverished must be removed from the tax rolls.
3. There must be a reduction in the relative burden for low- and moderate-income families.

To close the loopholes, provide relief where

it is critically needed, and bring the federal individual and corporate income-tax systems into line with America's standards of fair play, the AFL-CIO urges adoption of the following proposals:

1. **Capital gains.** Elimination of preferential tax treatment of capital gains for both individuals and corporations. Such gains should be taxed at regular tax rates. At the same time, the present income-averaging provisions should be broadened to include capital gains.

Approximate revenue gain: \$6-7 billion.

2. **Capital Gains on Property Transferred at Death.** All appreciation (difference between original cost and market value) should be taxed in full on transfer at death. The tax rate should apply to all appreciation occurring after date of enactment; one-half the tax rate should apply to all gains occurring between an appropriate date such as January 1, 1950, and the date of enactment.

The tax should be allowed as a deduction for estate-tax purposes. It should not apply on transfers between the decedent and spouse nor to estates valued at less than \$60,000.

To prevent "forced" sales of assets, appropriate installment-payment procedures should be adopted.

Approximate revenue gain: \$3-4 billion.

3. **Depletion.** Deductions for depletion should not be permitted to be taken after the cost of the property has been fully written off.

Approximate revenue gain: \$1.5 billion.

4. **Interest on State and Local Bonds.** All interest on state and local debt securities, issued after the date of enactment (following an appropriate transition period) should be subject to the income tax. The federal government should guarantee the bonds and pay the issuing state or local government an amount equal to one-third of the interest cost on such taxable issues. No federal guarantee or interest-rate subsidy should be permitted for industrial development bonds regardless of the amount of the issue.

There would be a net revenue gain, after taking into account the cost of the subsidy and the guarantee, of approximately \$100 million.

5. **7% Investment Tax Credit.** The 7% investment tax credit should be repealed.

Approximate revenue gain: \$3.0 billion.

6. **Accelerated Depreciation on Real Estate.** Accelerated depreciation (depreciation in excess of straight-line) should be disallowed on all real estate except low- and moderate-housing.

Approximate revenue gain: \$700-800 million.

7. **Limitation of Deductions Attributable to Farming Operations.** Each dollar of nonfarm income over \$15,000 should reduce the amount of farm loss that can be deducted from nonfarm income by \$1. This provision should not apply to farm losses resulting from taxes, interest, casualty, drought, and sale of farm property. This provision should not apply to farmers using the accrual method of accounting.

Approximate revenue gain: \$145 million.

8. **Unlimited Charitable Contributions.** The special unlimited charitable-contribution deduction should be repealed immediately.

Approximate revenue gain: \$50 million.

9. **Multiple Surtax Exemptions from Corporate Income Tax.** Commonly controlled business enterprises should, after an appropriate transition period, be limited to only one \$25,000 surtax exemption.

Approximate revenue gain: (when fully effective): \$235 million.

10. **Tax-Exempt Foundations:**

(1) Financial transactions between a foundation and its founders, contributors, officers, directors or trustees should be prohibited.

(2) Foundations should be required to spend their income within one year of receipt.

(3) Foundations should not be permitted to own 20% or more of any business unre-

lated to their charitable function—a reasonable time should be allowed for presently organized foundations to comply with this provision.

(4) If a donor maintains control of a business or property after it is contributed, no donation deduction from taxes should be allowed until the foundation disposes of the property or the donor's control over the property ends.

(5) Foundation borrowing to buy investment properties should be prohibited. Foundation lending should be limited to appropriate charitable functions.

(6) A limitation, such as 40 years, should be placed on the life of foundations.

(7) Congress should carefully examine the problems posed by the actual operations of foundations and the need for some degree of federal regulation of the use of the tax-exempt funds of foundations.

11. **Conglomerates.** The skyrocketing trend of business mergers requires detailed examination—including the anti-trust laws and the operations of the appropriate government agencies as the Justice Department, Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

A thorough investigation should also be conducted to determine the extent to which the federal tax structure contributes to this alarming trend of corporate mergers and acquisitions.

Among the tax provisions that should be examined are those which permit:

(1) Corporations to deduct interest payments on debt used to finance mergers and acquisitions.

(2) Capital-gains taxes to be paid in installments when stock is exchanged for debt securities.

(3) Tax-free exchanges on corporate stock transfers made for purposes of mergers and acquisitions.

(4) Corporations to "carryover" the operating and capital losses of an acquired firm.

In addition, the penalty tax provisions applying to excessive amounts of retained profits should be made workable in the light of recent experience.

12. **Allocation of Deductions.** Individuals and corporations should be required to allocate certain deductions between taxable and nontaxable income.

Under present law, those who receive tax-exempt income derive a double benefit. The income never appears on the tax return; hence no tax is paid. Secondly, personal or non-operating business deductions can be deducted in full from taxable income.

Before such deductions are permitted, since they are designed to define ability-to-pay, total income (taxable and exempt income) should be taken into account.

Individuals with tax-exempt income (as defined in item 13) in excess of \$10,000 should be required to allocate certain personal deductions in line with the ratio their Adjusted Gross Income bears to adjusted gross income plus exempt income. The deductions that should be allocated are: interest and tax payments, casualty losses, charitable contributions, medical expenses, and cooperative housing expenses.

Corporations with such exempt income, in excess of \$25,000, should be required to allocate non-operating expense deductions between net profit from operations and exempt income.

Approximate revenue gain from allocation of deductions: \$250 million.

13. **Minimum Tax on Exempt Income.** A 25% tax should be levied on the amount of exempt income which exceeds \$10,000 for individuals and \$25,000 for corporations, plus any amount of deductions disallowed under allocation-of-deductions formula. The exempt income subject to this tax should include the following:

(1) One-half capital gains.

(2) State and local bond interest.

(3) Depletion taken after the cost of the property has been written off.

(4) The difference between the cost and the market value of property donated to charity.

(5) Depreciation on real estate taken in excess of straight-line, except for low- and moderate-housing.

Approximate revenue gain from 25% minimum tax: \$1.5 billion.

TAX RELIEF FOR LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME GROUPS

1. **The minimum standard deduction should be increased from the present \$200 plus \$100 per exemption to \$100 per exemption.**

This proposal would exempt from federal income tax the majority of persons below the government-defined poverty level and significantly reduce the tax payments of all persons at or near the poverty level.

The revenue cost would be approximately \$1.2 billion.

2. **The standard deduction should be increased from the present 10% with a \$1,000 maximum to 15% and a \$2,500 maximum.** This proposal would bring standard deductions closer in line with the actual deductions claimed by most taxpayers. It would simplify reporting for the great majority of taxpayers and provide tax relief for all those whose itemized deductions amount to less than 15% of income or \$2,500. Most of the relief would flow to those in the \$5,000 to \$20,000 income range.

The revenue cost would be approximately \$2 billion.

3. **The first two individual-income-tax bracket rates should be reduced from the current 14% and 15% to 9% and 13% respectively.** This proposal would provide tax relief to all taxpayers, but the major portion of the tax deduction (approximately 95%) would go to those with annual incomes below \$20,000.

The revenue cost would be approximately \$3.4 billion.

4. **Moving-Expense Deductions.** Deductible moving expenses should be broadened to include certain non-reimbursed expenses such as those related to the sale of the old residence—real-estate commissions and advertising costs and costs of settling an unexpired lease; pre-move househunting trips; and temporary lodging costs (for worker and family). These additional costs should be subject to an overall limitation of \$2,000. Present treatment of other deductible moving expenses—unreimbursed expenses of transporting the employee, his family and belongings, incurred in a job-connected move—should continue.

The revenue cost would be approximately \$100 million.

Finally, all special tax-forgiveness proposals offered under the guise of "incentives" which would provide additional loopholes for the wealthy and further erode the fairness of the tax structure should be rejected. And all proposals to adopt a federal retail sales tax—whether called "value-added" taxes or offered clearly as a tax on consumers—should also be rejected.

There you have it, Mr. Chairman, the AFL-CIO proposals which we believe would achieve tax justice, eliminate abuses, restore public confidence and bring the American standard of fair play into the tax system.

The time for action is long overdue, Mr. Chairman. We are delighted the Committee is taking this hard look at the facts and we look forward to tax justice.

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, ON TAX REFORM, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 1, 1969

The great and growing inequities in the federal tax structure are clear to most taxpayers and reasonably informed citizens.

In 1967, the most recent date for available

information, the taxes paid by millionaires averaged only 25% of their total income. Twenty-one of these millionaires and 134 other persons whose reported incomes exceeded \$200,000 paid not one cent in federal income taxes.

Yet in that same year 2¼ million taxpayers whose income fell below the government's definition of poverty paid \$100 million in income taxes. And the average wage and salary earner with an income of \$8,000 paid over 10% of his total income in income taxes.

The federal tax structure is rigged against wages and salaries—against income from work. It is rigged in favor of unearned income.

The federal tax on wages and salaries is the full tax rate—and the tax is usually deducted from the paycheck. However, those who receive other forms of income are provided with special privileges and exemptions.

Income gains from the sale of stock or other property are taxed at only half the regular tax rate—with a top maximum rate of 25%. Moreover, when stock or other property is passed on to heirs at death, the increased value of the property from the date of purchase is not subject even to this much-reduced capital gains tax.

Income from interest payments on state and local bonds is completely exempt from federal taxation.

*Sizable portions of the income from oil and gas properties and a large number of minerals never enter the tax stream because nonexistent "depletion" expenses are written off.

Much of the income from real estate escapes taxation since it is written off as depreciation. Such income is not only exempt from taxation but, since it is considered a write-off cost, it provides a tax shelter for the wealthy because it is deducted from other taxable income.

These special tax privileges are the domain essentially of the wealthy. But the super-rich and corporations have even further privileges:

Because of the little-known unlimited-charitable-contribution-deduction special privilege, many wealthy individuals and businesses can make contributions and save more in taxes than the contribution is worth.

Tax-exempt family foundations can be set up so wealthy families can control their fortunes in perpetuity without paying taxes.

Wealthy nonfarmers can invest in farm operations which yield imaginary losses that can be charged off against their high non-farm incomes.

Business deducts 7% of the cost of new equipment and machinery from its tax bill—as a special tax credit. And, they can deduct it again as part of depreciation.

As a result of these and similar inequities, wealthy investors and businesses pay considerably less than their full tax burden. But moderate- and low-income taxpayers bear the full brunt of the tax system. This double standard of taxation heaps an unfairly great part of the burden of running the federal government on the shoulders of middle-income wage and salary earners.

These facts are generally known. They are eroding public confidence in the tax structure and in the fairness of the federal government as well. And since Americans expect so much from their tax structure—national defense, public facilities and services, grants-in-aid to the states and local governments—these inequities in the tax structure undermine public support for much-needed expansion of government services for a growing, urban population.

The entire federal tax structure must be overhauled. Tax loopholes for the wealthy must be ended. The relative tax burden on moderate- and low-income families must be eased.

Only twice since its inception in 1913 has

the federal tax structure been revised. And these two revisions—in 1939 and 1954—were, according to a former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, only "facelifts."

The case for thorough reform of the federal tax structure is compelling and demonstrated by numerous incongruities and paradoxes. There is another too frequently overlooked aspect.

Americans must pay other taxes. In fact, though federal income-tax revenues have grown and still loom largest among the taxes paid by most individuals, state and local taxes have grown at a far faster pace. From 1963 to 1967 states and localities have almost tripled their annual tax take—from \$44 billion to \$115 billion. In contrast, federal income taxes (corporate and individual) grew from \$69 billion to \$95 billion, or by slightly over one-third. What's more, the increases in state and local taxes have in the main resulted from levies on property and sales to consumers which take their toll primarily from those whose ability to pay taxes is the least.

The importance of viewing the impact of the total tax structure was dramatically documented in the 1969 *Economic Report of the President*. Data was presented showing that the combined federal, state and local tax systems converge in such a manner as to redistribute income "away from the poor." At the same time, those of modest and middle incomes are bearing a disproportionately high share of the tax burden, while those with wealth and ability-to-pay escape their fair share.

The impact of these tax changes over the past five years is shown in Table 1. A \$7,500 income family of four, as a result of the net effect of the 1964 federal tax cut and the 1968 increase, had an increase in after-tax income of 2% between 1963 and 1968. The rise in Social Security insurance rates and state and local tax increases over the period resulted in a 3.4% cut in after-tax income.

For those at the very bottom of the income scale, these tax changes over the past five years cut into after-tax income by 14.2%, while those with incomes of \$35,000 and over enjoyed net increases in after-tax income.

Thoroughgoing federal income-tax loophole closing and reform would make a substantial contribution toward compensating for the unfair manner in which the burdens of other taxes fall.

Furthermore, it is the federal income-tax system that most states look upon as the standard for a good and fair way to allocate the costs of public services. A number of states that do use income taxes use the federal definitions and standards as models for their own systems, and three states now "piggyback" their taxes directly upon the federal taxes that their residents must pay.

Yet, as the inequities in the federal system grow and become more and more notorious, the basic principles of taxation based on income and ability-to-pay become suspect and fair-minded state and local legislators find it increasingly difficult to convince those they represent of the advantages of fair taxation methods.

To the extent that states and localities model their systems on the federal "base," the inequities that exist in the federal structure are multiplied. And the basic advantages are lost as other states shy away from taxing income and continue their reliance on inequitable and ineffective consumer and property taxes.

A thorough overhaul of the federal income-tax structure must be approached with three objectives in mind:

1. The loopholes of special tax privilege for wealthy families and businesses must be eliminated.

2. The impoverished must be removed from the tax rolls.

3. There must be a reduction in the relative tax burden for low- and moderate-income families.

CLOSING THE LOOPHOLES

Capital gains

When certain so-called "capital" assets are sold, the profit is taxed at only one-half the rates that apply to ordinary income. And, the tax rate cannot exceed 25% regardless of the amount of the seller's total income. Capital assets under the Internal Revenue Code consist of property such as corporate stocks, vacant land, and other assets not held for use in the taxpayer's trade or business.

In addition, profits from the sale of many other assets—although not defined by the Code as capital assets—can also receive this same privileged preferential tax treatment. Profits from the sale of livestock used for draft, dairy or breeding; real estate used in a trade or business; royalties from sales of timber, iron ore, and coal deposits can all qualify for the preferential treatment as capital gains as can gains on sales of business machinery and equipment.

The preferential tax rates which apply to these unearned forms of income represent one of the most unconscionable flaws in our tax system. It is this special treatment, according to the Treasury, that is the most important factor in reducing the tax rates of those with high incomes.

Viewed in the context of the three major criteria upon which our tax system is built—equal treatment of equals, progressive rates, and neutrality in economic impact—the capital-gains tax fails on every count.

Similarly situated individuals, whose incomes differ not in amount but only because of source, will pay markedly different amounts of taxes. A married man with a wage income of \$8,000 will pay \$1,000 (excluding surtax) in federal income taxes. If his \$8,000 came from capital gains, his tax would be only \$354.

Tax rates on capital gains progress only from 7% to 25%. Tax rates on wages, salaries and other "ordinary income" go from 14% to 70%. An \$8,000 per year single wage earner who receives a raise of \$1,000 will pay a 25% income tax on this \$1,000, the same amount that would be paid by a taxpayer in the \$50,000 income bracket who receives \$1,000 worth of capital gains.

Many business and individual decisions to buy, sell, invest, donate, trade, pay dividends, harvest crops, will to heirs, and so forth, hinge upon the Internal Revenue definitions of capital gains and the preferential treatment accorded these gains.

If a corporation, for example, pays dividends to its stockholders, the dividends are taxed as ordinary income. If the corporation retains much of its earnings, swelling the market value of its stock, shareholders can profit from capital gains. If a farmer wanting to sell his orchard harvests his crop first, the profit from selling the crop would be taxed as ordinary income. If he sells the land with the crop unharvested, the entire proceeds will be taxed at the capital-gains rate. Hence, by not harvesting his crop, he's increased his after-tax income.

What's more, the capital-gains-tax escape route combines neatly with many other avoidance schemes, stimulating their use and compounding the tax benefits. Accelerated depreciation on real estate—a loophole which permits postponement of taxes and creates opportunities for tax-loss gimmickry—also paves the way for converting what should be ordinary rental income into capital gains. The depletion allowances for mineral industries, in themselves an unconscionable gimmick for deducting non-existent expenses, also serve as the vehicle whereby ordinary income is unjustifiably converted to capital gains.

Reported capital gains are taxed at only

half the normal rate—and never more than 25%. Thus, in 1967, some \$25.6 billion in capital gains were taxed at one-half the regular tax rate and subject to a maximum of 25%.

Another major leak in the tax system, according to the Treasury Department, results from the fact that large amounts of capital gains "fall completely outside the income tax system," since capital gains on assets transferred at death or by charitable donation go tax-free. The Treasury estimates that \$15 billion of capital gains, in 1967, were not taxed at all, through this escape-route. If an individual holds an appreciated asset till he dies, the appreciation is not subject to the income tax. If an individual or corporation donates appreciated property to a charitable organization, the appreciation is never taxed—and, the full appreciated value can be deducted from other income.

For example, if a taxpayer donates \$1,000 worth of stock which cost him \$100, he pays no tax on the \$900 of appreciated value and is permitted to deduct the full value (\$1,000) from his income. If he were in the 50% bracket, this gift of an asset which cost him \$100 would save him \$500 in taxes. If he sold the asset, included half the capital gain in his income, and then contributed the \$1,000 in cash, his net tax saving would have been only \$275. If the \$900 appreciation were taxed at ordinary rates rather than the 25% maximum capital-gains rate, the donation of this asset that cost \$100 would have only yielded a net tax saving of \$50.

Moreover, under certain circumstances it is possible for an individual to actually improve his after-tax position by giving away rather than selling an asset.

All told, the capital gains tax yielded only about \$5 to \$6 billion in revenue in 1967, representing an effective tax rate of less than 15%.

The Treasury estimates that, if all capital gains entered the tax base and were taxed as ordinary income, the 1969 revenue increase would be \$8.5 billion.

Finally, though capital-gains treatment discriminates unfairly between earned and unearned income, the effect is also to discriminate between classes of individuals. The benefits of capital gains flow almost exclusively to the wealthy.

For example, in 1967 one-third of all capital gains reported went to individuals with annual incomes of over \$100,000—50,000 income-tax returns out of the total 71.7 million filed accounted for 33% of the capital gains.

Put another way, after those with incomes of over \$100,000 took their capital gains, 99.94% of the population was left to share the other two-thirds.

Demonstrating this same point, the U.S. Treasury in its 1969 tax study showed that capital gains reduced the effective rates on taxable income from 55.5% to 32.7% for those in adjusted-gross-income brackets of \$1 million or over. For those in the \$5-\$10,000 brackets, capital gains reduced effective rates by only two-tenths of one percent—from 16.4% to 16.2%. Thus the net result was to water down the progression in effective tax rates from a top of 55.5% down to only 32.7%. (See Table 2.)

Depletion

Oil, gas and other mineral-extraction industries are allowed to take deductions for depletion. In principle, depletion for extractive firms is akin to the depreciation allowance taken by other industries and is geared to permit the gradual write-off of capital costs over the life of the investment.

However, the percentage-depletion deduction formula provides a much more generous write-off of otherwise taxable income than depreciation. Moreover, unlike depreciation the annual deduction from income never stops—it continues even after the cost of the investment has been fully written off. The

Treasury estimates that oil, gas and other depletion deductions average twelve times the deduction that would be allowed based on actual costs—in the petroleum industry, for example, 90% of the depletion deductions taken are "excessive." Hence, these firms are deducting nonexistent costs.

The percentage-depletion formula allows mineral operators to deduct amounts ranging from 5% (gravel, sand and clay) up to 27.5% (in the case of oil) of the gross income from the property—regardless of the amount of investment. Since the amount that can be deducted is limited to 50% of net income, in many cases the result is that only half the net income generated from the property is subject to tax.

Moreover, mineral producers are allowed to immediately write off certain exploration and development costs which, again, under normal accounting practices should be considered as investment costs to be written off over a period of years. And since these costs do not reduce the percentage-depletion allowance, a double deduction for the same capital investment results.

In addition, there are other gimmicks used by mineral industries to circumvent the modest limitations that do exist on the depletion deduction. The carved-out production payment, for example, is in actuality a loan. The proceeds, however, are treated as income in the year received, thereby boosting the depletion deduction that can be taken. When paid off, the loan is considered an expense. These transactions are timed to generate tax advantages which the Treasury estimates cost \$200 million in lost revenues.

And again, these abuses become magnified and compounded by providing opportunities for individuals, corporations and their stockholders to defer taxes, convert ordinarily taxable income to preferentially taxed capital gains, and traffic in tax-loss gimmickry by writing off imaginary losses against other income.

According to the Treasury, the 1968 revenue loss due to excess percentage depletion and the immediate write-off of development costs was as follows:

[In millions]

Excess depletion:	
To corporations.....	\$1,100
To individuals.....	200
Expensing capital costs:	
To corporations.....	240
To individuals.....	60
Total	1,600

As a result of these privileges, in 1965 the petroleum industry as a group paid taxes at an effective rate 21.1% of total net income and other mineral industries at 24.3%. At the same time, the average manufacturing corporation paid taxes at the rate of 43.3%—double the rate which applied to extractive industries. In 1966 the twenty oil giants paid taxes at a rate of only 8.5% of income.

The two most frequently offered justifications for the tax incentives granted these industries are: (1) special incentives are needed because these businesses are risky, and (2) these resources must be developed domestically for strategic considerations. Yet, risk is certainly not unique to mineral development and many other industries are as strategic or more so. What's more, the fact that percentage depletion is also allowed to companies developing the mineral capabilities of foreign nations hardly squares with the notion of developing a domestic productive base.

The most dramatic testimonial to the fallacy of these arguments, however, was contained in a study done under contract with the Treasury by the Consad Research Corporation of Pittsburgh. This study viewed the \$1.6 billion tax incentive appropriately

in terms of a federal subsidy, since this is the amount of tax revenue the nation loses as a result of the special privileges. The study showed that this \$1.6 billion subsidy led to additional national mineral resources valued in the market at only \$150 million. Every dollar in federal tax forgiveness yielded 9¢ worth of additional reserves.

And, according to the Treasury's analysis of the Consad study, the depletion allowance encourages excessive drilling and inefficient production methods and discourages research into other potential fuel sources.

Interest on State and local bonds

Federal income-tax law actually operates on a triple standard in its treatment of various forms of income. Wages, salaries and so-called "ordinary income" are fully included in the tax base and are subject to the full, progressive rate scale. A second standard applies to income from capital gains, since only half of it enters the tax base and there is a 25% limit on the tax rate. A third standard is applied to some forms of income which are completely excluded from the tax base—and, of course, subject to a zero tax rate.

The interest paid to holders of state and local bonds falls into this third category. For the year ended June 30, 1967, U.S. Census Bureau figures show that state and local governments paid out some \$3 billion to their bondholders. These governments saved \$1.2 billion in interest expense, since the tax-exempt privilege enabled them to sell these bonds at less than market rates of interest. However, the Treasury lost \$1.8 billion in revenue. The balance—\$600 million—went as tax benefits to wealthy individuals and commercial banks which hold most of the bonds.

Since the Treasury loses more than the state and local governments gain, the tax-exempt privilege is a wasteful, as well as back-door, method of providing aid to state and local governments. Moreover, this tax-free interest erodes the equity of the income-tax system since the tax advantages only go to the wealthy. The Treasury notes that tax-free income from state and local bonds is the second most important factor (capital gains is first) in reducing the taxes of those with incomes of over \$100,000 per year.

For example, in 1968 the average yield on high-grade municipal bonds was 4.51% and top-rated (Aaa) corporate bonds was 6.18%. The tax-exempt status compensates for the lower rate only for those in tax brackets of 28% and higher—the rate which applies to a married person with a taxable income in excess of \$16,000 per year.

To illustrate, if a married person with a taxable income of about \$8,000 (22% bracket) bought a high-rated tax-exempt municipal rather than a corporate bond, he would lose \$1.67 in interest on every \$100 invested and save \$1.36 in taxes, suffering a net loss of 31¢ for each \$100 invested. On the other hand for someone in the \$100,000-or-over bracket the \$1.67 in interest lost saves him \$3.83 in taxes—thus, a net gain of \$2.16 on each \$100 invested in tax-exempt bonds.

Also the benefits of the tax forgiveness to state and local governments often run counter to the needs and objectives of most subsidies. Since the amount of debt most state and local governments can issue is tied to property values, it is the richer areas of the nation that rely heaviest on debt financing. Thus, the wealthier areas get the largest subsidies. Similarly, the bonds issued by the smaller, less affluent governments generally are low "rated" or not "rated" at all by the investment analysts. Consequently, these bonds are considered riskier and, if they are to compete in the bond market, the poorer governments must bear higher interest costs.

On top of this, there has been a rapid growth in the proportion of municipal bonds held by commercial banks. In 1961 these

banks purchased 56% of the state and local debt, and in 1967 roughly 90% of the net purchases were attributed to commercial banks. This has resulted in an erratic market for municipal securities, since these banks switch their investment portfolios back and forth in response to demand for business loans.

In times of tight money and rising business loans, commercial banks reduce purchases of municipals and may, in fact, sell them, thereby limiting the market and driving up the interest rates that municipalities must pay. Such developments requires states and localities to pay higher and higher interest rates, in order to market their bonds.

Hence, in many ways the interest rates a municipality must pay on its debt (and the amounts of taxes its citizens must pay as a result) are at the mercy of the commercial banks and the bond raters.

What's more, many state and local governments have abused the tax-exempt privilege by issuing so-called industrial development bonds. These tax-exempt bonds have been used to build factories for private industry—sometimes to the corporations' exact specifications. In this manner, a number of states have pirated firms from other areas,

using their federal subsidy for the private benefit of wealthy corporations.

Real estate

A host of special tax-forgiveness provisions apply to real estate. Taken by themselves, these privileges are hardly justifiable but, when manipulated and combined, they result in unconscionable tax-avoidance opportunities for wealthy real-estate operators, investors, and speculators.

The major tax-escape route is the special accelerated-depreciation deduction. Under the accelerated formulas, new buildings can be written off at twice normal or "straight-line rates" and the cost of used buildings can be charged off at 1½ times normal depreciation rates. In the case of a new building with a 40-year estimated life, the result is that about 23% of its cost can be deducted from income during the first five years of the property's life. For a used building, 17% of the investment can be written off in the first five years.

The following table shows the effects of the special depreciation formulas compared to the "straight-line" method which apportions the depreciation deduction equally over the useful life of the asset.

[In percent]

	Building with a 40-year life			
	Straight line	200 percent declining balance	Sum of the years digits	150 percent declining balance
Year 1	2.5	5.0	4.8	3.7
1st 2 years, total	5.0	9.8	9.6	7.4
1st 3 years, total	7.5	14.3	14.3	10.8
1st 4 years, total	10.0	18.5	18.8	14.2
1st 5 years, total	12.5	22.6	23.2	17.4
1st 10 years, total	25.0	40.1	43.3	31.7
1st 20 years, total	50.0	64.0	74.4	53.4

Since depreciation write-offs are considered a cost, these fast write-offs and other costs are subtracted from rental income and the income tax, if any, is paid on the remainder. Often there is no income at all, or even a reported loss in the early years of ownership, as a result of accelerated depreciation.

Technically, the fast write-off provisions mean that tax liabilities are deferred—in principle, the lower taxes in the early life, due to excess deductions, will be made up later, as smaller deductions are permitted. To this extent, the excess depreciation results in an interest-free, no-strings federal loan to the real-estate operator.

But actually, the accelerated-depreciation special privilege paves the way for other tax gimmickry. First, a good part of the excessive depreciation deductions are never returned to the tax base, because the property is sold long before the depreciation deduction runs out. And a good part of that which is eventually taxed is taxed at only half the usual rate, and never more than 25% since it is considered a capital gain.

Combining these advantages with "leverage"—much debt, little equity—the infamous real-estate tax shelter is created. The excessive depreciation plus interest charges on the debt result in large bookkeeping tax losses. These phantom losses are in turn washed out against an individual's other income, sheltering it from the federal tax. To take full advantage of this, many high-income individuals join together into syndicates. These syndicates buy or develop high-depreciation property that will show a loss which can be applied to the wealthy investors' other income. What's more, when the properties approach a point when a profit might be shown (depreciation and interest become less than rental income), the property is then sold or refinanced, starting the cycle all over again.

A Treasury study of 19 investors, exploiting the real-estate shelter, showed that the

group had a combined income of \$2.7 million from their major economic activities. But, since they made investments in real estate, they were able to "shelter" (remove from their otherwise taxable income) \$1.5 million and cut their tax bill by more than half.

The average investor in this group, according to the Treasury, had an income of \$141,000 from his other interests. He sheltered \$77,500 of this from the Internal Revenue Service by his real-estate investments, and his paper real-estate "losses" saved him \$45,000 in taxes.

The Treasury also traced the activities of one real-estate investor over a seven-year period. This operator had a seven-year income of over \$7.5 million. Yet, because of real-estate depreciation deductions, he paid the same effective tax rate on his total income as a married wage earner with two children and an annual income of \$10,000.

Moreover, real-estate operators can unfairly lighten their share of taxes through reporting capital gains in installments, exchanging appreciated property tax-free, and through complicated mortgage-refinancing arrangements.

The privileged treatment real-estate investors receive through the tax structure contributes to eroding taxpayer confidence as do all loopholes, and:

1. Costs some \$850 million in terms of federal revenues foregone—expenditures or subsidies granted through the tax system. Fast depreciation, alone, accounts for a revenue-loss of \$750 million.

2. Runs in direct opposition to meeting one of our most serious national needs. These privileges serve to channel resources into luxury housing and away from the much-needed improvements and additions to the housing available for those with low and moderate incomes. The Treasury estimates that, of the \$850 million in tax benefits flowing to real-estate operators, only \$50 million went to those investing in low- and moderate-income facilities.

Tax havens for wealthy farm investors

Under the Internal Revenue Code there are special tax-accounting privileges for farmers—privileges which were developed to ease the bookkeeping chores of ordinary farmers.

However, these accounting privileges are being manipulated to provide windfall tax benefits to wealthy individuals and corporations who operate or invest in farms in order to get tax losses. These losses are not true losses: nevertheless they can be deducted from the wealthy investor's nonfarm income, sheltering it from the federal income tax.

Though most businesses use the "accrual" method of accounting, since it is the most accurate way to reflect the true income of the business, farmers are permitted to choose between use of the accrual method or the "cash" method. Using the cash method, inventories are ignored. The growth in inventories is not balanced off against other costs. Put another way, costs that reflect the building up of an asset (inventories) are deducted from otherwise taxable income, but there is no corresponding adjustments made for increase in the value of the asset (inventory). As a result, certain farm operators abuse this privilege by carefully mismatching costs and the income generated by these costs, to their tax advantage.

Losses, which under normal (accrual) accounting procedures would result in gains, are created which, in turn, are used to "shelter" the wealthy investor's nonfarm income from his taxable income.

What's more, since many of these "paper" losses actually reflect increases in investment, income taxes that should be paid annually at ordinary rates are postponed until the sale of the inventory at which time the tax is cut in half because capital-gains rates apply. Under these circumstances it is possible for the tax-deductible costs of raising an animal to exceed the taxable gain even though the animal is sold at a profit.

For example, a cash-basis farmer spends \$200 over a three-year period in raising a cow and charges the \$200 off over the period as an expense. He then sells the cow for \$250. His real profit on the transaction was \$50; yet, since the entire \$250 is considered as capital gains, only half of the \$250 (\$125) must be reported as taxable income. As a result, he reports \$125 in income and deducts \$200 in expenses over the three-year period—his tax returns show a \$75 loss on a transaction which in actuality yielded a profit of \$50.

Under normal accounting techniques, the \$200 spent in raising the cow would have been treated as an increase in inventory and would not have resulted in a deductible expense. Upon the sale of the cow, the capital gain would have been \$50 and one-half of it, or \$25, would enter his taxable income. Hence the "accrual" farmer would have reported \$25 in income (although it was really \$50) and no deductions. The "cash" farmer reported income of \$125 and expenses of \$200.

Moreover, the definition of what are capital assets (and therefore subject to capital-gains tax rates) is stretched considerably, to the advantage of certain farmers. The Internal Revenue Code, for example, treats livestock used for draft, dairy or breeding purposes as depreciable capital assets.

Through the use of "leveraging" (much borrowing—little cash investment), the advantages of these special privileges are compounded. The combined effects of interest charges on the money borrowed for the farm investment and the operating losses, that are so easily shown through cash accounting, result in phenomenal phantom tax losses, which are washed out against the other income of wealthy farm investors, sheltering it from taxation.

Some insight into how these special privi-

leges are utilized by the wealthy can be found in the annual income-tax return data published by the Internal Revenue Service.

In 1967, for example, there were over 1 million tax returns filed showing net farm losses, and almost 2 million reporting a net gain. For those taxpayers with adjusted gross income under \$50,000, the number of returns showing profits from farm operations exceeded the number showing losses, by rather substantial amounts. The overwhelming majority of actual, operating farmers were in this group.

However, where adjusted gross incomes were over \$50,000, more returns showed losses than gains. In the \$1,000,000-and-over income group, only 12 returns showed profits—totaling \$74,000—compared to 101 returns claiming losses—totaling \$7.6 million. (See Table 3.)

Obviously, "nonfarmers" are investing in farms solely for tax purposes. As a consequence, these nonfarmers compete unfairly with legitimate farmers. They distort the farm economy by bidding up the price of farmland and forcing ordinary farmers to compete in the market with those who are totally indifferent to whether they receive a fair price for the product or not.

The Treasury estimates an annual tax loss of some \$800 million due to the farm loopholes. By placing a \$15,000 limit, just on the amount of phantom tax loss that can be applied against other income, some \$145,000,000 in revenue could be recouped.

Tax-exempt foundations

The tax-exempt status granted to certain foundations represents one of the most glaring examples of how a well-intentioned, seemingly desirable, tax privilege can become twisted.

As a nation, we recognize that philanthropy is desirable and it should be encouraged. In line with this reasoning, individuals are permitted, within certain limits, to deduct from their taxable income, contributions to organizations established for religious, charitable, scientific, educational and similar purposes. Likewise, the federal government grants tax-exempt status to the organizations receiving the contributions.

Granting special tax privileges for such contributions or to such institutions raises the same fundamental question as in all tax-forgiveness schemes. The government is relinquishing funds it would otherwise be entitled to, and therefore others must pay a higher share of the costs of government. Thus, where there is tax forgiveness, there must also be an assurance that the nation's interests are being served.

Recent investigations into certain tax-exempt foundations—non-profit organizations set up and supported by wealthy families or individuals—have raised some serious doubts as to whether appropriate purposes are in fact being fulfilled and the nation's interest is being served.

Tax-exempt foundations have grown phenomenally—new ones are cropping up at the rate of some 2,000 per year. The assets of the larger foundations are currently estimated at some \$20 billion, and each of the 27 largest foundations has assets worth \$100 million or more.

The philosophy underlying the private foundations, according to a foundation spokesman is "the systematic use of private funds for public purposes." Unfortunately, the studies of the activities of tax-exempt foundations done by the House Committee on Small Business have shown that in many cases the opposite situation prevails. That is, public funds are being systematically used for private purposes.

Family foundations frequently are used as a means whereby the wealthy can avoid income, gift and inheritance taxes, yet maintain control over wealth. When families donate company stock to private family-run foundations, family control over the busi-

ness can be assured from generation to generation, while inheritance taxes are avoided. The donor can control the management of the foundation—appointing relatives, rewarding friends and employees. The foundation provides the conduit for donations which reduce the taxes on his business income.

Furthermore, this control can be parlayed to a point where the foundation is used to promote the foundation owner's other business interests. Practices have been uncovered which can be questioned on the basis of unfair competition, conflict of interest, self-dealing, "insider" arrangements to affect stock prices, and so forth.

Foundations, for example, can lend money to the founder, his family, or the family business at preferential interest rates, thus supplying venture capital for the donor's other interests. The Subcommittee's studies noted situations, where suppliers and buyers have made sizable contributions to foundations, controlled by customers, indicating underhanded pricing deals. What's more, these organizations can enter into deals, whereby through intricate tax maneuvering, they can buy a business, invest none of their own money, and pay the seller more than the market value of the business. On top of this, the deal can be set up as an installment purchase, permitting the seller to convert what should have been ordinary income into preferentially taxed capital gains.

A Prentice-Hall Executive Tax Report, for example, offers this advice:

"Have You Put a Price on Your Business? You may be able to double it—by selling to a Charity.

"Say you're planning to sell your business and you think a fair price would be five times earnings. If the company earns, say, \$101,500 after taxes (\$200,000 before), you're probably figuring on selling for about \$500,000. If that's the case, stop right there—you may be shortchanging yourself:

"That business could be worth \$1,000,000 to a tax-exempt organization: An ordinary buyer is only interested in earnings after taxes—that's all he gets to see. But a tax-exempt buyer keeps a hundred cents on the dollar. So a fair price to a charity would be five times \$200,000, or \$1,000,000—twice what you figured!"

Finally, the Report notes some "Frosting on the cake" and cites a case where the seller maintained 48% ownership of the corporation, "was active in management and drew a good salary."

Commenting on the abuses uncovered, a *New York Times* editorial added another dimension—that of the increased role of foundations in shaping national policy:

"Since almost everyone pays income taxes, the burden of exempting the income of the foundations is borne by the public at large. Yet the public is virtually powerless to influence the ways in which the foundations spend their tax-free dollars."

Generous tax treatment is appropriate for charitable organizations since private philanthropy is an important adjunct to public programs serving the goals of the nation. However, this special treatment is justifiable only if these organizations are in fact using the foundations, and their tax-exempt privilege, for the public good and not merely for the private advantage of a select well-heeled few.

Unlimited charitable-contribution deduction

The ordinary taxpayer cannot deduct charitable contributions that exceed 30% of his income. However, through use of a little-known loophole—the unlimited charitable-contribution deduction—about 100 of the nation's wealthiest families escape paying \$25 million in taxes. Many of these families pay no federal income taxes at all.

Though the loophole alone yields tax benefits to some of the nation's wealthiest, the major part of the tax bonanza comes about

through combining the unlimited-deduction gimmick with another loophole—that which permits the contribution deduction to be based on the appreciated value of assets (typically stocks) donated, not the cost. Hence, no tax—not even at privileged capital-gain rates—is ever paid on the appreciated value; yet the full amount is allowed as a deduction from income.

The unlimited deduction privilege seems stringent in that it's only allowed if total contributions plus income taxes paid in eight out of the ten preceding years exceeds 90% of taxable income. However, these criteria are easily met by many wealthy individuals whose income comes from nontaxable sources. Thus many who rely upon state and local bond interest, or capital gains, or whose taxable income is "sheltered" by means of excessive depletion or depreciation deductions can easily give away large percentages of taxable income—since so little of their income is subject to tax.

The Treasury studied the 1964 tax returns of four wealthy "non-taxpayers" and found that each had a total income of between six and ten million dollars and a taxable income of zero. Their incomes came almost entirely from dividends and/or capital gains. Each gave away property close to, or in excess of, the reported adjusted gross income—property which was for the most part appreciated stocks, upon which no capital-gains tax was ever paid—and in each case, taxable income and income tax were \$0.

As a result, a seemingly innocent and appropriate tax-forgiveness provision geared to encouraging philanthropy serves in the main to divert public revenues to private use. The public revenue cost is far out of proportion to the philanthropic goals forwarded, and the difference flows to a privileged few individuals of extreme wealth.

What is more, studies have shown that the charities supported by the contributions of the wealthy are generally quite different from those that receive the bulk of their contributions from the majority of the nation's taxpayers. And this evidence suggests that Congressional intent and the national interest in supporting charitable organizations is thwarted.

For example, a 1965 Treasury Department report showed that in the income classes under \$20,000, over 80% of the contributions went to religious organizations and charities concerned with social welfare, such as the Community Chest and the Red Cross. In contrast, those in the over-\$1,000,000 income class gave over two-thirds of their contributions to so-called "other organizations"—principally foundations. Religious and social-welfare organizations like the Community Chest received less than 10% of the wealthier group's philanthropy.

The 7 percent investment credit

The investment-credit tax privilege was added to the Internal Revenue Code in 1962 and liberalized in 1964. The privilege was enacted as an effort to spur the economy by encouraging business to invest in new machinery and equipment.

Under this provision, business firms are permitted to deduct from the federal income taxes owed an amount equal to 7% of the cost of new machinery and equipment. The full 7% can be deducted for firms with tax liabilities up to \$25,000. If the tax liabilities are more than \$25,000, the amount of credit that can be deducted is limited to one-fourth of their taxable income. In other words, the only limit on the credit is that it cannot reduce the firm's tax bill by more than 25%.

In effect then, the nation's taxpayers are picking up the tab so that a private firm can get a discount on the costs of its equipment.

What's more, prior to 1964, businesses had to deduct the credit from the cost of the investment before they were allowed to write

off depreciation. This was changed in 1964 and currently the credit can be taken, and the full purchase price can be written off. Thus, more than 100% of the cost can be written off and, like the oil-depletion deduction, imaginary expenses are used to reduce taxable income.

The revenue cost of the credit, according to the Treasury, amounts to \$3 billion at fiscal year 1969 levels of business profits and investment. This \$3 billion tax forgiveness subsidy induces increased business investment and feeds the only major source of inflationary-demand pressure in 1969—while the entire national economy is burdened with tight money, unprecedented interest rates and other generally restrictive measures.

Multiple surtax exemptions

The corporate income tax is a two-step affair. The first \$25,000 of profit is taxed at a rate of 22% and the remainder is taxed at 48% (excluding the temporary 10% surtax).

The exemption of the first \$25,000 from the full corporate tax rate was made part of the Internal Revenue Code in order to help small corporations.

However, the intent of this provision has been thwarted by many large corporations, which have intentionally organized themselves into chains, to shelter much of their income from the full corporate rate.

Thus, by spinning off into subsidiaries, a corporation can reduce its taxes annually by \$6,500 per subsidiary. A single corporation, for example, with a net profit of \$1 million would pay a tax of \$473,500. If the same corporation operated through 40 subsidiaries, each showing a profit of \$25,000, the tax would be cut by more than half—down to \$220,000.

The Treasury estimates that the exemption results in a reduction of the tax rate on corporations generally from 48% to 45.8% and a revenue loss of approximately \$1.8 billion. The combined effect of both the 7% investment credit and the \$25,000 exemption brings the effective rate down to only 43.4% and the revenue loss to some \$4-5 billion.

Moreover, this special privilege amounts to a tax incentive that encourages unsound corporate arrangements. It also adds an element of discrimination between those types of corporations that can easily be split up to take advantage of the special privilege and those that cannot.

As a result, a benefit intended to help small business also provides tax-windfall opportunities to large, highly profitable operations.

Conglomerates

The greatest wave of mergers in American history is now rolling through the economy. This great movement towards the concentration of economic power has been building up over the last 20 years. It obscures the peaks of the two previous merger waves in 1899 and 1929. The number of mergers of mining and manufacturing companies zoomed from 219 in 1950 to 844 in 1960 to nearly 1,000 in 1966 and over 2,400 in 1968, according to the Federal Trade Commission.

Not only are the "biggs" taking over the "smalls," but minnows are swallowing whales, and the "biggs" are merging with other "biggs." Conglomerate marriages, with increasing frequency, involve partners with assets over \$10 million. In 1966, there were 101 mergers involving an acquired company with assets in excess of \$10 million. The Federal Trade Commission reported 192 such mergers in 1968, with assets of the acquired companies totaling \$12.6 billion. The 200 largest companies acquired 70 firms in mergers in 1968, the FTC reported.

As a result, one out of every six firms that made Fortune Magazine's 1962 top-500 list has completely disappeared.

These conglomerate corporations grow in all directions, by acquiring companies in any industry or product-line, no matter how un-

related. They operate in all kinds of different industries and markets.

The great merger movement of recent years has brought an alarming increase in the concentration of economic power in the hands of the major corporations. In 1967, the 200 largest manufacturing corporations held nearly 59% of the total assets of all manufacturing corporations—up from about 48% in 1948. The 78 giant manufacturing corporations, with assets of \$1 billion or more, held 43% of the assets of manufacturing corporations in 1968 and received 49% of the profits of all manufacturing corporations.

The concern is not with large conglomerate corporations merely because they are large. It is the effects which must be examined. The immediate questions concern plant closings and impacts on collective bargaining and the local community. Beyond this, what does the concentration of economic power do to the political system and economic system, in terms of prices, competition, efficiency and inventiveness?

These questions go beyond those that can be answered through the tax structure. They involve the anti-trust laws and the operations of the Justice Department, as well as such other government agencies as the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Yet it is clear that there are tax inducements to those who would merge and the tax structure adds thrust to the corporate take-over movement.

By "swapping debt for equity" (offering bonds in exchange for stock) the acquiring firm has to pay bond interest rather than stock dividends. Interest is tax-deductible; dividends are not. Because of this tax advantage, the purchaser can offer a bond (debenture) supposedly valued at more than the stock, creating what has been labeled "funny money."

The seller also has a tax advantage since he pays no taxes on the transaction until the bond is paid off. Hence, it is the nation's taxpayers who are helping to finance the take-over.

If the seller receives stock in the acquiring firm in exchange for his old stock, the transaction, under most circumstances, is tax-free. Of the 352 major acquisitions that took place in 1967 and 1968, some 90% were tax-free. The "new" firms were valued in the stock market at \$3 billion higher than the pre-merged firms; yet no taxes were paid.

The tax-loss "carry-over" provisions in the Internal Revenue Code lead to anomalous situations, where a firm showing a loss becomes a more desirable partner for a merger than a profitable one. And again the nation's taxpayers are the losers. If a firm has losses, it pays no taxes. If the firm merges with a profitable firm, its losses can be washed out against the acquiring firm's otherwise taxable income. And, of course, other tax loopholes can be called into play to create phantom losses and situations similar to the tax havens built by wealthy real-estate speculators and tax-loss farmers.

Moreover, other business tax privileges—as the 7% investment credit, for example, and accelerated depreciation—help to provide many corporations with unreasonably large amounts of cash (depreciation allowances plus retained profits) after payment of taxes and dividends to stockholders. The cash is thus available for such venture as those involved in the sharp rise of foreign investment and buying out other firms.

Other loopholes for the wealthy

There are, unfortunately, many other loopholes of special privilege for rich people and corporations, that should be closed. Stock options, for example, permit corporate executives to receive income in the form of stock deals that are not reported or taxed as salaries, but are taxed on the sale of the stock, as capital gains. And other opportunities to defer taxes on salaries and con-

vert salary income to much lower-taxed capital gains are available to high-paid executives. Tax-deductible "business" vacations are the privilege primarily of wealthy businessmen and executives, as are the nontaxable benefits that accrue to those with lavish expense accounts.

Earnings from operating ships or aircraft registered in a foreign country, are tax-exempt. This encourages "runaways." In 1968, more American-owned tonnage was registered under foreign flags than under the U.S. flag. And, special tax gimmicks also apply to corporations operating through foreign subsidiaries.

Proposals to close the loopholes

To close these loopholes and bring the federal individual and corporate income-tax systems into line with America's standards of fair play, the AFL-CIO urges adoption of the following proposals:

1. *Capital Gains.* Elimination of preferential tax treatment of capital gains for both individuals and corporations. Such gains should be taxed at regular tax rates. At the same time, the present income-averaging provisions should be broadened to include capital gains.

Approximate revenue gain: \$6-7 billion.

2. *Capital Gains on Property Transferred at Death.* All appreciation (difference between original cost and market value) should be taxed in full on transfer at death. The tax rate should apply to all appreciation occurring after date of enactment; one-half the tax rate should apply to all gains occurring between an appropriate date such as January 1, 1950, and the date of enactment.

The tax should be allowed as a deduction for estate-tax purposes. It should not apply on transfers between the decedent and spouse nor to estates valued at less than \$60,000.

To prevent "forced" sales of assets, appropriate installment-payment procedures should be adopted.

Approximate revenue gain: \$3-4 billion.

3. *Depletion.* Deductions for depletion should not be permitted to be taken after the cost of the property has been fully written off.

Approximate revenue gain: \$1.5 billion.

4. *Interest on State and Local Bonds.* All interest on state and local debt securities, issued after the date of enactment (following an appropriate transition period), should be subject to the income tax. The federal government should guarantee the bonds and pay the issuing state or local government an amount equal to one-third of the interest-cost on such taxable issues. No federal guarantee or interest-rate subsidy should be permitted for industrial development bonds, regardless of the amount of the issue.

There would be a net revenue gain, after taking into account the cost of the subsidy and the guarantee, of approximately \$100 million.

5. *7% Investment Tax Credit.* The 7% investment tax credit should be repealed. Approximate revenue gain: \$3 billion.

6. *Accelerated Depreciation on Real Estate.* Accelerated depreciation (depreciation in excess of straight-line) should be disallowed on all real estate except low- and moderate-housing.

Approximate revenue gain: \$700-800 million.

7. *Limitation of Deductions Attributable to Farming Operations.* Each dollar of non-farm income over \$15,000 should reduce the amount of farm loss that can be deducted from nonfarm income by \$1. This provision should not apply to farm losses resulting from taxes, interest, casualty, drought, and sale of farm property. This provision should not apply to farmers using the accrual method of accounting.

Approximate revenue gain: \$145 million.

8. *Unlimited Charitable Contributions.* The deduction should be repealed immediately. The special unlimited charitable-contribution deduction should be repealed immediately.

Approximate revenue gain: \$50 million.

9. *Multiple Surtax Exemptions from Corporate Income Tax.* Commonly controlled business enterprises should, after an appropriate transition period, be limited to only one \$25,000 surtax exemption.

Appropriate revenue gain (when fully effective): \$235 million.

10. *Tax-Exempt Foundations:* (1) Financial transactions between a foundation and its founders, contributors, officers, directors or trustees should be prohibited.

(2) Foundations should be required to spend their incomes within one year of receipt.

(3) Foundations should not be permitted to own 20% or more of any business unrelated to their charitable function—a reasonable time should be allowed for presently organized foundations to comply with this provision.

(4) If a donor maintains control of a business or property after it is contributed, no donation deduction from taxes should be allowed until the foundation disposes of the property or the donor's control over the property ends.

(5) Foundation borrowing to buy investment properties should be prohibited. Foundation lending should be limited to appropriate charitable functions.

(6) A limitation, such as 40 years, should be placed on the life of foundations.

(7) Congress should carefully examine the problems posed by the actual operations of foundations and the need for some degree of federal regulation of the use of the tax-exempt funds of foundations.

11. *Conglomerates.* The skyrocketing trend of business mergers requires detailed examination—including the antitrust laws and the operations of the appropriate government agencies as the Justice Department, Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

A thorough investigation should also be conducted to determine the extent to which the federal tax structure contributes to this alarming trend of corporate mergers and acquisitions.

Among the tax provisions that should be examined are those which permit:

(1) Corporations to deduct interest payments on debt used to finance mergers and acquisitions.

(2) Capital-gains taxes to be paid in installments when stock is exchanged for debt securities.

(3) Tax-free exchanges on corporate stock transfers made for purposes of mergers and acquisitions.

(4) Corporations to "carry over" the operating and capital losses of an acquired firm.

In addition, the penalty tax provisions applying to excessive amounts of retained profits, should be made workable in the light of recent experience.

12. *Allocation of Deductions.* Individuals and corporations should be required to allocate certain deductions between taxable and nontaxable income.

Under present law, those who receive tax-exempt income derive a double benefit. The income never appears on the tax return; hence no tax is paid. Secondly, personal or non-operating business deductions can be deducted in full from taxable income.

Before such deductions are permitted, since they are designed to define ability-to-pay, total income (taxable and exempt income) should be taken into account: Thus, individuals with excluded income, as defined below, in excess of \$10,000, should be required to allocate certain personal deductions in line with the ratio their adjusted gross income bears to adjusted gross income plus exempt

income. The deductions that should be allocated are: interest and tax payments, casualty losses, charitable contributions,

medical expenses, and cooperative housing expenses. Allocation formula should be as follows:

$$\text{Deductions} \times \frac{\text{adjusted gross income}}{\text{AGI plus exempt income minus } \$10,000} = \text{allowable deductions}$$

Excluded income which would cause deduction to be allocated should include the following:

- (1) One-half of capital gains.
- (2) State and local bond interest.
- (3) Depletion taken after the cost of the property has been written off.
- (4) The difference between the cost and the market value of property donated to charity.
- (5) Depreciation on real estate taken in

excess of straight-line, except for low- and moderate-housing.

Corporations with excluded income, as defined above, in excess of \$25,000 should be required to allocate non-operating expense deductions between net profit from operations and excluded income.

The allocation formula should be as follows:

$$\text{Nonoperating deductions} \times \frac{\text{net operating profit}}{\text{net operating profit plus exempt income minus } \$25,000} = \text{allowable nonoperating deductions}$$

13. *Minimum Tax on Exempt Income.* A 25% tax should be levied on the amount of excluded income which exceeds \$10,000 for individuals and \$25,000 for corporations, plus any amount of deductions disallowed under allocation-of-deductions formula. The "excluded income" subject to this tax should include the following:

- (1) One-half capital gains.
- (2) State and local bond interest.
- (3) Depletion taken after the cost of property has been written off.
- (4) The difference between the cost and the market value of property donated to charity.
- (5) Depreciation on real estate taken in excess of straight-line, except for low- and moderate-housing.

The effect of the allocation of deductions and minimum tax proposals on an actual case cited by the U.S. Treasury is illustrated in Table 4. As shown in the table, a taxpayer with a total income of \$1.3 million paid a nil effective tax rate (.03%). Under the proposals suggested by the AFL-CIO the effective tax rate would be 21.8%.

Approximate revenue gain from allocation of deductions: \$250 million.

Approximate revenue gain from 25% minimum tax: \$1.5 billion.

14. All special tax-forgiveness proposals offered under the guise of "incentives" which would provide additional loopholes for the wealthy and further erode the fairness of the tax structure should be rejected. All proposals to adopt a federal retail sales tax—whether called "value-added" taxes or offered clearly as a tax on consumers—should also be rejected.

Tax relief for low- and middle-income groups

1. *The minimum standard deduction should be increased from the present \$200 plus \$100 per exemption to \$600 plus \$100 per exemption.* This proposal would exempt from federal income tax the majority of persons below the government-defined poverty level

and significantly reduce the tax payments of all persons at or near the poverty level. (See Table 5.)

The revenue cost would be approximately \$1.2 billion.

2. *The standard deduction should be increased from the present 10% with a \$1,000 maximum to 15% and a \$2,500 maximum.* This proposal would bring standard deductions closer in line with the actual deductions claimed by most taxpayers. It would simplify reporting for the great majority of taxpayers and would provide tax relief for all those whose itemized deductions amount to less than 15% of income or \$2,500. Most of the relief would flow to those in the \$5-\$20,000 income range. (See Table 7.)

The revenue cost would be approximately \$2 billion.

3. *The first two individual-income-tax bracket rates should be reduced from the current 14% and 15% to 9% and 13% respectively.* This proposal would provide tax relief to all taxpayers, but the major portion of the tax deduction (approximately 95%) would go to those with annual incomes below \$20,000. (See Tables 5, 6 and 7.)

The revenue cost would be approximately \$3.4 billion.

4. *Moving-Expense Deductions.* Deductible moving expenses should be broadened to include certain non-employer-reimbursed expenses such as those related to sale of old residence—real-estate commissions and advertising costs and costs of settling an unexpired lease; remove househunting trips; and temporary lodging costs (for worker and family). These additional costs should be subject to an overall limitation of \$2,000. Present treatment of other deductible moving expenses—unreimbursed expenses of transporting the employee, his family and belongings in a job-connected move—should continue.

The revenue cost would be approximately \$100 million.

TABLE 1.—IMPACT OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES, FAMILY OF 4, 1963-68

Wage or salary income	Decrease in Federal income tax	Increase in OASDHI	Increase in State and local taxes	Change in net income after taxes (percent)		
				Federal income taxes only	Federal income and OASDHI	Federal income OASDHI, S. and L.
\$1,000		\$7.75	\$89	-0.9		-14.2
\$2,000		15.50	110	-8		-7.9
\$3,000	\$60.00	23.25	132	+2.0	+1.3	-3.9
\$5,000	130.00	46.00	168	+2.8	+1.9	-2.2
\$7,500	139.50	156.00	182	+2.1	-3	-3.4
\$10,000	174.45	169.20	245	+2.0	0	-3.1
\$12,500	216.50	169.20	290	+2.0	+5	-2.6
\$15,000	270.35	169.20	317	+2.1	-8	-1.9
\$20,000	403.00	169.20	368	+2.5	+1.5	-9
\$35,000	943.40	169.20	567	+3.6	+3.0	+9

Note: State and local taxes were estimated by the AFL-CIO Research Department. These estimates were based upon Council of Economic Advisers studies for 1965 and Bureau of Census State and local tax data for 1963, 1965, and 1968. Federal income taxes based on family of 4, using the minimum standard deduction where applicable and assuming deductions equal to 10 percent of income for all other groups.

TABLE 2.—RETURNS WITH TAXABLE INCOME, 1966
EFFECTIVE TAX RATES

Adjusted gross income (thousands)	Effective tax rate on present-law taxable income (percent)	Effective tax rate on taxable income including excluded half of capital gains ¹ (percent)
\$0 to \$5	15.3	15.0
\$5 to \$10	16.4	16.2
\$10 to \$20	18.1	17.8
\$20 to \$50	24.0	22.8
\$50 to \$100	35.8	32.6
\$100 to \$200	45.6	37.8
\$200 to \$500	52.3	37.9
\$500 to \$1,000	55.3	35.8
\$1,000 and over	55.5	32.7

¹ These effective rates are actually overstated—particularly in the upper brackets—because other forms of exempt income, such as interest from State and local bonds, are not taken into account in this table. For example, the Treasury Department estimates that the effective tax rate on total income for nearly two-thirds of those with adjusted gross incomes of \$1,000,000 and over is 30 percent or less—4 percent of this group pay an effective tax rate of 5 percent or less.

Source: U.S. Treasury Department "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals," Feb. 5, 1969, p. 81.

TABLE 3.—SELECTED DATA FROM INCOME TAX RETURNS REPORTING FARM PROFITS AND LOSSES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Adjusted gross income	Farm returns			
	Net profit		Net loss	
	Number of returns	Amount	Number of returns	Amount
Under \$5,000	415,346	\$728,615	180,557	\$183,588
\$5,000 to \$10,000	502,044	1,580,178	371,917	410,518
\$10,000 to \$20,000	240,493	1,386,520	161,340	254,104
\$20,000 to \$50,000	50,608	605,232	41,441	161,673
\$50,000 to \$100,000	6,059	100,476	10,023	83,326
\$100,000 to \$1,000,000	1,292	25,537	4,262	85,827
\$1,000,000 or more	12	74	101	7,577

Source: U.S. Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service, Preliminary Statistics of Income, Individual Income Tax Returns, 1967.

TABLE 4.—ILLUSTRATION OF AFL-CIO 25 PERCENT TAX ON EXEMPT INCOME AND ALLOCATION OF DEDUCTIONS PROPOSALS ON A TAXPAYER (ACTUAL CASE) WITH OVER \$1,000,000 OF INCOME AND AN EFFECTIVE TAX RATE OF 0.03 PERCENT

[Actual case cited by Treasury Department]

	Actual	Proposed
A. APPLICATION OF ALLEGATION OF DEDUCTIONS PROPOSAL		
Reported adjusted gross income	\$679,405	\$679,405
Less personal exemption	-600	-600
Less itemized deductions	-\$676,419	-\$357,352
Taxable income	2,386	321,453
Income tax	383	210,507
B. APPLICATION OF 25 PERCENT TAX ON EXEMPT INCOME		
Total excluded income:		
Excluded capital gains	605,313	
Excess depreciation on real estate	11,141	
Total	616,454	
Less \$10,000	-10,000	
Less disallowed deductions (\$676,419-\$357,352)	-319,067	
Exempt income subject to 25 percent tax		287,387
25 percent on exempt income		71,847
Add tax on taxable income after deductions allocated		210,507

TABLE 4.—ILLUSTRATION OF AFL-CIO 25 PERCENT TAX ON EXEMPT INCOME AND ALLOCATION OF DEDUCTIONS PROPOSALS ON A TAXPAYER (ACTUAL CASE) WITH OVER \$1,000,000 OF INCOME AND AN EFFECTIVE TAX RATE OF 0.03 PERCENT—Continued

[Actual case cited by Treasury Department]

	Actual	Proposed
B. APPLICATION OF 25 PERCENT TAX ON EXEMPT INCOME—Con.		
Income tax	383	282,354
Income tax as percent of total income	0.03	21.8
¹ Computed as follows:		
Adjusted gross income		\$679,405
Add excluded capital gains		605,313
Add excess depreciation on real estate		11,141
Total income		1,295,859

Deductions $\times \frac{\$679,405}{\$1,295,859 - \$10,000} = \$357,352$ allowable deductions

² Actual loss reported was \$22,283—analysis assumes only $\frac{1}{2}$ of this loss due to excessive depreciation.

Note: 1968 surtax excluded.

TABLE 5.—EFFECT OF AFL-CIO TAX-RELIEF PROPOSALS FOR LOW-INCOME GROUPS¹

Family size	Poverty income line ²	Present Federal income tax	Federal income tax under AFL-CIO proposals
1	\$1,751	\$123	\$41
2	2,265	93	24
3	2,785	68	8
4	3,572	80	15
5	4,209	71	19
6	4,723	45	11

¹ Increase in minimum standard deduction to \$600 plus \$100 per dependent. Reduction in first 2 bracket tax rates to 9 and 13 percent.

² 1966 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare nonfarm poverty income levels adjusted for change in living costs 1966-68

TABLE 6.—EFFECT OF REDUCTION IN FIRST 2 BRACKET RATES TO 9 AND 13 PERCENT—MARRIED TAXPAYER FILING JOINT RETURN

Taxable income ¹	Present Federal income tax	Tax under AFL-CIO proposal	Tax reduction	Tax reduction as a percentage of present tax
\$1,000	\$140	\$90	\$50	35.7
\$2,000	290	220	70	24.1
\$3,000	450	380	70	15.5
\$5,000	810	740	70	8.6
\$7,500	1,285	1,215	70	5.4
\$10,000	1,820	1,750	70	3.8
\$12,500	2,385	2,315	70	2.9
\$15,000	3,010	2,940	70	2.3
\$20,000	4,380	4,310	70	1.6
\$35,000	9,920	9,850	70	.7
\$50,000	17,060	16,990	70	.4

¹ Wage and salary income less personal exemptions and deductions.

Note: Figures exclude 1968 surtax.

TABLE 7.—EFFECT OF AFL-CIO TAX-RELIEF PROPOSALS MARRIED TAXPAYER, 2 CHILDREN, STANDARD DEDUCTION¹

Wage or salary income	1968 Federal income tax	Tax due under AFL-CIO proposals	Tax reduction	Tax reduction as a percentage of present tax
\$1,000				
\$2,000				

TABLE 7.—EFFECT OF AFL-CIO TAX-RELIEF PROPOSALS MARRIED TAXPAYER, 2 CHILDREN, STANDARD DEDUCTION¹—Continued

Wage or salary income	1968 Federal income tax	Tax due under AFL-CIO proposals	Tax reduction	Tax reduction as a percentage of present tax
\$3,000				
\$5,000	\$290	\$168	\$122	42.1
\$7,500	686	546	140	20.4
\$10,000	1,114	949	165	14.8
\$12,500	1,622	1,359	263	16.2
\$15,000	2,172	1,827	345	15.9
\$20,000	3,428	2,965	463	13.5
\$35,000	8,504	7,849	655	7.7
\$50,000	15,360	14,540	820	5.3

Note: Excludes surtax.

¹ Increase in minimum standard deduction to \$600 plus \$100 per dependent. Increase in standard deduction to 15 percent, maximum of \$2,500. Reduction in first 2 bracket tax rates to 9 and 13 percent.

TABLE 8.—ESTIMATED FEDERAL REVENUE GAINS AND LOSSES RESULTING FROM AFL-CIO TAX PROPOSALS

	Approximate revenue gain (loss) (millions of dollars)
Loophole-closing proposals	
1. Elimination of preferential tax treatment of capital gains	6,000-7,000
2. Taxation of gains on property transferred at death	1,300-4,200
3. Disallowance of depletion after investment fully written off	1,500
4. Elimination of tax-exempt State and local bond interest and inclusion of Federal subsidy and loan guarantee	100
5. Elimination of 7 percent investment credit	3,000
6. Elimination of accelerated depreciation on real estate except for low- and moderate-income housing	700-800
7. Limitation of farm-loss deductions	145
8. Elimination of unlimited charitable-contribution deduction	50
9. Elimination of corporate multiple surtax exemption	* 235
10. Tax-exempt foundations	
11. Conglomerates	
12. Allocation of deductions	\$250
13. 25 percent minimum tax on exempt income	1,500
Total gain	1,750
TAX-RELIEF PROPOSALS	
1. Increase in minimum standard deduction	(1,200)
2. Increase in standard deduction	(2,000)
3. Reduction in first 2 bracket rates	(3,400)
4. Broadening of allowable moving-expense deductions	(100)
Total revenue loss	(6,700)
Approximate net revenue gain from AFL-CIO proposals	8,130-10,330

¹ If taxed at current capital-gains rates.
² If taxed at full rates.
³ When full effective.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP HONORING THE LIFE AND DEATH OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, recently on an NBC news special narrated by Sander Vanocur, a tape was included on the problems of Irish Catholics in Northern

Ireland. As these poor people marched to the singing of "We shall overcome," I reflected on the love of the memory of Martin Luther King that so many of the world's people have for this great American. He is a man honored by the people of the world in the only way they know—by imitation—as he was honored by the world's most important people by the Nobel Peace Prize. Yet even though I contacted a former Postmaster General on April 8, 1968, and introduced a bill on May 1, 1968, for the purpose of bringing about the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and even though I have received assurances that something was going to be done, nothing has been done.

I will try again. I am today introducing a bill that would commemorate the life and death of Martin Luther King by a commemorative stamp, should it be enacted into law.

Martin Luther King believed that the foundation of democracy was progress in human dignity, a growing share in freedom for all men. He represented a universal hope for human dignity. He was killed, as you know, while aiding a strike by municipal employees, most of whom were Negroes, some of whom were white, who wanted a voice in their own future through their labor organization. He had nothing to gain. He gave all that he had to his country and his God.

The dream of Martin Luther King was a dream that in America and in all the world our acts would match our beliefs, would match our better selves. He brought his dream for us closer to reality.

Martin Luther King did more to revive the American dream than any man during the past 40 years, and when he died as the result of a bullet fired from a rifle held by an escaped convict, he was only 39 years of age.

His life and his work resulted in the passage of three civil rights bills.

His life brought within reach equality for all Americans.

His life resulted in the beginning of the end of our race problems.

His life began the solution of what foreigners have called "The American Dilemma."

All this in so short a time and all this in one lifetime.

Martin Luther King was a builder, not a destroyer. His advocacy brought about our civil rights legislation. The civil rights laws that have been passed by the Congress became laws among prophecies of doom. Yet, no one has been destroyed. Millions of Americans benefited by becoming full citizens. America is more of a democracy, it is a bigger country and a better nation.

Martin Luther King brought understanding with him, the understanding that was carried into every home in America, white or black, that the Negro could not wait any longer to be equal, that 100 years of disappointment after the Civil War were enough. Equality is a quality that belongs to all men, but it must be recognized. The shock of recognition was necessary for all of us, the recognition that our goals were great and our performance was so weak.

There are those who thought of Martin Luther King as a lawbreaker. They are wrong. He was the most lawful of men.

He ignored unjust ordinances, but he willingly paid the penalty for their violation. He showed that where men are willing to pay the penalty, unjust laws cannot stand. An unjust law is an unworkable law because the majority of Americans are not willing to begin a campaign of massive repression to deny rights to others which they accept for themselves.

The American people are a just people. They are very often too busy with the material problems of getting and spending to give their full attention to the big questions. Martin Luther King made people listen and think, to look deeply into their own souls and the soul of their country. We all have been better for that.

When Martin Luther King thought of death he said that he would like "somebody to say, Martin Luther King tried to love somebody." He loved more than somebody, he loved this country. I believe that it is fair to say that millions of Americans white and black love him back today.

For all of these reasons, I have introduced a bill today which will direct that a commemorative stamp be struck in honor of Martin Luther King. I hope that the Post Office Department and its special committee on Commemorative Stamps will act very soon and issue such a stamp.

Last year on May 1, 1968, I introduced a bill for the purpose of encouraging the Post Office Department to honor the memory of a great American who was known and loved by millions of Americans and millions of citizens of the world as one of our greatest citizens. Since that time many commemorative stamps have been issued. Those who are responsible for such stamps no doubt thought they were very important. Perhaps they were.

A stamp commemorating the achievements of the musician W. C. Handy, the father of the blues, will be issued May 17 with first-day ceremonies in Memphis, Tenn., since that city was immortalized by Mr. Handy's compositions. A stamp commemorating the 50-year life of the American Legion was announced on January 19 with first-day ceremonies on March 15. A stamp commemorating the flight of Apollo 8 was announced on January 29 by the Postmaster General for issuance on May 5, 1969. That was quick action commemorating an important event in space, but what was even quicker was the redesigning of the stamp and the addition of the words "In the beginning God." I am sure that Martin Luther King would have approved of that change. But when I think of our concern with space and our seeming lack of concern with earth and its people, it makes me wonder about our values.

I think that I have been patient in waiting for something to be done about honoring the life and works of a great American. I had written the then Postmaster General on April 8, 1968, 4 days after the assassination of Dr. King. Now I have waited almost a year. At that time I stated that I would consider hearings and the review of the whole commemorative stamp process. I was told at that time by postal officials that I had no need to worry, that everything possible would

be done. Perhaps everything has been done that could be done. Perhaps, there are problems. I would like to know what they are. If I am not assured in a very short time that a commemorative stamp honoring Dr. King will be issued, I will take action.

Surely postal officials are aware of the significance of Dr. King's life, of the significance of civil rights legislation which he helped bring about. I want action and I intend to get it.

THE LAST ECHOES

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Ray McHugh, chief of the Washington bureau of the Copley News Service, in a recent column, reflected on the funeral ceremonies for, and tributes to, former President Dwight Eisenhower.

Mr. McHugh's column, beautifully written, has captured the essence of what I believe most of us have felt during the days of the ceremonies and those which followed.

I am pleased to bring it to the attention of the Senate because of the fine tribute it is to General Eisenhower, but more so because it gives an added sense of meaning to the events of early April in which all Americans were in one way or another participants.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRIBUTE—NATIONAL—INTERPRETIVE

(By Ray McHugh, chief, Washington Bureau, Copley News Service)

WASHINGTON.—The last echoes of the cannon and the bugles have faded away; the tributes are ended; but the American people may discover that in death, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower performed one last service for them that could overshadow all his victories in war, all his achievements in peace.

The last five days have seen a "coming together" of Americans in salute to a man who has been called "the all-American president," "the 50-star general," "the most beloved American of the 20th century."

Out of the death of Gen. Eisenhower and the sad, but majestic pageantry of his final rites here and in Abilene, Kans., have come some powerful reminders about the roots of America.

As men looked back on Gen. Eisenhower's years of high military command and on his presidency, it was inevitable that they should comment on the order that marked those years—even the war years.

As they looked back even further, into the general's own origins, it was inevitable that they should comment on his simple, protestant heritage, his firm belief in the West Point creed of "duty, honor, country; his uncomplicated character that disdained political maneuvering, rejected the waste of hatred and reflected until the very end his faith in his country and the principles on which it was built.

It will be a long time before American history books forget his last words to his wife Mamie:

"I've always loved my wife.

"I've always loved my children.

"I've always loved my grandchildren.
"I've always loved my country."

The outpouring of genuine affection and respect for the old soldier must have surprised those in Washington who have delighted for almost a decade in pointing to his 1953-1961 presidency as a "do-nothing" period.

Many younger political figures dismissed the simple, open Eisenhower style as an anachronism. His principles no longer fit the changing times and mood of the nation, they said.

They must wonder today if times and moods have really changed that much, or if they have been listening only to strident minorities.

For the nation, too, Gen. Eisenhower's death brought a kind of reawakening. An increasingly secular citizenry suddenly paused, looked at its television screens, and seemed drawn back to the "God of our Fathers," the apt title of one of Gen. Eisenhower's favorite hymns.

"Onward, Christian Soldiers" had the ring of a call to duty and "Army Blue" was a reminder that old loyalties are not to be forgotten.

It has been easy for some Washington observers to disregard the relative order and quiet of the Eisenhower years as a post-war "interlude" and to blame the disorder and tension of the 1960s on the release of suppressed frustrations and the encouragement of intellectual ferment.

In the dignity of the last five days, both arguments seemed to collapse.

Gen. Eisenhower brought more to the national scene than a contagious grin. He brought a strength of purpose and a conviction in America. Perhaps even his closest friends did not grasp the full measure of that strength until this week.

In death he reminded millions not only of his achievements, but of their own achievements, their own origins and the origins of their country. Each act in the funeral drama—a program he had personally approved three years ago—seemed to emphasize these origins.

The change that came over the nation was almost visible in the lines that honored the 34th president as he lay in repose at the National Cathedral, then in state at the Capitol.

In those first hours Saturday the lines were made up largely of the middle aged and older Americans who remembered Gen. Eisenhower fondly as a great wartime commander and as a president who kept the peace. There were few young people or children. Few negroes.

But in the final hours at the Capitol Tuesday, at the railroad stations along the 1,300 mile ride home to Kansas and in the streets of Abilene Wednesday, youth and people of all races joined the tribute.

It was as if this man many could not even remember had in death awakened a pride of country, a new awareness of God, a selflessness that too many had forgotten.

For the first time in a long time, Americans had a good look at themselves and liked what they saw. Gen. Eisenhower was so typical of America that each in his own way could see a bit of himself in the soldier-president.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and our people

mourn the passing of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States.

If one word were used to describe General Eisenhower, I believe that word would be "dedication." Dedication to his country, dedication to his duty, and dedication to his family.

His military career spanned the victorious conclusion of the greatest world conflict in history.

His political career was climaxed with the ending of hostilities in Korea, the first direct armed conflict our Nation faced with Communist aggression.

He was truly a man of peace.

Personal integrity and honor marked his years as our Commander in Chief, and its impact was so profound that those years have been designated the "Eisenhower Era."

General Eisenhower, through his example as a leader, as a father, and as a man, exemplified those values we cherish most highly. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

From the heartland of our Nation, at his birthplace in Kansas, he acquired his basic sense of values of honesty, integrity, love of family, respect for authority, reverence for God, and dedication to country. These were his contributions to the highest office of the land, the Presidency of the United States.

As a patriot, a leader, as a father, and as a man, General Eisenhower exemplified our most cherished values. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

He will be missed, and he will be long remembered.

GRUENING THE CRUSADER

HON. TED STEVENS

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Ernest Gruening has served the Nation and my State with rare devotion and ability.

The Washington Post of April 3, 1969, contained an interesting article concerning his future plans. I commend the article to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, April 3, 1969]
GRUENING, 82, IS CRUSADING IN PRINT AGAIN
(By Harry F. Rosenthal)

Ernest Gruening started crusading in his first newspaper job in 1912 and now, at 82 a distinguished former Senator, he is once more using the printed word as his lance.

In 1923 Gruening's name appeared on the masthead as managing editor of "The Nation", an influential, intellectual weekly. That was long before he midwived Alaska to statehood, long before he became one of the Senate's most eloquent doves on the Vietnam war, which he calls "an unmitigated tragedy and disaster."

Now, deposed from his Senate seat by a

younger man and long past retirement age, his name appears again on The Nation's credits as editorial associate, and he is launching a new attack on an old target—overpopulation.

"I consider it, next to peace, the most serious problem mankind faces," Gruening said in an interview.

He said he also is deeply concerned about the USS Pueblo incident and international spying in general, but reserves his sharpest criticism for the Vietnam war.

"The country has been misled and it's now pretty apparent," he said of Vietnam. "It's surprising to me that more people don't realize the extent of the disaster, the consequences of which will be with us for the rest of the lives of the people now born. We will have spent over \$100 billion on this war—a sum not recoverable—we have neglected in consequence to take care of our really burning domestic issues."

In 1964 Gruening held Senate hearings on the problem of overpopulation and he now is affiliated with the Population Crisis Committee—a voluntary group—which is trying to expand government activity in the area.

"My interest in it (population control) arose over a half century ago when I was in medical school and when going on obstetrical cases in the slums of Boston I saw these large families living in tenements, children sickly, mother sickly, unable to support this ever-increasing brood. I felt then it was imperative that parents have access to the knowledge which would enable them to decide how many children they should have and at what intervals."

Gruening went into journalism soon after Harvard Medical School and, as managing editor of the Boston Traveler, wrote an editorial opposing a state law that banned publicizing of information about contraceptives.

"This editorial was considered so perilous," Gruening recalled, "that my boss, the editor of the morning paper, had the presses stopped and the editorial extracted."

Later, as editor of the Boston Journal, Gruening wrote a similar editorial. "It ran, but we lost a lot of advertising."

The problem is different now and larger because of the population explosion, Gruening said.

"It took 1850 years to bring about a population of one billion. Now, 118 years later, that population is more than tripled and it will double—unless we do something about it—every 30 years . . . We have lost the battle already, we already have more people on this little earth than we can support."

His new position on "The Nation," Gruening says, includes writing an occasional article or editorial. He also is working on an autobiography.

He worked on three Boston newspapers and then became managing editor of the New York Tribune in World War I. After a brief tour in the Army, he became managing editor of The Nation.

His first book was "Mexico and Its Heritage." The second, "The Public Pays," was an expose of private power companies.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him to a number of posts dealing with other countries and later made him the first director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions.

In 1939 Gruening was appointed Governor of Alaska and began working immediately for Alaskan statehood, saying: "A democracy has no business having colonies." He represented Alaska as a non-voting Senator for two years before Alaska became a state in 1958. When Alaska became the 49th state, he and the late E. S. Bartlett were its first elected Senators.

BIAFRA

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Maxwell T. Cohen, one of my constituents, recently made a trip to Biafra to determine the condition of the Biafran population, which has endured tragic food shortages and disease during almost 2 years of the Nigerian-Biafran conflict.

Mr. Cohen's report on his trip appeared in the winter-spring issue of the magazine entitled "Prevent World War III," which is published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

I include in the RECORD the text of Mr. Cohen's article in order to give my colleagues the benefit of Mr. Cohen's views of the tragic results which may arise if the Nigerian-Biafran war is not speedily terminated:

I WAS IN BIAFRA: INCUBATOR OF WORLD WAR III
(By Maxwell T. Cohen)¹

The drama, agony, tragedy, frustration and foreboding arising out of or associated with Biafra was epitomized in the first twenty-four hours that I spent in that beautiful but disturbed country.

I landed at night in a very dimly lit improvised airfield in a plane which carried a cargo of food and medical supplies. The plane flew over enemy territory without lights and made its miraculous landing under conditions which would have horrified any aviator.

I was then driven through the jungle by a series of back-roads to the home of one of the Government Ministers for a prolonged conference.

Around 11:00 o'clock I conferred with the Chief Justice of Biafra who had been a former member of the International Court of Justice. We discussed the application of the Genocide Convention in a thoroughly objective, professional manner with a degree of cold detachment as if we were discussing the civil problems of a client in our respective law offices, distant from Africa, from warfare, from destruction and from the devious involvements of diplomacy. This, however, was the last time that I was to discuss the Genocide Convention with cold, unemotional objectivity.

I returned to the two story hotel and watched the scene from the balcony. A man was washing a car below me; there were some groups of people talking; some boys were playing soccer in the adjacent field. I could hear the sounds of the market place nearby.

I returned to my room and soon I heard a series of sharp reports followed by a thunderous sharp sound. The building shook. There was another series of sharp reports followed by a resounding boom.

I ran out to the balcony and saw heavy black smoke spiral up from the market place. I went downstairs and two boys approached me. They were bleeding profusely. One fell at my feet screaming in a high pitched voice and pointed to his left leg. There appeared a ghastly flesh wound approximately one foot long, three inches wide. Flesh, blood, bone and tissue were visible. The other boy was also shot. A car drove both boys to a nearby hospital. About fifteen or sixteen boys passed us. Every single boy was wounded.

The attacking plane, identified as a Russian Mig flown by an Egyptian pilot dropped two bombs, three rockets and also strafed

the area. Seventy-four people were killed. Hundreds were wounded.

That night I heard a broadcast on the BBC shortwave. Lord Shepherd and General Alexander of the British Commission in Nigeria were blandly reassuring the world that they had seen no evidence of atrocities or incidents of genocide.

That same night the Chief Justice visited me. I confessed to him that after having experienced the bombing and seeing the consequences of the bombing, I would no longer be able to discuss the application of the Genocide Convention with professional detachment and objectivity.

I remember stating to him: "I know that you as a distinguished Jurist will advise me as an attorney not to become emotionally involved." The Chief Justice smiled very sadly and said that he would not so advise me. He told me that he had had three nieces and nephews who had been visiting his home and they had a discussion with him regarding their school work. He told me they were brilliant students. After discussing their work they went to a book store. The book store was bombed, and the three children perished. "One child we identified by some of the clothing on those parts of the body that we could find, one body we never found at all, and one body because of its condition we could never be sure, that this was the third child. I know how you feel."

There are several observations that can be made as a result of my visit to Biafra. These observations corroborate my opinion that unless there is an immediate cease-fire in the Nigerian and Biafran War that this war could be a prelude to World War III.

Although the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Nigerian Government have maintained that this war is "an internal matter," that is not the case. British guns, munitions and finances, Russian Mig's, war supplies and finances and Egyptian pilots are publicly involved on the Nigerian side. In addition there are a number of African States backing Nigeria either openly or diplomatically through the OAU and the United Nations. On the Biafran side France has been supplying arms. While I was in Biafra the People's Republic of China had issued a statement of its position on the war which was exceedingly pro-Biafran. There are a number of African States whose sympathies lie with Biafra. Throughout the world, many groups have aligned themselves with the humanitarian aspects of this war and are contributing substantial amounts of food and medicine to Biafran Relief. Obviously, this conflict is international and not an "internal matter."

DISGRACEFUL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Another fact which is an ominous foreboding of World War III is the deliberate duplicity on the part of the many nations in falsifying information which their governments and their people are entitled to know.

There have been several Commissions from Great Britain, Canada, several other nations and the United Nations which have publicized repeatedly their findings that they had seen no evidence of atrocities or genocide in this war. Half a dozen Commissions supposed to visit Biafra to ascertain whether or not atrocities were being committed have repeatedly stated with a great deal of publicity that they have seen no evidence of atrocities or genocide, but those commissions had never visited Biafra!

Catholic and Protestant clergymen and welfare workers, objective newspaper reporters, have seen and experienced atrocities and acts of genocide. Their observations are rarely publicized. The Irish Press is the only press which has consistently published reports of those who had actually witnessed atrocities.

Russia and the People's Republic of China are involving themselves in Africa through the medium of this war. Their participation in this war will open up to them all of

Africa's incredible wealth, its oil, gold supply and its political possibilities.

Tragically much of Africa is receptive to these influences. The heritage of recollection of British, Belgian, Spanish, Dutch and Portuguese colonialism and imperialism is very much in evidence.

Unless the United States intervenes at this time to induce a cease-fire, or unless the United Nations assumes its proper responsibility and authority to impose a cease-fire, I can foresee that within this generation all of Africa could be engulfed in a world war.

The Biafrans will continue this war and they are prepared to continue guerrilla war. The Nigerian economy is shaky and in sheer desperation in order to obtain further assistance Nigeria may be obliged to commit its oil reserves to Russia.

It is in the interest of every American that the United States should use its moral, economic and political pressures to induce both sides to enter cease-fire immediately. The alternative must lead to internationally deteriorating and destructive consequences.

Finally, the unbelievable tragedy existing in Biafra is forcefully brought out by the following excerpt from an editorial in the New York Daily Column of December 17, 1968:

"It has been estimated that at least 10,000 Biafrans—thousands of them children—die each day from starvation. Ten thousand every day—and the end is not in sight.

"Meanwhile, the world stands by and allows this to happen. Britain doesn't want to antagonize Nigeria because of the valuable oil reserves. The Soviet Union has supplied the Lagos government with Mig fighters. And U.A.R. pilots are flying them—probably because they need the practice. De Gaulle for reasons of his own—is supporting the Biafran effort."

The conscience of the world must come to early grips with a solution to this tragic and calamitous question if it is not to be haunted by the specter of death, destruction and deprivation.

ABM—INCREDIBLE SAFEGUARD

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the New Bedford Standard-Times has consistently commented in a clear and logical manner in the debate over the ABM system, whether it be called Sentinel or Safeguard.

The Charleston Gazette, of Charleston, W. Va., has also spoken out in a forthright manner on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the New Bedford Standard-Times and one from the Charleston Gazette be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette,
Apr. 18, 1969]

NIXON'S SAFEGUARD PLAN PREPOSTEROUS, A
SELLOUT

President Nixon has applied a generous coating of sugar. He has done everything up in a most disarming way with fancy political wrappings. But all the sweet coating and deluding packaging fails to cover the bitterness of the gall or hide the fact he has sold out to the military-industrial complex in his decision to proceed with deployment of

¹ Maxwell T. Cohen, a New York City lawyer, is a member of the International Law Committee of the American Bar Association.

a temporarily limited version of the Sentinel antiballistic missile system.

In an obvious effort to placate critics of the ABM system, he has hit upon a compromise to place the ABM sites around Minuteman missile bases in Montana and North Dakota, rather than around heavily populated cities as contemplated by the Johnson administration. He offers a generous serving of honey by promising a saving of \$1 billion in next year's budget, but the sulfur will come in increased costs in succeeding years.

Indeed, the Nixon version of the ABM system will cost \$6 billion to \$7 billion over the next several years, which will make it considerably more expensive than the Johnson version. But the real danger from the cost standpoint is that it places a foot in the door, and on the basis of past demonstrations the Pentagon can be counted on to apply its astronomical mathematics in a way to make initial estimates look like peanuts.

In short, at a time when this nation is confronted with the very real problems of arms control, peace in Vietnam, the agonies of the cities, hunger and poverty, racial unrest, jobs and housing, President Nixon gives the go ahead on a fantastically expensive experiment that will give even greater profits to those who will benefit—namely the military-industrial complex—and that at best will provide protection of the most doubtful nature, if any at all, against nuclear attack.

The Nixon system may be different from that proposed by the Johnson administration, but it does not answer the criticisms of most leading scientists that the system is unproven, subject to computer and human error, unlikely to add much to our security and an invitation to nuclear escalation.

The President's thinner-than-thin ABM program, which he calls "safeguard," is designed to "protect" our deterrent power to launch a retaliatory second strike.

But with the ABM system "safeguarding" only two of the Minuteman missile bases, it is highly doubtful that an enemy with the capability of knocking out our population and 90 per cent of our missiles with a saturation attack would be deterred by the possibility that 10 per cent of our missiles might survive. And survival of the 10 per cent is only problematical because any kind of an ABM system depends upon delicate radar and other electronic devices which many qualified scientists say would be rendered useless by a saturation attack.

As noted by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the United States now has more than 600 Polaris missiles ready to launch from far-ranging submarines, and the Poseidon program is in process of proliferating these missiles into 4,000 warheads, all to be fired from untargetable mobile bases under the seas. If such a second-strike capacity will not deter an attack, nothing will. And the highly questionable ability to protect a small share of our land-based missiles is not going to add credibility to our deterrent capacity.

The whole plan is preposterous, not only because of the fantastic cost but also because there is no way of knowing whether the ABM will provide any protection against nuclear attack and because it creates the danger of further escalation of the arms race. A better plan would have been to provide for a thorough study of the matter by a non-governmental panel of experts and to bring about early arms control talks with the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, we can only hope that Congress will show greater fortitude than President Nixon in withstanding the pressure of the military-industrial complex.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Mar. 16, 1969]

ABM—INCREDIBLE SAFEGUARD

There are some crumbs of cold comfort in President Nixon's decision to deploy a

"modified" anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system called Safeguard, primarily to protect American offensive missile silos.

In announcing his plan to move ABM sites away from major population areas and into the countryside, the President conceded there is no way to expand the Sentinel system into a heavy defense against a Russian attack on the nation's cities. At least that \$50 billion boon-doggie has been vetoed.

Implicitly, in admitting that "it is not now within our power" to provide the American people with complete protection against a major nuclear attack, the President acknowledged—as The Standard-Times argued in its recent series—that the untested Sentinel system is unfeasible and unready for deployment, even though the Army had started to deploy it.

Further, although Mr. Nixon's Safeguard decision may make it harder to reach such goals, his references to peace talks, arms limitation and emphasis on defensive, rather than offensive missiles, revealed his earnest hope of avoiding a weapons race and escalation of world tension.

Finally, the fact that he has slowed down the ABM deployment schedule, and plans extensive testing and annual review of Safeguard, at least give hope that we will not plunge blindly into fullscale establishment of the system.

Setting up a few sites at a time, beginning with two, is less of an evil than planning for 15 to 20, as was the case with the Sentinel program. But this meager case is all that can be offered for the President's decision, for it represents at best political accommodation, a public-relations attempt to soothe the ABM's critics in Congress, and in the nation.

Changing the name of the weapon and moving it from city to country; reducing the initial expenditure, and promising to test it more answer none of the fundamental arguments against an anti-ballistic missile system.

Sentinel was supposed to cost \$5.5 billion, according to the Johnson administration. Safeguard, Mr. Nixon estimates, will cost \$6 billion to \$7 billion.

Thus, although we are supposed to "save" \$1 billion initially (Safeguard is budgeted in fiscal 1970 for \$800 million, and Sentinel called for \$1.8 billion), we shall actually spend more in the long run.

Further, the record of military spending, complicated by miscalculated costs and inflation, teaches us that if the estimate now is \$6 billion to \$7 billion, it undoubtedly really will cost nearer \$10 to \$12 billion.

In part, Safeguard will cost more than Sentinel because many more Sprint (short-range) back-up missiles will be required for full coverage of the nation's six Minuteman "wings" (headquarters complexes) with 1,000 separate missiles than would be needed for protecting five long-range perimeter acquisition radar sites under the Sentinel plan. The Pentagon is planning acquisition of 12 sites, almost the number needed for Sentinel deployment. What "modification" is this?

Moving ABM into the countryside in no way increases its effectiveness.

On March 12, Sen. Cook, R-Ky., disclosed on the Senate floor that a Sentinel sub-contractor in the Northeast had told him, the anti-missile system was "technically so unreliable that it 'should not be deployed.'" Some of the nation's top scientists have said the same thing for months.

Even if improved, the system cannot be tested because of the nuclear test-ban treaty. We will never know whether it will work at all.

By surrounding our offensive missile sites with this defensive weapon of doubtful capability, we invite an enemy to overwhelm with his own attacking missiles the sites on which our deterrent rests, and we do not know what adverse effect firing our ABMs

may have on the operation of our own offensive missiles.

The administration's insistence on ABM raises a question of credibility. For years, several secretaries of defense have informed Americans that, even allowing the Russians to strike first, we possess a second-strike capability with our Minuteman missiles in underground sites that would inflict unacceptable damage upon the Soviet Union.

This basic policy—that a strong offense is the best defense—was based on public declarations that we did not need more protection for our missiles, that hardened sites were adequate.

Were we being misled then, or now?

If this policy was sound and the sites are adequately protected by their construction, why do we need an antimissile system to protect them further?

If they are not adequately protected against an increasing number of Soviet missiles, there are ways of hardening the sites that offer added protection and are far cheaper than ABM.

The flimsy argument that we need even harder protection of our land-based Minuteman ICBMs completely ignores the fact that we have 41 Polaris submarines with 16 ICBM's each, which no nuclear power can destroy with a first strike because they are under water and moving all the time.

Although Mr. Nixon expresses reservations about the effectiveness of site-hardening, it has many proponents, including the eminent nuclear physicist, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, who has advocated it in preference to ABM, and who says it could be accomplished for \$1 billion.

Deployment of an ABM system, in whatever name or place, also means that the President will lose control over the use of atomic weapons, because a quick decision on whether to fire a defensive missile armed with a thermonuclear warhead must be left to a computer or a junior military officer.

We flatly disagree with the President that deployment of this system, whether two units or 12 will not heat up the arms race. Since the Russians traditionally have emphasized defensive weapons, and since Safeguard is a defensive system, it is reasonable to suppose that our ABM deployment would cause them to move ahead with a larger defensive missile setup, and to increase their offensive missile capability as well.

Naturally, we would then be pushed to increase our offensive missile capability.

The more offensive missiles the Russians build—as they now are doing and may be expected to do to counter our ABM—the less effective any U.S. anti-missile system becomes.

ABM or, in fact, any defensive missile system, has a built-in weakness of diminishing returns; the bigger the enemy arsenal, the higher the odds rise against effective defense.

The Standard-Times predicts that if the United States goes ahead with ABM deployment, however leisurely and by whatever name, within a decade, we shall have spent another \$50 billion; that the Soviets will make proportionately the same additional effort and that, relatively, our arsenals will be precisely as they are now—except with a much less stable balance of nuclear power and less security for the whole world.

This is the "mad momentum" of which former Defense Secretary McNamara warned, when he said, "What the world requires . . . is not a new race toward armament, but a new race toward reasonableness. We had all better run that race."

Mr. Nixon's Safeguard decision is not running the race toward reasonableness. Equally important, it will probably reduce—not add to—the nation's security.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Mar. 19, 1969]

WHY ARE WE DEPLOYING ABM?

In announcing his decision to go ahead with deployment of an anti-missile system,

President Nixon said the move was designed to fulfill three objectives.

1. Protection of our land-based retaliatory forces against a direct attack by the Soviet Union.

2. Defense of the American people against the kind of nuclear attack which Communist China is likely to be able to mount within the decade.

3. Protection against the possibility of accidental attacks from any source.

According to Richard L. Garwin, member of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1962 to 1965, and Hans A. Bethe, winner of the Nobel prize in physics, and a member of the same committee from 1956 to 1959, and Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, MIT provost and former science adviser to President Kennedy and Johnson, our land-based retaliatory forces do not now need any such further protection.

Garwin and Bethe have stressed that, "The United States has 1,000 Minuteman missiles in hardened silos, and 54 much larger Titan II missiles. In addition, we have 656 nuclear missiles in 41 Polaris submarines and nearly 700 long-range bombers. The Minuteman alone could survive a surprise attack and achieve assured destruction of the attacker."

Wiesner added, "There is no real threat at all to our deterrent at this time from the Chinese or the Russians."

During the presidential campaign, in a White House news conference after his inauguration and again on March 4, Mr. Nixon said he did not accept the Johnson administration explanation that the "thin" ABM system was designed as a defense against Communist China. In other words, he acknowledged that it was a defense against Soviet missiles and, in part, a response to a missile defense system begun by the Russians.

Now Mr. Nixon apparently has changed his mind, and accepts the China argument. What weakens this aspect of the argument, however, are the quickly changing official reasons for an ABM system.

If the growing Chinese nuclear threat makes construction necessary, why—by moving defensive rocket sites away from major cities—have we de-emphasized preserving urban lives in favor of maintaining U.S. offensive weapons "second strike" capability in event of an enemy attack? In so doing, we have eliminated the principal anti-Chinese reason offered for the construction of the ABM system by the Johnson administration.

As a matter of fact, just the other day, in ruling out future expansion to a "thick" ABM system to counter Russian missiles, Deputy Defense Secretary Packard said such a system would not work because even if it knocked down most of the incoming warheads, a "very few weapons coming into your city can inflict unacceptable damage."

We are not, then, defending "American people," but American weapons, which, many experts attest, do not need further defending.

The last argument, protection against the possibility of an accidentally fired missile, is equally interesting, but even weaker.

The chance of an accidental firing is one of the few things on which pro- and anti-ABM groups agree; both call it remote, and point to the fact that in the 24 years since Hiroshima, there has not been one instance of this. It does not seem to be much of an argument for deploying a multibillion-dollar weapon system.

Moreover, should an accidental firing occur, there is disturbing contradiction as to what would actually happen. Mr. Packard said Sunday that final authority for any use of the ABM system would lie with the President, adding, "I could not recommend any system which would rely on the decision of a computer."

Dr. Herbert York, top Defense Department research official under President Eisenhower and in the early Kennedy administration,

and Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard, former science adviser to President Eisenhower, this month testified before a Senate subcommittee that:

"The decision to fire at an incoming missile must be made so swiftly that only computers and junior officers could be involved . . . the firing of an ABM must be determined in a matter of minutes after radar picks up the incoming missile and presidential control is inevitably lacking."

Dr. Kistiakowsky added that it would be "impossible" for the president to make the decision and that it would have to be made automatically by a computer, or by a comparatively junior military officer.

"Nor does the problem stop there," he said, "because a computer is really a very stupid thing, and would have to distinguish between a warhead and thousands of pieces of 'space junk' that are constantly orbiting the earth."

Thus, we first had to build ABM as a defense against China; then, it was because the Russians were building one; later, it was because the Russians are building more missiles. Initially, ABM was to protect people; now, it is to protect weapons. If it is accident "insurance," can the President make the decision to fire, or can't he?

How flexible, how changeable is the "justification" for building an ABM system; how disturbingly controversial are the arguments for doing it at all.

So much so that the Nixon administration has created its first credibility gap, for many Americans—having been given no better official reason—are bound to think we really are deploying ABM simply for deployment's sake, for more defense industry jobs, for political reasons, or for the military-industrial generals who don't care why it is built or how high the cost.

TRENTON'S OWN HERO

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the controversy which surrounds the war in Vietnam, all America can take pride when one of its soldiers exhibits that sort of courage upon which this Nation was founded. Such an exhibition was displayed by S1c. Fred W. Zabitosky of my home city of Trenton when he, badly injured himself, rescued the pilot and copilot from a burning helicopter. For this exploit, Sergeant Zabitosky was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for demonstrating courage far above and beyond the call of duty. I am pleased to place before the House the following editorials which appeared in the April 11 edition of the Trenton Evening Times and the April 12 edition of the Trentonian which comment upon Sergeant Zabitosky's heroism:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, Apr. 11, 1969]

MERITED HONORS

"I was lying on the ground with some smashed ribs and my back crushed and thinking I was going to die.

"Then I saw the helicopter in flames on the ground, and heard the men screaming, and I knew I had to get them out."

And Sgt. 1C Fred W. Zabitosky went to get them out.

The sergeant was so badly injured when

the helicopter in which he and some others were escaping from North Vietnamese attackers was shot down that he was unable to walk for four weeks thereafter. But he made himself walk then. He got to that burning helicopter and pulled out the pilot. Then he pulled out the co-pilot. After he had dragged these two 80 yards to another rescue copter, he started back again for other men still in the burning ship. This time he didn't make it. He collapsed.

Sergeant Zabitosky, a Trenton native, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. He came back to Trenton this week to receive the city's distinguished service plaque. On his arrival, he met Ben Kaufman, a World War I hero and the city's other Medal of Honor winner.

Sergeant Zabitosky forgot himself when he might well have been calling on others to help him. He risked all in repeated acts of courage to save the lives of his comrades. He deserves the proud "well done" of all of his fellow townsmen along with his country's highest military award for heroism.

[From the Trentonian, Apr. 12, 1969]

TRENTON'S OWN HERO

There is a certain special aura about a war hero, even in a war that does not have a universally popular cause. And Trenton this week put on its best suit to pay a welcome home tribute to a war hero of its very own, SFC Fred Zabitosky.

The role of celebrity is a new one to Sergeant Zabitosky and he carries it well. There is nothing pretentious about him nor is there any needless humility. He is a professional soldier, and men like him have been needed since civilization began, and perhaps, unfortunately, always will be.

But when one talks about Fred Zabitosky, it's not really necessary to talk about the philosophical aspects of war. The medal of honor he wears so well was not awarded because he was expert at killing, but rather because he risked his own life to save two comrades from a burning helicopter though seriously hurt himself at the time.

Fred Zabitosky grew up on the streets of Trenton. What made him a hero, he found there.

EROSION OF THE WAR POWER OF CONGRESS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post of April 6, 1969, contains a thoughtful article dealing with the erosion of the war power of Congress.

For a long time I have been concerned that other branches of the Government have usurped power that rightfully belongs to Congress, and I feel that Congress itself shares a major part of the blame for not fighting to protect its rights and responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Congress Is Losing Its War Power," written by Merlo J. Pusey, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CONGRESS LOSING ITS WAR POWER

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

(NOTE.—Pusey is an editorial writer for the Washington Post. The following is excerpted from his new book, "The Way We Go to

War," to be published later this month by Houghton Mifflin.)

Can the United States be committed to war without action by Congress? In 1787, the Founding Fathers resolved that it could not be, and the country held to that principle with little deviation for a century and a half.

In recent years, however, the President has been exercising the power to make war with alarming consistency. One-man decisions involving the lives of citizens and the fate of the Nation have become the rule at a time when the President has at his command more power than any other human being has ever had.

The facts about this momentous transition in American government are scarcely open to challenge. The President sends American troops to any part of the world whenever he thinks they may be needed in the national interest. Three times in the last quarter century, one man in the White House has taken the United States into war—once in advance of congressional action, once without any congressional action and once with only a casual nod from Congress. In defense of these historic acts, the Executive Branch has laid claim to "inherent powers" broad enough to determine the fate of the Nation in any future crisis.

Several years of war in Vietnam brought the country an acute awareness of the problem. Deeply troubled by the war, people belatedly woke up to the fact that it had never really been authorized by Congress, although Congress in 1964 went through the motions of supporting the President in whatever action he might decide to take.

Later, some of the legislators who sponsored the Tonkin Gulf resolution almost tore their hair in chagrin over the fact that they had let the war power slip through their fingers. The result is an executive-legislative clash which may evolve into the most important constitutional contest of this century.

T. R.'S BIG STICK

The modern expansion of the President's power to use American troops abroad began under Theodore Roosevelt. Carrying out his determination to build a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, he used the Navy to prevent the landing of Colombian troops in the rebellious Colombian state of Panama. He also sent troops into Cuba and the Dominican Republic without any authorization from Congress.

Presidents William H. Taft and Woodrow Wilson and several of their successors made a practice of intervening in unstable Caribbean states, usually seeking to justify their actions as being essential to protect American lives and property. Without waiting for congressional approval, which was later granted, President Wilson had the Navy seize Vera Cruz to cut off a shipment of German arms to Mexico and to elicit an apology from the Mexicans for the arrest of American sailors at Tampico.

In 1916, Wilson sent an expedition under Gen. John J. Pershing into Mexico following Francisco "Pancho" Villa's raid across the border. Though the action was defended on the ground of "hot pursuit," the stay of Pershing's forces for almost two years, without any congressional authorization served further to stretch the claims to presidential power.

Wilson came into direct collision with Congress over the war power when he asked, in February, 1917, for authority to arm American merchant ships against German submarines. The House passed the requested bill but the Senate procrastinated even after the President had called a special session.

Without waiting for a final showdown, Wilson authorized the installation of weapons on the merchant vessels by executive order. Before the order could be carried out, however, Congress declared war. The mounting submarine attacks in the Atlantic had left no alternative.

World War II brought an alarming inflation of the war power in the hands of the Commander in Chief. The period which led up to Pearl Harbor was an excruciating experience because the country was still addicted to isolationism in a world aflame.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt was keenly aware of the perils facing the United States as well as the peoples of Europe and Asia. Yet he could not move openly to join the hard-pressed democratic countries of Europe or to stop Japan's aggressive sweep in the Far East without risk of division in the country and defeat in Congress.

His dilemma was magnified by the fact that he was a candidate for a third term in the election of 1940. Prof. Thomas A. Bailey sharpened this collision of objectives when he wrote: "If he (Roosevelt) let the people slumber in a fog of isolation, they might fall prey to Hitler. If he came out unequivocally for intervention, he would be defeated in 1940."

No doubt the pull from these opposite poles accounts in large part for what happened. But the decision between war and peace always involves extremely painful choices. Today we must look coolly at the course of a President who moved steadily toward war while promising fathers and mothers, as he did in his campaign speech in Boston in October, 1940, that "your boys will not be sent into foreign wars."

[President Truman's decision to enter the Korean War] was not a case in which the President was responding to an attack on the United States, its forces or its citizens. Nor can it be said that Mr. Truman moved promptly to carry out the terms of a defense treaty. At that time there was no mutual defense pact between the United States and Korea.

If there was any discussion between Mr. Truman and his advisers about asking Congress for authority to launch a military venture that would almost certainly grow into war, he has not disclosed it. Rather, the President was chiefly concerned about getting a go-ahead signal from the United Nations. When the fateful presidential decision was made that Monday night, however, the Security Council had merely charged North Korea with a breach of the peace, called for withdrawal of the North Korean forces and asked for assistance in the execution of that very limited resolution.

The appalling fact is that the President plunged the United States into the war without a shred of authority from the Constitution or the laws of treaties and without so much as a request for military help from the United Nations. At that time, the Security Council had not yet decided that any kind of sanctions would be desirable or necessary. The order to Gen. MacArthur was given even before the South Korean government had asked officially for American aid.

A GENTLEMANLY ERA

Have congressional declarations of war become obsolete? The reason most often given for reliance on executive power in a war situation is that the whole concept of a formal legislative decision to go to war belongs to the horse-and-buggy days. In the nuclear age, wars are not declared; they simply begin spontaneously. Does it not follow that the power to make war must be in the hands of the President for the sake of our national survival?

The short answer to the question of whether declarations of war are obsolete is yes. Such declarations are no longer in style. They belong to an era of wars among gentlemen. Except in rare circumstances, they have no relevance to the conduct of foreign relations in the last half of the 20th century.

But when all this is accepted, it says no more than that the form in which Con-

gress has usually exercised its power is no longer efficacious. Where the Administration spokesmen who declare the obsolescence of declarations of war have made their egregious error is in supposing that changes in international usage in some mysterious way transfer the war power to the White House.

It was not a special license to use the words "declare war" that the Founding Fathers gave to Congress. Rather it was the full, red-blooded reality of deciding that another country is our enemy and that war—any form of war—should be levied upon it. The power is not basically changed or diminished because current circumstances call for a different method of using it when necessary.

What Congress is now groping toward is a new format for the exercise of this power in keeping with the realities of the nuclear age. Executive officials have often expressed willingness to cooperate with Congress. Ardent lip service is given to the idea that the two branches must pull together to make the influence of the country properly felt in foreign affairs. Yet the White House has consistently sought to leave the line between congressional and presidential authority vague and amorphous so as to allow a maximum of flexibility in carrying out its own policy.

The fact is that the White House has ruthlessly squandered its capital of good will in Congress. Democrats and Republicans alike are worried about the continued concentration of power in the President's hands, and many of them seem determined to do something about it. If the trend keeps running in the present direction, the distrust and alienation between the two branches could reach the proportions of the post-World War I days when a rampaging Senate, with the help of Woodrow Wilson's intransigence, scuttled the League of Nations.

A DELICATE BLEND

It is, of course, an extremely complicated undertaking to secure a proper blending of presidential control over foreign affairs and the armed forces with the power of Congress to declare war and to raise and support armies. The President, as Jefferson once said and as the Supreme Court has reiterated, is the sole voice of the Nation in foreign affairs. Only he has the diplomatic contacts, the background information and the executive maneuverability to conduct our foreign relations intelligently.

It follows that the President may lead the country into situations where war seems inevitable. Indeed, his response to an attack may be the crucial step in putting the country into war. Nevertheless, the principle of divided powers remains valid, and it can be respected if the President is so disposed or if Congress insists on the proper procedures.

JUDGE'S VIEW OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUSTICE: IT'S A GI-GANTIC FUNNEL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. HOGAN, Mr. Speaker, our concern for the crisis in crime that is now confronting our country is amply demonstrated by numerous stories, editorials, and articles that have been inserted in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these past months. I would not be surprised if crime were the single most discussed subject in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD this year. Its importance certainly merits this attention.

In the March 9 edition of the Washington Star there appeared an extremely interesting interview with Judge Tim Murphy of the Washington, D.C., Court of General Sessions. Judge Murphy "tells it like it really is." I think it is very important that my colleagues be made aware of what is actually happening in our criminal courts today. This article, I feel, will give them an insight into the functioning of our criminal courts.

The lesson that I learned from it is that we have to know what is really going on rather than merely how the laws read or what some ivory tower scholars are telling us. Until we know this, our efforts to deal with the crime crisis will be futile.

Therefore, I am inserting this very interesting article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 9, 1969]
JUDGE'S VIEW OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUSTICE: IT'S A GIGANTIC FUNNEL

Judge Tim Murphy of the Court of General Sessions is a blunt, unblinking critic of justice here.

"You look around the court on a given day," he said in a recent interview. "Two or three Cadillac drive up—occupied by defendants.

"They're the holdup men. Our crime rate in many respects is the same people doing it over again. The police know it. The criminal knows it. The kids on the street know it.

"And they say: 'Mr. Big. He's out on bond. He's holding up banks. And you're telling me to get job training to run an elevator or clean out a building at 60 bucks a week when I can make \$9,000 on a holdup.'"

Murphy, 39, speaks from experience. Before he was named to the bench two years ago, he was chief of the U.S. attorney's office at the Court of General Sessions for three of his seven years in the U.S. attorney's office.

A major in the Marine Corps Reserve, he is one of the new breed of judges at the court. And he makes no bones about the gravity of the problems he sees facing his court and the rest of the District's justice system.

"The whole system is just kind of madness," said Murphy.

TOP GETS BIGGER

"The toughest, meanest man in the world can be named U.S. attorney, but when you get down to it, we can't even seem to try bank robbers.

"It's a gigantic funnel. We hire a thousand more policemen, but a trial that used to take two days now takes five days. So the top of the funnel gets bigger and bigger, and the bottom gets smaller and smaller.

"One police official told me he'd rather cut the number of new policemen in half and give up those people to judges, probation officers and court staff.

"First, we have a guilty plea rate of only 45 percent, I suspect. It's about the lowest in the nation. An efficient court should have an 85 to 90 percent plea rate. The plea rate is just much, much lower because the statistics on getting reversed here are so much better than in most other jurisdictions.

"So what happens? The prosecutor reduces charges that shouldn't be reduced because we can dispose of them quicker in the Court of General Sessions.

"Once they're reduced, there's 'judge shopping' here. Judges we know give lenient sentences, outrageously light sentences, are also the ones that accept a substantial number of the pleas."

ODDS FAVOR THE CRIMINAL

"The U.S. District Court is no better. One way you can avoid reversal in the U.S. Court of Appeals there is you get a plea. So pleas are encouraged. However, multiple offenders usually always get other charges dropped. And you never see big sentences any more.

"You see, law enforcement, prosecution in the District Court, is almost purely symbolic. "Most criminals are not caught. Seventy-five percent are not caught.

"If you are caught, most are not indicted. "And if they are indicted, only 74 percent are convicted.

"Then your appellate rate is about 75 percent sustained.

"So a criminal goes in facing tremendous odds on getting out of the system scot-free. When you add in the likelihood of going to jail, versus getting probation in spite of his record, the odds favor the criminal.

"Now the criminal may not know the sophisticated law, but he knows there's survival."

THE PUBLIC IS HOODWINKED

"You go through all this rhetoric. They always say, 'No promises have been made' in the District Court. However, he's just been told they're going to drop four counts of the indictment.

"He immediately becomes part of this great desire to move the case on.

"The public is being hoodwinked by the administration of justice—in all major cities.

"The real problem you've got, though, is that things aren't going to change much without a massive increase in the number of judges, young, able, vigorous judges and supporting personnel, including probation and ball personnel and everything else.

"Dope addicts in Washington already steal more in one day than it would have cost to put all of the judges on the bench. The police already catch more people in the act every week than they've got courts to try them in.

"This is no criticism of the U.S. Attorney. In my day, you didn't indict any more than 100 a month. You broke them all down in General Sessions."

GUNS ARE TOO NUMEROUS

"Guns after a felony? Every day, we get men in here, convicted felons on the street with guns, they're almost always broken down. Second gun offenders? Almost always broken down.

"Why? They don't want those cases in the District Court unless he was using the gun in a hostile manner. If he's just on the street with a gun, a convicted felon with a gun, even though it would be a felony charge, he doesn't go to the District Court.

"They're faced with a priority, too. "Which is more important? To try the hold-up robber? The homicide man? The serious narcotics pusher?

"They've got so many serious cases now they don't know what to do with them. They're selecting the worst from the worst, and sending the rest back to General Sessions.

CRIME VICTIMS IGNORED

"Well, we've got to sit down and say, 'What is best? What is best for the man in the system?'"

"We can con the public by making them think we're really working for the good of the community. But we're not, really, because we're not victim-oriented.

"No one gives a damn about the victim except their family.

"We shortchange justice—the victim—by reducing all the charges with generally no notice or consultation.

"Somebody ought to stand up and say, 'It's an awful thing to knife a persons 50 stitches.'"

LET'S TELL THE PEOPLE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the recently concluded convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, which was held in Washington, D.C., I attended several of its functions as an invited guest. One of the functions I attended was the 14th annual breakfast meeting held on Monday, March 24, at the Shoreham Hotel, and the principal speaker on that occasion was Mr. Herb Jacobs, president, TV Stations, Inc. As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Mr. Jacobs' remarks.

The address follows:

LET'S TELL THE PEOPLE

Good morning, I certainly hope it will be a good morning, and a good beginning to a good convention. We can sure use a good one.

I say that, because even though business is good, you don't need me to remind you what a hectic year it has been for the industry. Why it has even made a lot of hitherto unconcerned broadcasters want to be cooperative and friendly.

Apropos to the friendly I'm talking about, someone once defined friends as being two women mad at the same person.

We sure have a belly full of friend makers. Now you know who they are, so I am not going to waste time calling them by name. Besides, what names you wish to call them, is a private matter between you and your religious training.

The only one who deserves special mention is broadcasting's exceptional Excedrin headache, Thomas Hoving. His do-it-yourself book on claim jumping just missed the best seller list . . . but only because his citizen's buttinsky committee ran out of money.

What pleases me most though, is the concern everyone is beginning to show about every Tom, Dick and Nicholas, who uses us as his pet whipping boy.

Amen, brothers! It's about time we started to remove the veneer, and recognize that there ain't no Jupiter on some Mount Olympus, who is gonna pull your chestnuts outta the fire. It's jes I'll ole you who is gonna hafta do it all by hisself.

It's your bag fellows, and if you expect to continue to prosper, you're going to have to do your own thing.

Television is a very successful enterprise, and more to its credit, it has succeeded despite handicaps few other industries have had to face. We are keenly scrutinized by the most well informed public in history, whose so called intelligentsia have taken unto themselves the role of Public Defender.

Their incompetent criticisms of television strangely parallel the philosophy of today's militant students—that the individual is no longer capable of responsibility for his own welfare, or morally responsible for his own conduct. This seems to me to be more of a Big Brother attitude, than that of a Public Defender. But the records show neither of them capable of offering a substitute program that will satisfy their would be defendants.

Their most notable experiment to date, has been the Ford Foundation's recent \$10,-000,000 fiasco, the Public Broadcasting Laboratory, which their Friendly friend has consulted them into. It has been unable to produce a single public affairs program, with

merit enough to gain notice of even the breathlessly awaiting bleeding hearts . . . to say nothing of the poor deprived souls they cry out to save from our so-called inadequacies.

To some, that might be heard as the sound of two sour grapes banging together, if it weren't so tragic a miscalculation of the comically uninformed. They have been so busy listening to the beat of their own drummer, that they are out of step with reality. Moral commitment, they have yet to learn, is no guarantee against failure, and their failure is at the elementary level.

The task is to get the people to turn on the set. If they don't, there is no beginning. If they don't, you can't use the medium to educate, inform, raise the cultural level or even entertain.

We are under attack from all sides as the corruptors of our youth. And we sit there, defending our position with polite imagination, instead of using the overwhelming amount of fact to the contrary.

A few years ago, the graduate and undergraduate classes at Fordham University were given a paper to do on "The Problems of Modern Man". Along with their other concerns, quite a few of the students named television as one of the prime causes of the other evils. When challenged to prove the connection between the two, the students gave the professor a stunned look as if to say, "Why everyone knows that!"

Well, I for one do not know that! True, Jack Gould, Vance Packard and a dozen or so other prophets of doom know it—as of course do most of the college professors, artists, PTA chairmen, and intellectuals. They all know it!

The only people who are ignorant of the causal relationship are the social scientists, and those who have had long experience with mass media. The social psychologists are particularly ignorant, for they hesitate to make any really sweeping statements about the influence of mass media on national values. The evidence available does indicate that mass media does have some influence, in some areas, in some circumstances. However, it also shows that this influence is limited, and that other social forces are far more important in determining the values and ideas of a people. But unfortunately for us, these other forces are not worthy of headlines.

If this be true, and the evidence points in that direction, then the hue and cry against us is serving to hide the true responsibility. Parents, teachers and almost everyone else in public prominence, cast their sins upon us, and spend their time shouting at the scapegoat instead of facing up to their own failure.

This, I submit, is a really dangerous situation. It is part of the general pattern of flight from responsibility, and adds up to a real challenge. If they expect intelligent planning to be done, it must be based on facts—not prejudices.

The ignorance of television and other mass media effects, has done more than obscure the responsibility of parents, educators, clergy and public officials. It has opened the way for a real attack on the freedoms we so zealously guard. Paradoxically, the attack comes from those who proclaim themselves the friends of freedom . . . the intellectual, the artist, the teacher and the public official.

You hear it everywhere, at cocktail parties, faculty lounges, PTA meetings and even the halls of Congress, and it goes something like this:

"Television is pandering to the lowest tastes of the least common denominator."

"We must protect our people and children from it."

"The medium should be in the hands of universities, mothers, and citizens committees."

"The artists should have the final say as to what is presented."

"We need a National Board to supervise all television programs."

And on, and on, and on, ad nauseam. Now

some complaints may not be without justification, but the thinking contains the germs of a Big Brother Knows Best attitude, and I submit there is a dangerous similarity between the two mentalities.

These people are indirectly denying that the airwaves belong to the people as a whole, and after all, it is the people who are the major patrons of the arts in our times. At base, these attitudes hide a refusal to face the fact that we have a new type of culture, which is not the exclusive property of the elite, of the wealthy, or of the well educated. And our friends also forget that in most cases, the greatest majority of the people are just not interested in the art and thought of their would be masters.

Now I myself do not enjoy everything on television, which will be unmistakably demonstrated soon. However, I suspect if the bleeding hearts had their way, we would have boring discussions in place of boring so-called comedy and variety shows, and the high-brow violence of Tennessee Williams in place of the low-brow Wild Wild West. I'm not so sure the first state would not be worse than the last.

To focus on the violence tempest, a few years ago the wire services carried a story that happened in Alabama. Perhaps some of you will remember it. An 11 year old farm boy raised the flag on a rural mailbox outside his home. When the postman stopped, the boy killed him with a .22 caliber rifle.

The boy's father said he had given the rifle to his son for Christmas, that he was normal and did well in school. He then said, "I think the main cause is TV, he liked war pictures and westerns."

Now allowing for the father's grief and shock which would numb his thinking, his effort to find a "cause" for the tragedy is pure fantasy. The inevitable logic of his pronouncement is that such acts of insensate violence, by young boys in our society, were almost unknown before 1950, when television became widely available in the American home.

In addition, there are upward of 15,000,000 pre-adolescent boys in the United States. In the countryside or suburbia, a considerable number have small rifles, or access to one, and all of them watch television too. So what were they doing that week?

Small boys, and often girls, have an instinct for violence in defense of their rights, or of right. A visual image of violence is not necessary to evoke it. It is spontaneous and biological in the young. The civilized deplore television violence for violence's sake alone, but the young are not civilized, never were, and never will be. If the young were civilized, the race would vanish in its own insipidity.

It is the duty of all of us, as adults, to civilize the young as they pass through our homes, churches and schoolyards. However, let us not try to shift the blame for any failures, for our lack of perception and courage, to a picture in a television set. The problem is not a product of the electronic age. It is ageless, and I would like to read a short referral quotation:

"Our youth now love luxury. They have bad manners and contempt for authority. They show disrespect for their elders, and love idle chatter in place of exercise. They are now tyrants, not the servants of their households. They no longer rise when elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble up their food and tyrannize their teachers."

Gentlemen, those words were written in the 5th Century B.C. by Socrates. It's hard to believe isn't it, that in hundreds of generations so little change has taken place in what might be termed "human fundamentals." And there could be no complaint about the insidious influences of television then. Could it be, Mr. Senator, they blamed it on the scrolls and statutes?

Our main trouble is that the world of the

television viewer is divided into people who want us to make what they like. The only fault with that is there are hundreds of millions of people, but only about 16 hours of available viewing time every day, except, of course, the insomniacs who stay up to watch the late, late, late show. And even someday, when it will be possible to supply them with 20 channels of programming, if we multiply them by the 16 hours, the attrition would only be 320, which would leave us about 199,999,680 short of pleasing everyone.

The answer, of course, lies in creativity, which is not for sale, and can't be legislated, adjudicated or even regulated. It is endowed by our Creator so sparingly, that it must be one of His greatest gifts. We in America must be His chosen people, because we possess more of it than any other nation. And our television industry has its rightful share, not because as an American I say so, but because the true intellects of the world do.

England's Sir Denis Brogan, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Cambridge University, wrote in a recent New York Times article, "Europe has now gone to school in America, instead of its being the other way around. There are some European cultural exports to America now, like the Beatles. But most of the traffic is across the Atlantic from west to east."

We find proof of that in the quotas every foreign country has set against the importation of American made television programs. Gentlemen, they do not fear economic competition, for the high cost of American labor precludes it. They fear the cultural competition, because their own citizens prefer our programs overwhelmingly, when in competition with their own.

As for moral commitment, no other industry can hold its head higher. Our networks and individually owned stations throughout this nation, commit more time and money to documentary, information and public affairs programs than all the television countries on earth collectively, and it is a well known fact, that this type of programming is produced at a loss.

Reports containing millions of words of the good we do, lay in suspended animation in the files of this or that committee or agency. But our few faults find headlines magnified to astronomical proportions.

Last season alone, the three networks spent hundreds of millions of dollars on 300 Special programs, in addition to their day in and day out fare. They transported the public to every corner of the earth, under it and off of it, to all the great opera houses, symphony and concert halls, theatres, and even to the dark side of the moon and beyond. There isn't a single international, national or local everyday problem you can think of, that wasn't covered in depth, and by experts.

I think it deserves mention that the networks and local stations have committed to do it, knowing full well they would suffer a loss, because cultural, documentary and educational programs never return their production costs . . . and, in addition, be damned for it because people hate to see truth, when it mirrors their own mistakes. The networks and local stations do it because they do have the sense of obligation no one wants to give them credit for.

We should not have to remind anyone about our comprehensive news coverage, because it's unparalleled anywhere on this planet. From the White House to castles in Spain. From the battlefields of Viet Nam to the battlegrounds of our universities. From national political conventions and elections to the rape of Czechoslovakia. From wherever, whatever is happening, they are there.

They have access to the greatest collection of cultural scientific and artistic brains and talents ever assembled in one place, at one time, on one medium. Works from the pens of playwrights Arthur Miller, Jean Cocteau

and Chekov. The music of Bach, Beethoven and Brahms, by Leonard Bernstein, Pablo Casals and Segovia. The teaching of every learned educator and scholar. The art of Picasso and Dali. The explorations of Jacques Cousteau, who took them to the depths of the seas never before seen by man. Documentaries of such magnitude as the four hour special ABC did on Africa, and played it in prime time on Sunday night.

When has man ever had access to so much culture, so much art, so much science, so much history in the making, prepared by so much creative intellect and presented with so much genius. Never, that's the answer! Never!

And how does anyone think almost 200 educational stations got on the air? The broadcasters donated millions of dollars worth of equipment, trained their staffs and continually gave them cash handouts, that's how.

I have seen the pilots of every new show, and I have listened to the rationale of every series from the heads of the networks, and I can tell you that they do have the sense of obligation our detractors turn blind eyes and deaf ears to. There's not one whit of violence in any of them. The networks have all but broken their spines bending over backwards, complying with today's social demands. Not only are there no new westerns or private eye series, but quite a few of the old ones are missing.

Does anyone know of another industry with any more moral commitment? Yet all they ask us are loaded questions like, "Do you still beat your wife, or when did you stop?"

It's time our story was told in its true perspective, and I don't mean to let George do it, or at the national level. That's already being done. I mean for each and every one of you to help them do it at the local level; and it makes no difference if you're ABC, CBS, NBC or an independent station. The only competition should be who does it best.

It won't take superlatives either, because, there's so much truth on our side, that adjectives aren't necessary. Let's be proud of what we are, and let's tell it like it is.

That's about all the sweet charity I can muster up on that subject so early in the morning. Except, perhaps, to recall that I spoke my piece about it, in this very room, from this very platform on this very day, four years ago. And I mention it, only because in my business as a program analyst and forecaster, when I'm right nobody remembers... but when I'm wrong nobody forgets.

So let's tell everyone! Let's tell every Senator. Let's tell every Congressman. Let's tell every Commissioner. Let's tell every citizen's committee, but most important, let's tell the people in our own hometowns, and let's use their own airwaves to tell them.

The public is entitled to weigh the facts for themselves, instead of the fantasies they are being breast-fed. I for one think they are ready to be weaned.

Besides, the life you save may be your own.

ABM REBUTTAL

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I know of no issue more important to the future of our country and world peace than deployment of an antiballistic-missile system. We are told that such a system is necessary to the national

defense and therefore the Nation must bear the cost. Distinguished scientists have taken issue with the rationale underlying the administration's arguments for the antiballistic missile—notably the position expressed by Dr. Ralph Lapp. I am pleased to place before my colleagues an editorial from the April 11 edition of the Trenton Evening Times which suggests that the administration meet Dr. Lapp's arguments before it determines finally to go ahead with this questionable decision to deploy the ABM. The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, Apr. 11, 1969]

ABM REBUTTAL

In announcing his decision to deploy a "substantially modified" version of the Sentinel antiballistic missile (ABM) system, President Nixon said the system would protect U.S. Minutemen missile sites and assure a U.S. retaliatory capability in case of attack. If this were indisputably so, it would be wrong to oppose deployment of the ABM as many congressmen have continued to do.

The threat to our retaliatory capability was spelled out by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, who said that it would arise in the mid-1970's out of a growing force of Soviet offensive weapons, including the SS-9 intercontinental ballistic missile. There is "no question" the defense chief said, that the Soviet Union is "going for a first strike capability"—that is, elimination of our retaliatory capability—with its SS-9.

There has since been some indication that the administration was seeking to modify the emphatic nature of Mr. Laird's statement. Nevertheless, the administration's case for the ABM rests on the contention that steps are necessary to protect Minutemen missiles against SS-9 attack.

This contention was rebutted in an analysis prepared by Dr. Ralph Lapp, scientist-author and informal scientific consultant to Senate opponents of the ABM. Dr. Lapp's detailed study concluded that, on the basis of the most pessimistic Defense Department assumptions, the SS-9 force could not eliminate the Minutemen as a deterrent force. He presented arguments to show that the strongest conceivable SS-9 attack in the mid-1970's would leave 760 of our Minutemen intact. This would be more than enough deterrent to give any would-be attacker pause.

Dr. Lapp's contribution may be likened to that of one speaker on one side of a debate of extraordinary significance. On its outcome depends the expenditure of billions of dollars for a nuclear shield that is either needed for our protection or would represent a cruel deception and a colossal waste. Dr. Lapp has gone directly to this point of need for the ABM. Unless his arguments can be refuted, the deployment called for by Mr. Nixon would be unbearable folly.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost a friend with the death of former President Dwight David Eisenhower. He dedicated his entire life to his Nation and mankind around the world.

General Eisenhower's devotion to

man's fight against tyranny, his constant quest for peace, his sense of justice and equality place him alongside the great leaders this Nation has known.

The memory of this old soldier's devotion to God and country will never fade away so long as this Nation cherishes the ideals he championed in a lifetime of service to his fellow man.

In the brief period since his passing, tributes to his life have come from around the world. To me, President Nixon struck the most significant theme when he eulogized that General Eisenhower's life reminds us "there is a moral force in this world more powerful than the might of arms or the wealth of nations."

The citizens of the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana, who gave General Eisenhower overwhelming support in his two presidential campaigns, joined the world in paying tribute to this great man as demonstrated in this sampling of editorial comment from district newspapers:

[From the Bloomfield Evening World]

May God grant that generations will continue to produce such men who place great value on religious faith, family and country.

[From the Bloomington Courier-Tribune]

Among General Eisenhower's most important qualities was his ability to bring men of diverse views together and to infuse them with his own spirit of generosity and service in a common cause.

[From the Bloomington Herald-Telephone]

The kind of man you'd want your son to be.

[From the Brazil Times]

Not since George Washington has America seen a leader such as Dwight David Eisenhower. Had he lived forever the world could never repay her debt to him.

[From the Crawfordsville Journal & Review]

There was something about this most uncommon common man that inspired confidence and faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crises and challenges, nothing dire would happen so long as Ike was there.

[From the Greencastle Daily Banner]

General Eisenhower was so many things that most Presidents are not—a military hero and a national symbol—that it became customary to minimize his accomplishments as a political leader.

[From the Plainsfield Messenger]

A soft-spoken man, Eisenhower's image of being the nonpolitician but possessing that man you could trust look, will be greatly missed in government.

[From the Putnam County Daily Graphic]

This man has a world that will remember and never forget one of the men who did not ask or hesitate but gave of himself, all of himself, for the betterment of his world.

[From the Rockville Republican]

He was a humble man. He was a good man. And was there ever a man more human?

[From the Terre Haute Saturday Spectator]

The name of Eisenhower is deeply carved in the marble tablets of history, as a leader, a man of integrity, outstanding character and compassion.

[From the Terre Haute Star]

His openly friendly and sincere character, although at times a matter of consternation to his political associates, endeared him to both great and small.

[From the Terre Haute Tribune]

In his military role he did as much as any man to save the world from totalitarianism. His abiding concern as president was to build a more stable world order.

THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT: A CHRISTIAN PROSPECTIVE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems facing America today is the seemingly insoluble situation which continues to fester in the Middle East. I was recently privileged to read an address by Rev. John T. Pawlikowski, of the Catholic Theological Union, in Chicago. Father Pawlikowski entitled his address to the Hyde Park Kenwood Council of Churches and Synagogues "The Middle East Conflict: A Christian Perspective." I believe there is much wisdom in Father Pawlikowski's words, and that his thoughtful presentation does much to dispel many of the common misconceptions about the Middle East today. It is my great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to insert Father Pawlikowski's address at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech referred to follows:

THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT: A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE

(By John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, Catholic Theological Union)

The Russian novelist Leo Tolstoy once remarked that "certain questions are put to mankind, not that men should answer them, but that they should go on trying." The highly complex Middle East situation in which we must deal with the rights of Jews and Arabs against the background of a power struggle between a Russia and an America with nuclear weapons may often seem to be one of the questions to which Tolstoy was referring. I do not propose to offer any final solution this evening. But I will try to clear up what I conceive to be some misconceptions blocking a possible solution.

My interest in the Middle East problem is both moral and political. In fact, I do not think you can separate the two aspects. A political solution which would not consider the question of the rights of the local peoples is not morally justified as far as I am concerned. But neither is a solution which appeals to moral principles but lacks political and historical sophistication. An example of the former is the recent interview with William Polk, head of the Adlai Stevenson Institute of Foreign Affairs at the University of Chicago, which appeared in the *Chicago Daily News*. Though I highly respect Dr. Polk's knowledge of the Middle East exhibited in such a book as *The United States and the Arab World*, his position in the *Daily News* interview seemed to dictate a settlement almost exclusively on the need to avoid a nuclear confrontation between the United States and Russia. American self-interest seemed to be primary in his mind. I do not for a moment wish to deny the seriousness of the nuclear threat inher-

ent in the tense situation. But Dr. Polk fails, in my opinion, to adequately consider either the rights of the Israelis or the Palestinians in his projected solution. A particularly striking example of the lack of political and historical sophistication in handling the problem from a moral point of view is the recent *Commonweal* issue on Israel, especially the lead article by Arthur Southwick.

To begin to evaluate the Middle East situation from a moral point of view, I believe the following considerations are essential.

(1) As a Catholic, I am seriously disturbed by the continued lack of recognition of the State of Israel by the Vatican. This is a source of some irritation to the Israeli government, and rightly so. I am not at all convinced the Vatican should be involved in the diplomatic game of recognizing governments. But it so happens that this is the case at present and there is no immediate change in the foreseeable future. And the recent visit of President Nixon to the Pope underlines the Vatican's continued importance. I strongly suspect that the traditional theology of Christianity which relegated Jews to a life of perpetual wandering for the murder of the Messiah played an important role in the original decision not to recognize Israel. This was the reply given by Cardinal Merry de Val, then Secretary of State, to Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern political Zionism, when Herzl came to the Vatican to speak about a Jewish national homeland. There is still a residue of this theological anti-Semitism present in the Vatican according to Fr. Cornelius Rijk, head of the Vatican Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations. But the principal reason given for non-recognition today is fear of reprisal by Arab governments against their minority Catholic population. The fear may be real. Yet I feel that justice of the larger situation demands that the Vatican take a risk and abandon its narrow internal Catholic concern. Some may say, what value would papal recognition have at present given the current esteem of papal pronouncements in many quarters of Catholicism. I feel the principal value would lie in increased pressure on the thirteen or so other so-called Catholic nations (principally Latin nations) which have refused to recognize Israel because of the Vatican attitude. This lack of recognition frequently constitutes a difficult problem for Israel at the United Nations where she must sometimes deal with a security council the majority of whose members do not recognize her. Vatican recognition would also remove the lingering impression that there is something immoral about the very existence of the State of Israel, a fact that Arab propaganda has played up on occasion.

(2) Christians must become much clearer in their notion of the recent history of the Middle East and of Zionism in particular before making any moral judgments on the current situation. The American Christian majority has, on the whole, been deprived of any real knowledge of modern Middle Eastern history because of the preoccupation of our educational system with American and Western European history. This situation should be corrected. Many Americans, despite the claim of the Arab nations that their point of view receives no hearing in America, have swallowed the Arab line that Zionism is a dirty word, that it is synonymous with militarism and expansionism. Zionism is anything but a rigid univocal concept. Once it is granted that a Jewish national homeland is vital to Jewish survival, Zionism takes on different meanings for different Jews. This has been the case from the very beginning of modern Zionism. Herzl's views were not fully shared by Ahad-ha-Am, Martin Buber or Labor Zionism. And there is hardly complete agreement in Israel or in the diaspora on what Israel's policy should be today. An Israeli

such as Jack J. Cohen, in a major article in the *Reconstructionist* (Arabs and Jews. From Dilemma to Problem", Vol. XXXIII, No. 11, Oct. 6, 1967) has expressed the belief that the Israeli government has not done enough for its Arab citizens. Zionism has fundamentally represented an attempt to insure Jewish survival (and what, I may ask, is wrong with wanting to survive?) through the concept of a nation-state. Now there is nothing sacred about the nation-state concept. I certainly stand with those who see the need for a movement towards a more global form of government. But realistically that day is not yet with us. How many Americans are willing at present to relinquish some of their sovereignty to a world or regional government? Until we are willing to do this, I fail to appreciate how anyone can give the impression, as some Christian writers have that the Israeli preoccupation with nationhood is somehow philosophically and politically old hat. Let us not fall into the trap of judging Israel by some form of political eschatology.

(3) Christians must begin to take a realistic attitude towards the Israel-United Nations issue. So often Christian writers have given the impression that Israel should place her fate fully in the hands of the United Nations. For Israel to act otherwise would be somehow immoral. This was the attitude conveyed by some of the writers in *The Christian Century* series on the Middle East shortly after the June '67 war. I am a strong supporter of the U.N. and firmly hope that one day it might even become more important than at present. But U.N. diplomats are hardly disinterested humanists. The dominant factor is still power and a *quid pro quo* mentality. And in terms of political clout at the U.N. the Arabs have sheer numerical power. And numbers are terribly important for a nation such as Spain seeking support over Britain on the Gibraltar issue. Let us also not forget that it was capitulation by U Thant that precipitated the present crisis in May of 1967 and that continued Arab attacks on Israeli children and farmers for years from the Golan Heights and elsewhere as well as recent attacks in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv have gone officially unnoticed at the U.N. while the Beirut attack received the strongest of U.N. condemnations. Israeli cynicism about the U.N. in the present crisis is not totally unjustified.

(4) The demographic changes resulting from the U.N. settlement of the British Palestinian Mandate need to be placed in proper perspective. The impression is often given that Israelis are living on stolen land which the Western nation granted her as a guilt offering for the genocide of the Nazi period. Some demographic changes were inevitable in a rational solution of the Mandate issue, changes that affected both Jews and Arabs. It should be remembered that Jews had been occupying a considerable part of the territory that is now Israel for years before 1948, having purchased the land through special funds set up by Zionist leaders. And there has been a continual Jewish settlement in the area from biblical times. Prior to the British Mandate the area was in the hands of the Turks. The U.N. partition plan of 1948 called for the creation of an Arab and a Jewish homeland in Palestine. It was the Arabs who rejected the plan and went to war. This Arab refusal has been primarily responsible for the tremendous suffering endured by the Palestinian refugees for twenty years. Here is another vital distinction that one must make when dealing with rights in the Middle East. It is not Jordan or Egypt or Syria or Iraq that have suffered injustice in Palestine. Only the Palestinians can make such a claim. And their problems are due much more to the actions of their Arab neighbors and to Russia than to Israeli policy. If the U.N. partition had been accepted, I am sure the Palestinians who are in many ways the most creative

and educated of the Arab peoples could have a well-developed national homeland. Instead their rightful homeland is in the hands of Jordan (a fact which Palestinian commando leaders have acknowledged recently with some animosity in statements appearing in *The Christian Science Monitor*) and they have been treated at best as second class citizens in other Arab countries which have used the hate-Israel slogan to cover up internal problems. This is especially true for the U.A.R., Syria and Iraq. One has to wonder if the June '67 crisis was not a way President Nassar hoped to avoid the internal challenge to his one-party regime which surfaced in the student riots at Alexandria and elsewhere. And the internal political situation of Iraq and Syria hardly needs further comment. Jordan has been caught in the middle of a political squeeze. Left to itself, Jordan would have made peace with Israel long ago.

Let me say emphatically that I believe there cannot be a morally justified settlement of the Middle East problem without the creation of a Palestinian national homeland along the lines of the 1948 plan, joined perhaps in some sort of economic union with Israel and Jordan. I do think the states have to be politically separate. The current Palestinian proposal for a single Jewish-Palestinian state is unrealistic at present.

The major world powers ought to help the growth of the new Palestinian state in anyway they can, either directly or through an agency such as the World Bank. Even from a strictly political viewpoint the Palestinian, through the recent organizational mergers, are now strong enough to prevent any effective peace in the area if they fail to receive some form of national identity.

(5) Christian writers on occasion have criticized certain Israeli actions in such a way that it would seem Israel had no right to exist if it was guilty of any failures whatsoever. Earlier on I spoke of an erroneous application of political eschatology to Israel. Here we have a case of a false application of moral eschatology to Israel. There is legitimate room to question some Israeli policies. Israelis themselves have, and are doing, precisely this. But even if one were to judge certain actions of Israel as morally wrong, this fact does not automatically rule out the continued existence of the state. If such eschatological criteria of absolute morality were applied to our own country, I ask you what the verdict would be? Certainly my conscience troubles me when I read of Israeli use of napalm in the June '67 war. And certainly I worry about the possibility of a war mentality being forced upon Israel. But I must judge these aspects against the total picture of rights and wrongs and against the fact that the Israeli government is not dominated by militarists. In fact, the recent party merger in Israel has strengthened the doves.

On particular issues such as the status of Jerusalem there is room for discussion and disagreement. I personally wish to remain open on the subject at present. Let me insist, however, that my motive here is not any fear of Israeli control of the holy places nor a desire for U.N. control (which the Danzig and Tangles situations show to be impractical). My reason is based on the feeling that some Palestinian control of East Jerusalem might be vital to the economic stability of the state. I would be inclined at present towards Arab and Israeli sector, but with free access to both parts of the city by Palestinians and Israelis. A temporary U.N. presence of some sort might be necessary for stabilization. But I remain open on the issue.

(6) Christians should also be aware of the danger that American policy in the Middle East might not be determined in the future by considerations for all the peoples in the area. The Middle East desk at the state de-

partment has been traditionally pro-Arab. It took a maverick president named Harry Truman to go against the state department and recognize Israel in 1948. And what Michael Harrington has termed the social-industrial complex might begin to play a decisive role in policy formulation during the business-oriented Nixon administration. Oil is one aspect of the problem, another is the potential consumer market for American goods in Arab lands.

(7) Something should also be said about the Jewish charge of Christian silence on the Middle East and the Christian counter-charge that Jews over-reacted. I believe that in this exchange there has been something less than adequate sensitivity to the other's problem by both sides. Christians were ignorant of the importance of Auschwitz and all it symbolizes in contemporary Jewish theology and literature. As the novelist Elie Wiesel has said, Auschwitz and June '67 were intimately connected. Christians were also shortsighted in not realizing the close connection that exists for many Jews between what Christian would classify as the political and the religious spheres. Jews are a people, an important aspect of which is a religious tradition. The survival of Jewish religion is linked in the eyes of Jews to the survival of the people. And for an increasing number of Jews, after Hitler this means the survival of Israel. The Christian cannot simply brush off Israel as a political issue that has absolutely no place in interreligious dialogue. Although some Jewish spokesmen may have given the impression of wanting one hundred per cent support of Israeli policy, the principal Jewish leaders have no such ideas. Apart from any dialogue considerations, they are merely asking for a moral affirmation by Christians of Israel's right to survive in the face of another genocide threat. In fact, my research shows that important for most of the major non-fundamentalist Protestant groups and a number of Catholic leaders did unequivocally affirm Israel's right to exist. Silence is perhaps better applicable to Catholics than Protestants, especially to Catholic leaders. Unfortunately, many of those who did speak out had their priorities in the wrong order. They began their statements with a criticism of particular Israeli policies before coming to their affirmation of the absolute non-negotiability of Israeli independence in any peace settlement. The National Council of Churches principal (second) statement on the crisis is a perfect example of such a confusion of priorities. This confusion has greatly added to Jewish resentment.

On the other hand, I do feel that some Jews were not entirely sensitive to the dilemma faced by Christians when the crisis broke. Christian leaders in the peace movement were simply unprepared emotionally to react so quickly to war in another part of the world. And let me add this was not only a Christian problem. Jewish groups also had to face it as a special memorandum from the UAHC central office testifies . . . Ordinary Christians overwhelmingly supported Israel, though some may have done so on the basis of an anti-Communism that would embarrass many Jews. It must also be remembered that the Catholic Church has only recently broken down its conception of church-state identification and in the eyes of many Catholics the Jews were falling back into a trap that had proven so disastrous for them. This is a highly complex issue, although it needs further re-thinking in Catholic circles.

The Jewish-Christian dialogue was really quite limited prior to the war and Israel appeared on the agenda only infrequently. So the average Christian must at least be partially pardoned for his failure to understand how deeply American Jews could feel about Israel. In fact, the June '67 crisis brought to a head a growing sense of Jewish peoplehood among diaspora Jews. This made it difficult

for many Jews to understand why Christians could not appreciate their new enthusiasm for Israel and Jewish peoplehood. Some Jewish leaders whose opinions I value highly have said to me privately that they feel diaspora Jewry stills needs to do some serious thinking about the precise relationship they should have to Israel. It is interesting that black American writers such as Malcolm X and Albert Cleage have a deeper appreciation of what Israel can mean to non-Israeli Jews than do most white American Christians.

The present hour thus demands from Christians an idealistic drive for peace and justice for all peoples in the Middle East combined with a realistic understanding of the tactics needed to achieve this goal. Concretely this will involve recognition of the right of Israel to exist as an independent nation with security and to have access to the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba; creation of a Palestinian national homeland; a greater sensitivity for the meaning of Israel to diaspora Judaism; and a concern lest American foreign policy turn its attention to peace without justice in the Middle East in order to aid American business interests. Only with such an approach can we hope for some daylight in the present Middle East crisis.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon and the American people have lost in the death of former President Eisenhower, a powerful voice and good counsel at a time when we can ill afford that loss.

Few men in American history have given so much to the American people. I join with all Americans in mourning his passing.

I would like to take this opportunity to insert two editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding Dwight D. Eisenhower from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

The articles follow:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Mar. 31, 1969]

A LEGACY OF DECENCY

As long as free men cherish their freedom, Dwight Eisenhower will stand with them, as he stood during war and peace; strong, confident and courageous.—President Nixon proclaiming today as a national day of mourning.

Most men who make their mark upon the world and who die in greatness leave behind as their legacy some specific deed or thing, or some words expressing inspiring or profound thoughts.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has given more. He has left behind, for all who will accept it, a legacy of decency.

As 34th President of the United States, as most respected citizen in retirement, as General of the Army, Mr. Eisenhower held to a strong and basic faith in his country and its people.

There was, he was certain, a strength, a resolve and a basic goodness in the land and in its people. To him the qualities of honesty, tolerance, self-reliance and patriotism were not to be described as old fashioned. They were part of each day.

When Mr. Eisenhower saw these qualities held up to ridicule he became concerned. He

saw the young people of today as perhaps the finest the nation has ever produced. But he expressed fear that so many of them have been taught nothing of responsibility and self-discipline or the real meaning of life.

"You accepted hard work and a concern for others as a way of life," Mr. Eisenhower once said in describing his formative years. "We would have sneered at anyone who said we were underprivileged or anything like that."

Mr. Eisenhower was indeed, as President Nixon said yesterday, a product of America's soil and America's ideals. Mr. Eisenhower was, as he said in his London Guild Hall speech in 1945, from the "heart of America."

There is a tendency today to brush aside the qualities that were so much a part of Mr. Eisenhower as something of value only in a past, unsophisticated and simplistic era. But in truth they are as relevant and more needed today than ever before in the nation's history.

And, despite the cynicism and the skepticism that is part of America today, the vast majority of the nation holds to the same beliefs that Mr. Eisenhower held—a faith in themselves and in their country and a respect for their fellow man.

The difficulty today, as it has been in other periods of this country's history, is that it is difficult to hear the voice of this majority above the shrill shouts of those who seek confrontation rather than conference and conciliation.

President Nixon, in the eulogy delivered yesterday in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol said that these days of national mourning should also be days of gratitude for the inspiration and the strength which Mr. Eisenhower has given his countrymen.

These days can be something more. They can be days of rededication to the basic beliefs and the truths that were Mr. Eisenhower's. They can be the time of acceptance of Mr. Eisenhower's legacy of decency.

Nothing, in a nation so divided and torn by dissent, could be a finer tribute to a man who believed that his nation's future rested upon its moral strength.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Mar. 30, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

There is nothing wrong with America that the faith, love of freedom, intelligence and energy of her citizens cannot cure.—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Eisenhower presidential years now seem a time of serenity and untroubled acceptance of the virtues which make us a great people.

The era has a placid, sunlit quality to it. This tranquility and amiable consensus derived from circumstances and General Eisenhower's demeanor, his faith in God and belief in America, and in the American people.

The circumstance, of course, was the relatively brief period of calm intervening between the end of one war, the Korean War, and the gathering storm of another, the Vietnam War.

Probably no President could have made such a respite more purposeful.

His contribution was a renewal of the spirit, a general sharing of his instinctive sense of decency, a time of weighing values and the inevitable reassertion of the virtues which went into the making of the nation.

As recently as last summer, he told the GOP National Convention by television from his hospital room that the vast portion of the people are law-abiding and proud of their country and ready to sacrifice on her behalf—that all but a tiny percentage of Americans are patriotic, optimistic and loyal.

Dwight David Eisenhower was sure about important things like that, things which perhaps he made sound more simple than

they are, but which are nonetheless the basis of Americans' faith in their country and in one another.

Ike, as the American family called him with fond familiarity, trusted his countrymen and his countrymen trusted him. That relationship—the affection, confidence, and respect—may not come through in the history books. Youngsters, even today, may not feel it. But it explains a great deal about the America of the nineteen-fifties, about Mr. Eisenhower's years in the Presidency, and about the inexhaustible reservoir of goodwill on which he drew among the generation of World War II.

It was this great confidence, this respect that helped to elect him President: Americans had ample cause to remember and be grateful for the services of the commander in Europe who carried such massive responsibilities in the battle against Nazi evil that threatened this nation and mankind.

But it was more than gratitude or the remembrance of past glory that put the general in the White House. In 1952 the Korean War was the sort of agonizing issue that the Vietnam War is today. Americans trusted Mr. Eisenhower to find a solution to it. They were willing to accept what he would do as necessary, in the nation's interests, honorable.

And something else: the American political atmosphere was also befouled then by those who spread fear, hate and distrust to gain their ends. Mr. Eisenhower did much to clear the air in the fifties simply because he was the kind of man he was—towering above the demagogues in public esteem, restrained, patient, moderate in speech and trusted.

There was added to Mr. Eisenhower's world reputation as a military man a universal recognition of his qualities as a man genuinely desirous of peace. He was at once able to inspire caution in potential aggressors to extend the olive branch. His countrymen trusted him to be firm without being bellicose and peace-seeking without appeasing.

Let historians deal with the specifics of his political leadership and of his Presidency. To his nation, and to the world, he gave a strength of leadership, a new sense of resolve. And although he sat along with the great, his was an open and unassuming greatness that raised him to a place above the others.

He served his country in war in one of the highest of commands. He served his country and the free world in time of relative peace and in the most powerful office in the world. The "Eisenhower Years" may blur with the passage of time, but the quick and friendly grin of the man will never be forgotten. His was a great and rare gift, the gift of measuring problems and seeking solutions in terms of people.

The American nation mourns a great soldier, a high-minded President, a good and trusted man.

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A GIRL SCOUT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will agree that the Girl Scouts is one of the finest organizations in this country.

I am proud of their achievements in my district and at this point place in the RECORD a statement by Girl Scout Connie Huskey, of Philadelphia, Tenn.:

Connie Huskey, of Junior Troop 133 of Philadelphia, was recent winner in a contest in which she wrote a paper "What It Means To Be a Girl Scout." She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Carlton Huskey, Route 1, Philadelphia. Mrs. Hal McCrary is troop leader.

Following is the texture of Miss Huskey's paper:

"It means to be a friend to everybody and to be kind to animals. To know the needs around, as to what you can do to help yourself and other people. To grow up to be a better citizen. Scouting gives you an opportunity to enjoy outdoor sports, such as camping, hiking, swimming, canoeing, bicycle hiking, and other group activities. It teaches you to be thrifty and not waste your money. To be considerate and thoughtful of others. It gives you an opportunity to meet other people. To share your ideas with other people. To tell the truth so people will have faith in you. To obey your parents, leaders, and other elderly people. To be cheerful and happy. In all, it helps us to be better people, to form a better world."

PLOWSHARE, POLITICS, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I insert the remarks I made to the symposium on the Public Health Aspects of Peaceful Nuclear Explosives, on April 8 in Las Vegas, in the RECORD at this point:

PLOWSHARE, POLITICS, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

As a friend and strong supporter of the Plowshare Program, I am delighted at the opportunity to come here this evening to speak on its behalf. This is a very important meeting on a tremendously interesting subject. It is especially timely for a variety of reasons.

First, the Senate's recent ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty will have a positive, long-term impact on world-wide interest in applications of peaceful nuclear explosives. Article V of the Treaty deals specifically with this subject. The United States, as a nuclear weapons nation, promises to make the benefits of Plowshare available to the non-weapons countries on a non-discriminatory basis.

Second, President Nixon has indicated he intends to pursue the Plowshare program vigorously. A positive indication of this was his instruction to AEC Chairman Glenn Seaborg regarding a feasibility study of blasting a harbor at Cape Keraudren in Australia. The project collapsed, but for totally non-nuclear reasons. Sentinel Mining Company withdrew its interest because it couldn't make a sale to the Japanese of the iron ore to be shipped from Keraudren. But Cape Hedland and Cape Preston are emerging as alternate sites for alternate companies. An Australian Plowshare harbor is still a real possibility. You will be hearing about it quite soon. My lips are sealed for now.

Third, The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will resume hearings shortly on the Commercial Plowshare Services Bill. As you will recall, preliminary hearings were held on it last year, and I think the committee will broaden its view and look into several related issues this year. I am confident that passage of this bill and the information developed during the hearings will have positive effect on the pace of events in this field.

In short, we are approaching a period of greatly accelerated progress in Plowshare if certain obstacles are overcome. This symposium will contribute information, particularly in the public health area, which is a prerequisite to a broad commercial program. In addition, I would hope that any new questions raised here and left unanswered can be tackled by the Joint Committee at its hearing.

PROMISE OF THE PLOWSHARE PROGRAM

It is interesting to me that the papers being presented and the topics being covered at this meeting are similar to those at another seminar about 12 years ago. That, too, was a historic meeting for Plowshare.

In 1956, one of the periodic Middle East uprisings blocked off the Suez Canal to international shipping. With the patterns of international trade disrupted, serious thought began to focus on alternatives to and substitutes for the Suez Canal. Creative minds at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory came up with one of the better ideas: namely, if you can't get through the existing canal, dig a new one! And do it with nuclear explosives.

A year later, in 1957, the year in which the first underground shot was ever fired, a "brainstorming" symposium was organized at LRL to examine the concept of peaceful nuclear explosives. The program still had no name and very little money, but the scientists were certain they were on to something important. Some time later, I don't recall when, Edward Teller succeeded in attaching the Plowshare name to it.

Unlike today's symposium, the earlier one was cloaked in a necessary shroud of secrecy and security.

The now-declassified papers of 1957 demonstrate the remarkable clarity of foresight possessed by these Plowshare pioneers. With very few exceptions, their message was economic—how to introduce peaceful nuclear explosives into the marketplace at costs competitive with conventional industrial processes and technology.

All three categories for possible use were mentioned—*excavation technology* to build canals, harbors, or knock down geologic obstacles; *underground engineering* for petroleum production, gas stimulation, and mining; and *scientific applications* for seismic studies, neutron sources and new element production. With essentially zero experience in below-surface explosions of nuclear size, the participants recognized the key technical problem areas—radioactivity, containment and ground motion.

SOME OBSTACLES TO BE CLEARED

Today, at this meeting, we are seeing where we have come and how far we still have to go. For a variety of reasons, we have not moved ahead in this field as fast as we might have. When you compare progress in reactor development with that in Plowshare since, say, 1960, I think it is clear that Plowshare has been dragging.

There are understandable historical reasons for this. In the first place, Plowshare was, and to a large degree still is, a government reserve. Industry, the potential user, was not brought in at the beginning. Only in recent years have we seen the development of private industrial interest in specific applications. Meanwhile, classification, parental jealousy and over-protectiveness—all human frailties—have played their delaying roles.

Nor for the first decade and a half of the nuclear age was industry particularly alert to Plowshare opportunities. In 1958, for example, it rejected out-of-hand a joint AEC-Bureau of Mines proposal to detonate a Plowshare explosion in the oil shale of Colorado. The oil companies found a variety of superficial flaws in the project, without examining either its underlying concepts or its

potentials. Later, of course, the nuclear test moratorium slowed Plowshare to a crawl and hindered establishing a rapport between government and the private sector. But that is past history. There is a healthy interest now.

Probably the most exasperating obstacles to progress in this area have been and still are those so-called "liberals" whose conscience pangs cause them to view any peaceful application of atomic energy in terms of a mushroom cloud. It strikes me as irrational that these people are offended by attempts to develop the power of the atom for man's benefit. They are 100% for foreign aid and the Peace Corps, but 100% against foreign Plowshare applications and 200% against domestic ones. To hear them tell it, Plowshare, by itself, is the single major obstacle to total and complete world disarmament.

In addition to the assorted professors, scientists, lawyers and literati who whine over Plowshare for philosophical reasons, a hard core of Plowshare opponents seems to have developed within the Executive Branch of the government itself—particularly within the Budget Bureau, the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Behind the scenes, this group strenuously fights to obstruct every attempt at upgrading the program. These people seem to have a paranoid distrust and abhorrence for Plowshare, which they cannot divorce in their minds from the weapons program. I am sure Article V of the NPT, which gives Plowshare international respectability, must have broken their bleeding hearts.

Despite the fact that this program generally has strong support within Congress, industry, the AEC and in most corners of the Executive Branch, this clique exercises considerable clout in opposing it, by budget constricting and otherwise. For example, in early 1967, the Cabriole experiment was summarily cancelled by the Johnson Administration for fear of upsetting negotiations on the NPT and the Latin American Treaty on a Nuclear Free Zone. At that time, I made a speech in the House of Representatives questioning the judgment that led to this decision. It is totally beyond me how a research program aimed at developing the peaceful atom could be construed as detrimental to efforts at halting the spread of nuclear weapons.

Another more recent example concerns the late, lamented Cape Keraudren project. The AEC was directed by the President to actively and promptly study the feasibility of the project. Yet this same anonymous brotherhood seemed to do everything within its power to prevent the Commission from getting any money, even for the feasibility study.

Since the Limited Test Ban Treaty was signed in 1964, they have never ceased forwarding overly-legalistic interpretations calculated to eliminate the possibility of Plowshare excavations. The Treaty prohibits a nation from "causing to be present outside its national boundaries" radioactivity from a nuclear explosive device, warlike or peaceful. They claim one single radioactive atom beyond the three-mile limit would constitute a violation. Yet all of our standard radiation protection guides—even those adopted by the United Nations—state that radiation is "not present" when its measurable amount constitutes less than 10% of the established maximum permissible concentration. Further, these guides relate to human exposure, not merely to abstract presence.

Based on evidence which admittedly is somewhat tenuous, my own belief is that the Soviets are anxious to remove the handcuffs of the Limited Test Ban Treaty from nuclear excavations. They have plenty of geological cosmetology which is in their self interest to perform, just as we do. Since any treaty means precisely what the two most powerful signatory nations say it means, I am of the opinion that the LTB can be rapidly brought

into line with the facts-of-peaceful-nuclear-explosions-life, if certain people in our own government will stop throwing up artificial hurdles.

WHAT WE HOPE TO DO THROUGH H.R. 477

It is accurate to say that without the continuing support of the Joint Committee, the Plowshare program might have been successfully sidetracked, eventually buried, and never heard of either domestically or on the international scene in the form of the NPT's Article V provisions. We may not be able to overcome all the anti-Plowshare forces in the government, but we are going to try to get Plowshare off the back burner by enacting H.R. 477, the Commercial Plowshare Services Bill. This bill is co-sponsored by all the House members of the Joint Committee, and a Senate companion with similar bi-partisan support is expected shortly.

Under present law the Commission is essentially confined to experiments involving research and development. Our objective is to give AEC authority to make Plowshare services available on a commercial basis. Since, under terms of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States has an obligation to provide commercial services to non-nuclear nations, the new legislation is sufficiently comprehensive to accommodate foreign as well as domestic customers.

PLOWSHARE—A BUSINESS

As AEC gears up to furnish commercial Plowshare services, there are a number of business decisions and business-like procedures which need to be concluded. There are still, of course, technical areas needing additional R&D—which is your job. But some of the procedural and policy issues before us in government also need resolving:

First, exactly what the government is to furnish under the category of "peaceful nuclear explosive services" must be defined, and the responsibilities of the customer and his engineering consultants must be fixed. Within the government, a management structure must be established to coordinate and control the various inputs which will be made by AEC, the Public Health Service, the Interior Department and other appropriate government agencies.

Second, a standard line of devices must be established, perhaps 12 to 18 in number, providing a reasonable combination of yields and other characteristics. After this initial R&D effort, it will be impossible to tailor each shot minutely to a customer's particular requirements. The government cannot be expected to involve itself in new R&D expenses every time another customer comes along. The Non-Proliferation Treaty requires that the charge for services to foreign customers exclude R&D cost and that the services be supplied on a non-discriminatory basis between all customers. Since this makes R&D expenses unrecoverable, the only way they can be minimized is by the standardization technique.

Third, a price list must be posted which the NPT requires to be "reasonable" and which, in any event, is necessary if potential customers are to know enough about their costs to make rational decisions.

Fourth, in the case of foreign customers, we must re-examine our agreements for cooperation, under which U.S. and other nations spell out the extent of their nuclear collaboration, to make sure that special requirements as to Plowshare are covered. I have in mind such things as retention of the devices under U.S. custody and control, public health and safety responsibilities, liability questions, compliance with the Limited Test Ban Treaty and the NPT and similar topics requiring orderly separation of responsibilities.

Fifth, in the case of domestic customers, we shall have to establish regulatory control measures not unlike those that apply to nuclear power reactors and resolve jurisdic-

tional questions between federal, state and local governments.

REGULATION AND CONTROL

This area of regulation and control is as important to the formation of an industry as price, technology or any other factor. I foresee the AEC as the executive agent for the government for this purpose. In addition to developing the devices and furnishing the explosives services, AEC's role is likely to include the following:

Absolute control of nuclear explosives until their detonation.

Protection of the public from harm caused by radioactivity or seismic damage at the time of detonation.

Protection of the public from harm caused by radioactivity present in any commercial product resulting from a nuclear explosion.

Protection from physical damage to buildings or structures.

In assuming this regulatory role, the AEC should be cognizant of several characteristics of the industries most likely to be involved in commercial applications of nuclear explosives. Industries such as natural gas are already highly regulated. The FPC strictly controls the gas pipeline industry. It typically requires two years to process an application for development, of new gas fields, connections to existing pipelines, construction of new pipelines and establishment of the rate structure for gas from such a field.

Other agencies are involved in the safety aspects of pipeline construction and operation. The recent Santa Barbara Channel blowout bears witness to the government's present multi-agency involvement in environmental pollution, and points to an ever-expanding governmental role in safety and pollution aspects of industry.

The point to be made here is that the AEC should recognize that it is moving into an area already strongly controlled by government, and that only those additional controls necessary under the Atomic Energy Act need be instituted. Its function as to existing controls should be that of a coordinator in these peripheral areas.

A possible scenario of the AEC's Plowshare regulatory role could go like this: The industrial applicant would be required to submit a detailed proposal for the project including the equivalent of a reactor safety analysis report which evaluates in detail radioactive and seismic safety at the time of detonation as well as possible product radiological contamination. The AEC would then conduct a detailed review of the proposed project in the same way reactor applications are reviewed. This review would be in parallel with other government regulatory reviews so that the already excessive regulatory times are not further extended by the AEC process. Assuming AEC approval of the application, provision probably should be made for a public hearing. Our options are either to provide a mandatory hearing in all cases, or just on request from affected members of the public.

Once the project has been approved, the Commission and the licensee would negotiate a contract covering the detonation services, explosives and arrangements for adequate insurance coverage. Preceding the detonation itself, the AEC would have to perform or coordinate inspections from the public health and safety standpoint and assure that all emplacement and stemming procedures have been properly performed. Final legal permission then would be given for detonation. Following the shot, the AEC would be required to retain control of the area as necessary to protect public health and safety.

The foregoing is not intended as a comprehensive description of the probable Plowshare regulatory picture, but it does indicate the kind of considerations involved and underlines the fact that large-scale applications of Plowshare technology are going to require

carefully designed and intelligently administered procedures.

DIVORCING PLOWSHARE BUSINESS FROM THE WEAPONS EFFORT

At this point I am going to start treading on some toes in the AEC in general and at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in particular. For I do not see how Plowshare can really succeed unless the responsibility for its peaceful explosives devices and their use is divorced from the weapons program, which has an entirely different underlying philosophy.

In Plowshare, the primary emphasis will have to be on economics. In this competitive field economics is crucial. A Plowshare device does not have to be the most efficient nuclear device ever built. It doesn't have to be the smallest or the lightest. It must be safe and it must be clean. But it does not have to possess the ruggedness, reliability and other characteristics of a warhead. Since it is not a weapon, it will have to be designed, handled and used with the unique requirements of its users in mind. These users are not the Army, Navy and Air Force. They are civilians pursuing their economic enterprises in a cost competitive environment.

From its inception, Plowshare has been a step-child of the weapons program, both at LRL, the Nevada Operations Office and at the Nevada Test Site. Until the recent series of Plowshare tests—Gasbuggy, Cabriole, Buggy and Schooner—this dependence was desirable, if not absolutely necessary, even though a side-effect has been to associate the weapons and Plowshare programs together in the public mind. Now the time has come to separate the two, both in the public mind and as to technical objectives.

LRL, NEVOO and NTS from their inception have been dedicated almost exclusively to weapon devices and tests. They are geared up to satisfy one customer—DOD. They have been a very efficient operation for this purpose, and we can be thankful as a nation for that. But they are not geared up—technically or philosophically—to satisfy efficiently the El Paso Natural Gas Company, the Austral Oil Company, the Kennecott Copper Corporation, or other Plowshare customers.

These weapons organizations are so traditionally geared to conducting test programs for military weapon systems that cost is of minor importance. On something as vital to our security as weapons R&D, we can't afford to quibble over a few dollars. But this basic attitude is incompatible with the Plowshare program, where you must quibble over pennies. If they don't develop economic explosives and emplacement methods, the whole purpose of the Plowshare program will become academic because industrial interest will vanish.

The weapons scientists at LRL have an entirely different set of values than does the Plowshare group. Yet during the execution period for any Plowshare event, responsibility is transferred to the weapons people. There is even some evidence that Plowshare is little more than a nuisance to the weapons organizations, and that they conduct Plowshare tests in the same extensive and expensive manners that weapons test procedures dictate.

As an example, the LRL Plowshare engineering group formulated an operational plan for the Cape Keraudren project that involved operating from a ship anchored offshore. Maximum preparation of the explosive would be done at LRL before transportation to Australia by ship. At the site, operational personnel would be housed and fed on board the same ship. The emplacement of the explosives would be done from the ship, utilizing barge-mounted cranes. The vessel would then move to a safe distance, and the row charge of explosives fired by a radio link. This procedure could save \$1.5 million over conventional land-based operations with air transportation of the

explosives, amounting perhaps to 15% to 20% of the total project cost. But the entire concept was vetoed by the weapons test group for the apparent reason that they simply "don't do things that way."

I don't have any specific recommendations to make in this area tonight, but I think it is something we all can think about—particularly within AEC. And the Joint Committee should devote some careful attention to it during the hearings. We could consider whether the Plowshare program should be transferred to the oversight of another field office, such as San Francisco or Grand Junction. An independent Plowshare group could have complete responsibility for the design and fabrication of explosives, the conduct of experiments, and the conduct of the commercial service itself. It would separate weapons and Plowshare philosophically and politically, and it would assure that the program is responsive to the civilian user's technical and economic requirements.

PLOWSHARE AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Before I leave you this evening, I would like to say a few words about the public relations aspects of this program. Despite the fact that we will be conducting these events in very remote and unpopulated areas, it still will be necessary to conduct an active PR campaign to demonstrate the benefits to be achieved. I think the unfortunate experience with Project Ketch, where opposition from the public and state officials caused the withdrawal of the application, is an example of the continuing need to emphasize the benefits to society. We found during the early days of the reactor development program that winning public support and defusing the nut-fringe must start early in the project and continue actively. For example, with an underground engineering shot, if we could show convincingly how this type of mining does not deface the surface of the earth, as does strip mining, we might even end up with the Sierra Club on our side.

I don't think it is possible to overemphasize the importance of developing public support for Plowshare. Given a clear, accurate picture of the potential benefits and the high level of scientific precautions being taken, the public will not be unduly alarmed about possible hazards. For its part, industry must do its homework well and promptly respond to public inquiry and hesitation. When this is done, this nation and the world will be able to glean the vast benefits available by applying this new engineering tool to man's advantage instead of his destruction.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Dwight Eisenhower leaves all Americans with a deep sense of grief and sorrow.

Yet there is also a feeling of quiet pride in the very full and very rich life which he lived.

It was my honor to serve under General Eisenhower as a navigator in the Army Air Force in Europe during World War II.

I was privileged to visit with our former President in 1967, when he greeted Republican freshmen at his home in Gettysburg.

I was struck by his modesty, by the clarity of his mind, by his intellectual

articulation of basic truth, by the force of his expressions, and by his constant consideration for those of us around him.

Soldier and statesman, his life was one of distinguished and disciplined devotion to service.

Ike's life and achievements and the high principles for which he stood will continue to serve over the years as an inspiration to us all.

I join my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and family at their great loss.

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL OF DANVILLE: A TOUCH OF ALGER, AND A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM FOR SUCCESS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the fact that one of the freshmen Members of the House, the Honorable W. C. "DAN" DANIEL, of Virginia, is a former national commander of the American Legion.

In his term as national commander, he was one of the most widely traveled and active holders of that important office. During the course of his tenure, he made more than 700 speeches and is widely recognized throughout the country for his active interest in military affairs, service to veterans, and as an eloquent exponent of patriotism.

Not all of us, however, are familiar with the totality of DAN's activities and I would, therefore, like to insert in the RECORD at this point a very fine article which appeared in the February edition of the Commonwealth magazine which is the monthly publication of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce. Our colleague, DAN DANIEL, is the current president of the Virginia State chamber and prior to his election to Congress last November, he served as a member of Virginia's General Assembly.

DAN has had a colorful and active career and has come to Congress at a time when his background and experience can be most useful to this body and to the Nation. He is a member of the House Armed Services Committee and, typical of his usual performance, he has quickly assumed an important role in that committee's activities. He is well liked among his colleagues and highly respected by all who know him. Indicative of his fine qualities of leadership is the fact that he was elected President of the group of freshman Members of Congress at the beginning of the session and has lost no time in familiarizing himself with the total operations of the Congress.

I commend the article from the Commonwealth magazine to the reading of the Members of the House and include it herein with my remarks:

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL OF DANVILLE: A TOUCH OF ALGER, AND A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM FOR SUCCESS

(By Melville Carico)

President Nixon made a speech at a breakfast for newspaper editors in Washington,

D.C., in the 1950s and afterwards Marion Saunders, editor of the Danville Register, found himself in a small group chatting with the then Vice President. Saunders casually asked Nixon if he happened to know Dan Daniel, then national commander of the American Legion, from Saunders' home town.

"Oh yes," Nixon replied. He recalled having met Daniel at Legion conventions which he had addressed and then added: "He's the kind of young man we need in Congress."

"Dan Daniel is a Democrat," Saunders advised Nixon.

"That doesn't matter. He's the kind of young man we need in Congress," Nixon replied.

Voters in Virginia's 5th Congressional District, where agriculture and industry are combining harmoniously into a prosperous economy, apparently felt the same way last November as Nixon did years ago.

Daniel, then a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and assistant to the chairman of the board of Dan River Mills, won the House seat which since 1953 had been held by former Gov. William M. ("Bill") Tuck who, at 72, wanted to retire from public life.

And, in winning, Daniel got more votes than his Republican opponent and an independent combined—a remarkable political feat when projected against the political turmoil that gripped Virginia last fall.

It is even more remarkable, almost unbelievable, personal story of success in an age that scoffs at Horatio Alger for a man born 54 years ago one of eight children of a tenant farmer near Chatham.

His resignation as assistant to the chairman of the board of Dan River Mills before going to Washington symbolized this success. He started as a laborer in the dye house at 40 cents an hour, having gotten the job because of his brawn.

He plans to serve out his term as president of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, which expires in April, unless a conflict should develop with his duties in Washington.

He had to resign, too, as Danville's representative in the Virginia House of Delegates where, in eight years, he reached the "inner circle" of legislators who provide the General Assembly leadership and creative thinking.

He was on four major House committees—Privileges and Elections, Education, General Laws, and Finance. There are many members who would give their eye teeth to be on even one of these committees which, together, handle nearly all of the important legislation.

Daniel carries to Washington a business background gained from his years with Dan River Mills and as frequent spokesman for the entire southern textile industry, particularly on tariffs and world marketing; a farm background growing out of his boyhood and his years in the farm district; an enviable knowledge of world affairs gleaned through years of coming up through the ranks of the American Legion to national commander, and of travel as a member of the President's People-to-People Committee.

His experiences have led him to question the wisdom of continuing economic foreign aid but, at the same time, he feels Virginia and the South have great opportunities in developing foreign markets for their products.

John T. Connor, then Secretary of Commerce, appointed Daniel to the Regional Export Council in 1965 and in 1967, he spent three weeks in Europe with Gov. Mills E. Godwin Jr. participating in Virginia's first overseas trade mission to acquaint European markets with the State's agricultural and manufactured products and its tourist attractions.

"We cannot continue to shoulder the fi-

nanial burdens of the world," Daniel said in a speech on the Marshall Plan.

He wants to see the Merchant Marine expanded and is worried over what has been the reluctance of the United States to build nuclear-powered merchant vessels. "We are losing the wet war of the sea," Daniel warned in one campaign speech.

During his campaign for a seat in Congress he talked often about the rising crime rate, the looting and burning in the cities. In the General Assembly, he was a member of the Virginia State Crime Commission.

"The time has come to be harsh with those who refuse to live with the organized rules of society," Daniel said in a recent speech. And in another, he suggested that "We are the victims of an era of permissiveness."

Daniel, like many of the Southern congressmen who are returning to Washington, will be raising questions about some of the leftover programs of the Johnson Administration involving millions of dollars in appropriations, including the "War on Poverty."

"No one wants to stop worthwhile rehabilitation programs which will help to eradicate poverty, but you and I realize that in the name of fighting poverty a multitude of sins have been committed, and I say that they must not be allowed to continue," Daniel declared in a campaign speech.

Based on his own experiences, Daniel is convinced that the key to success is fourfold: education, discipline, training, and work. They paid off for him, because there is nothing in his boyhood background, using today's widely accepted yardsticks, that would be considered encouraging.

During the depression of the 1930s, he was in the Civilian Conservation Corps and when he applied for his first job at Dan River Mills he had not finished high school. Only his size, a strapping 200 pounds, got him a job.

A longtime friend of Daniel's, a newspaper man, says he believes Daniel took the first big step when Dan River Mills put in a program to provide high school classes for its employes. Daniel was the first to sign up. Many fellow workers were not interested. He was the valedictorian of the plant's first graduating class—an event that led to a job in the company's personnel department.

Daniel had been a patient in the tuberculosis sanatorium at Blue Ridge. In fact, it was there that he met Mrs. Daniel, the former Miss Ruby McGregor of Pittsylvania County, who was working there. He has been cured.

When World War II started, Daniel tried to volunteer five times, was rejected five times because of his lung condition. He finally got into the Navy on the sixth try, but was soon discharged because of the lung condition which five times before had kept him out.

Tobacco farmers in Virginia have a Congressman who can question the government's anti-smoking campaign.

"I'm the only one in my family who didn't smoke and I'm the only one who had any lung trouble," Daniel often says.

Daniel was first appointed by President Eisenhower to membership on the President's People-to-People Committee, and in the fall of 1959, he went to Russia to assess the feasibility of this concept toward improving foreign relations. In 1956, he had been on a similar mission to the Arab countries; in 1959, to the NATO countries of Western Europe and Israel. Then, in 1960, he went to Mexico; in 1961, to Canada. He has been to Vietnam twice and he did not miss the opportunity to seek out Virginia boys on the battle lines.

"I don't believe you can buy friends over the bargain counter," Daniel says. In world affairs, he says, the United States must always be able to deal from a position of strength. As for the leadership in Russia, Daniel says, "A Communist is never more dangerous than when he smiles to shake hands."

Many honors have come Daniel's way—the Star of Italian Solidarity (First Class), given by Italy to foreigners who have performed outstanding achievements for the Italian nation; the Croix de Merit, by the Republic of France for work on the President's People-to-People Committee; the Service to Mankind Award, by the Sertoma Clubs; the Military Cross, by the Virginia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy; the Distinguished Virginian Award, by Virginia Exchange Clubs. Daniel is a Baptist, Legionnaire, Kiwanian, Elk, and Mason. In addition, he's an excellent golfer who, friends say, shoots in the 70s. Golf is the Daniels' recreation. They have a married son who works for the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board (ABC) in Danville.

One day during the campaign, a reporter asked Daniel what he thinks, in the light of the myriad problems facing the nation at home and abroad, is the biggest challenge the United States faces in the years ahead. "To keep America America," he replied.

KING HUSSEIN: A STATESMAN WITH A PLAN FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, King Hussein of Jordan has long been admired in this country for his courage, vision and steadfastness. Now, in a brilliant and well-reasoned speech before the National Press Club, he has clearly shown that he is a statesman of the first rank. His eloquent and moving plea for peace and the moderate and reasonable terms offered by the Arab States are impressive evidence that many Arabs sincerely and genuinely desire peace with Israel. Because of the timeliness of his remarks, I insert excerpts from his talk, as reported in the New York Times, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM HUSSEIN TALK

For 18 months—since the unanimous adoption of the Security Council Resolution of 22d November, 1967, and the appointment of Dr. Gunnar Jarring, as the United Nations Special Representative, there have been no recognizable signs of progress toward a just and peaceful solution.

This has been a surprise to me because from the very beginning Jordan's attitude had been a positive one. We have from the outset agreed to accept every single one of the principles of the resolution and so indeed has the United Arab Republic. We are still waiting for Israel to do the same.

Consider this, for example: if, before the war, on the First of June, 1967, the Arabs had agreed to terminate the state of belligerency with Israel, to provide her with guaranteed access to Sharm el Sheik and the Suez Canal, to recognize her right to live in peace and security, and to agree to provisions which would finally solve the refugee problem—if the Arabs had agreed to such terms on the First of June, 1967, such a move would have been so dramatic and such a concession on the part of the Arabs that Israel would very likely have found it impossible not to acknowledge the magnanimity of the offer; and so would everyone else in the world.

The fact of the matter is that the Arabs are making Israel that same offer today, and the Israelis are rejecting it.

STRESSES 1967 U.N. RESOLUTION

Future peace in the Middle East must stand or fall on the implementation of the November '67 United Nations resolution. We have agreed to abide by its provisions, and so far the Israelis have refused to do so.

Their contention that "negotiation directly" between the parties involved is essential to agreement is a rather curious and "arbitrary" position.

SEES A NEED FOR SPEED

I predict that if progress toward a solution is not made within the next very few months, not only will no one be willing or in a position to talk about peace, but no outside force, even with the best of intentions, will be able to divert the area from permanent conflict and eventual war.

Perhaps unwillingness to give up the territory Israel overran during the war is not the only reason she is unwilling to accept the United Nations resolution—and that is the provision concerning the Palestine refugees.

These were people who were driven from their homes during wartime. Their homes and their land are occupied by the enemy. And they don't want to find refuge in another country. They want to go back to their homeland.

Can anything be done about it? Not by anyone but Israel. They have traditionally taken the position that the Palestinian refugee problem is not their problem—that it is up to their fellow Arabs to look after them.

WOULD NOT STOP GUERRILLAS

The danger of the refugee problem is not a question of looking after their physical needs. The United Nations, with generous aid from the United States, has been doing this for almost a score of years. It is a question of their rights. Once these rights have been restored—by Israel's acceptance of their right to repatriation or compensation—then the final step toward peace will not be far off.

That is why when I am asked "Why don't you stop the fedayeen, the commandos, in their raids against Israel?" I reply, "I would stop them." It is their land that the Israelis are occupying and they see no way out for them except to struggle to achieve their rights.

Again about the commandos. I am frequently asked, "What good does it do you to seek a peaceful solution when members of the resistance forces say they will not accept it?" And my answer to that is simply this: "There is no difference in my aim in seeking a peaceful settlement and their aim in a settlement by conflict."

It is the intolerable situation that produces the commandos, not the commandos who provoke the situation.

ASKS PART OF JERUSALEM

There is no basis for any negotiation, since Israel has not yet accepted the [U.N.] resolution. This would require that Israel realize that she must withdraw her troops from all the territories which she occupied in June, 1967.

Moreover, any plan for withdrawal must include our greatest city—our spiritual capital, the holy city of Jerusalem. To us—Christian and Moslem Arab alike—Jerusalem is as sacred as it is to the Jews. And we cannot envision any settlement that does not include the return of the Arab part of the city of Jerusalem to us with all our holy places.

In conclusion, may I sum up for you just what it is that we are prepared to offer Israel? And this I am speaking for President Nasser as well as for myself.

On our part, we are prepared to offer the following as a basis for a just and lasting

peace, in accordance with the Security Council resolution.

1. The end of all belligerency.
2. Respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all states in the area.
3. Recognition of the rights of all to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of war.
4. Guarantees for all the freedom of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.
5. Guaranteeing the territorial inviolability of all states in the area through whatever measures necessary including the establishment of demilitarized zones.
6. Accepting a just settlement of the refugee problem.

In return for these considerations, our sole demand upon Israel is the withdrawal of its armed forces from all territories occupied in the June, 1967, war, and the implementation of all the other provisions of the security council resolution.

The challenge that these principles present is that Israel may have either peace or territory—but she can never have both.

TAX REFORM IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress must act soon to reform our current tax system. Over the past months I have studied various components of the Federal Government's fiscal programs, and today I submitted for consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means a statement outlining my positions on tax reform, surtax extension, and overall Government spending. I now present that statement for the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM PRESENTED TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS BY REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., APRIL 14, 1969

Mr. Chairman, from all over America the uproar over our current tax system steadily grows in intensity. And a few pertinent statistics indicate why I think there's good reason for such griping. For example, since 1958: the average American pays 76% more taxes to all government units—federal, state and local; but, average per capita income has risen only 56%; and, consumer prices have climbed over 20%.

No wonder the middle income American—the man or woman who heads a family with a total income between \$7,000 and \$20,000—is upset.

True, over the same period, both the quantity and quality of services offered citizens by government have increased dramatically—per capita expenditures by all government units went up 85% between 1958 and 1968—but the rising cost of government has been a prime contributory factor to recent inflationary pressures. In addition, distribution of the tax burden has not been even, with middle and low income earners carrying a heavy and unequal share of the rising costs of government.

Many of the complaints I receive deal with federal tax levels—and especially with the tax surcharge—although a further look at statistics presents a somewhat different perspective.

Again, since 1958, all taxes have risen 76% on a per capita basis, yet it has been the

federal tax take which has increased the least—67% up, compared to an 82% rise for local government taxes and well over 100% for state taxes. And for both state and local government units, the cost of government itself has grown more than have allocations to any one functional area. For instance, state and local government expenditures rose nearly 95%, their educational programs increased around 77%, highway costs were up about 55% and public welfare expenses rose approximately 50%.

Per capita state and local government expenditures went from about \$259 in 1958 to around \$474 in 1967—an increase of some 83%—and over half of the state and local government funds went for either education or highways.

At the federal level, since 1958, areas of greatest growth have been education and job training (approximately a five-fold increase), space and science research (two-and-one-half times as much), health-welfare-housing-urban assistance (all with an increase of some 1.7 times), and defense, which had an increase of 75% but started out at a much higher base—around half of total budget allocations. These high growth areas should also be compared with other large expenditure sectors, such as agriculture, international affairs and finance, and natural resources, which saw very little real increase over the past ten years.

What the statistics mean to me is that the push for tax reform should not be limited to the federal tax structure alone. Tax reform should be implemented to all government levels—with the federal government taking the leading role.

In addition, I believe that any meaningful tax reform package must be accompanied by some rational system of allocating government funds. Without a realistic priority scheme for the budgetmaking process, I see the dismal prospect of an ever-increasing demand for more and more taxes—no matter how sweeping a reform program can be put together.

But, even without a statistical justification for tax structure change, the fact that too many high income earners and huge corporations get away with paying proportionately so little in taxes ranks as a vital incentive for major tax reform.

Ideally, the tax system in this country should reflect the basic principles of a participatory democracy, and each taxpayer should assume an equitable share of the total tax burden. Unfortunately, this is not the situation today. Strong Congressional action is needed to reform our tax structure rates and is an imperative move towards bringing government back to the people.

During the current Congressional session, I have put great emphasis on developing what I consider to be a fair and equitable program of tax reform. I have already introduced five major bills aiming for significant tax structure change, and I shall continue to consider other proposals as they are developed.

The bills which I have sponsored and which I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to act favorably upon are:

1. H.R. 3255, which increases the personal income tax exemption from \$600 (where it has been since the 1930's) to a more realistic \$12,000;

2. H.R. 3256, which liberalizes deductions taxpayers can claim dealing with moving expenses related to a job change;

3. H.R. 5250, the comprehensive tax reform bill—which if fully approved would raise more than \$9 billion in additional revenues—with its major provisions to eliminate the investment tax credit, substantially reduce mineral depletion allowances, tax capital gains heretofore untaxed at death, limit tax losses on "hobby" farming, and to establish a municipal bond guarantee corporation as an alternative for tax exempt state and local bonds;

4. H.R. 9896, which eliminates the application of the oil depletion allowance for foreign produced oil.

In addition, I have sponsored H.R. 9915 which would return a portion of federal tax revenues to state and local governments which undertake programs of cost-reducing administrative reform, including tax structure change. I believe that Congress must begin to give serious thought to the concept of revenue-sharing, and I favor an approach which would pass funds through state governments to municipalities, and, in addition, could include another pass-through from municipal governments directly to communities or submunicipal groups.

I also support Treasury Department recommendations to provide for a basic minimum income tax paid by all income earners, for a limit on the maximum tax that any one person could be expected to pay, and for an increase in standard deduction limits.

Passage of a tax reform program such as I have outlined here would greatly reduce the need for additional surcharges. Last year the Johnson Administration pushed passage of its 10% tax surcharge on grounds that the surtax would, by the end of the year, cool off the surging economy and ease inflationary pressures. The surtax received Congressional approval but, to date, what has happened is just about the opposite of what was predicted. The economy keeps steaming ahead, price levels continue moving upwards at an alarming rate, and credit conditions are as tight as they have ever been.

Now, President Nixon is again trying to get Congress to okay the surtax for virtually the same reasons. From all indications, the chances are good that the President will prevail and the surcharge will be extended.

All of the economic justifications for the surcharge are a subterfuge, however, for the real need for additional taxes—the demands for additional resources for the defense establishment. Last year I voted against the surtax because I know that it was nothing more than a means for financing our adventures in Vietnam. This year I will once more oppose the surcharge on the same grounds.

Nixon Administration economic advisors claim that current inflation results primarily from the economic boom of the last four years, and that inflation can be cured by limiting overall consumer expenditures via higher tax rates. In part, that is true, but I feel strongly that more of our recent inflation comes from imbalances within the economy caused by burgeoning defense expenditures.

The rapid growth in defense spending since 1965 has tended to shift resources out of many non-defense sectors and into the coffers of the military-industrial complex. The result is inflationary pressures for the relatively scarce amount of resources available. This imbalance has occurred throughout the economy, and should be blamed as a prime factor in recent inflation.

I believe that the amount of funds slated to be brought in by the surcharge could just as easily be raised by other—more equitable—means, and since Congress convened in January I have been backing two major efforts in this direction—lower defense expenditures and tax reform.

Congress inserted expenditure controls into last year's surtax bill, but the defense budget went virtually untouched. The new Administration will probably attempt the same play. Recently the Defense Department announced a \$660 million budget cut; earlier this year, Secretary Laird had made a \$500 million reduction. But, much as I applaud these cutbacks, I am at the same time a bit leary that these are just diversions to keep Congress from severely slashing such pet programs as the Safeguard ABM and the multiple-head MIRV missile.

Almost 60¢ of every dollar already flows into the military-industrial complex, and the

waste in defense programs is huge. I shall continue to support efforts to slice away at the defense budget—from which I believe at least another \$9 billion could be pared without impeding national security, and, indeed, even improving it.

Certainly Congress was aware of a possible "taxpayer's revolt" even before outgoing Treasury Secretary Barr made that prediction before the Joint Economic Committee in January. One provision of last year's surtax bill was a request for a sweeping tax reform proposal from the Johnson Administration.

But tax reform is not as simple as some persons might claim it to be. In attempting tax reform, government must balance its needs for increasing revenues against problems of fairness, and both of those factors must be attuned to allow for economic growth. It might be simpler to raise more revenue through selected boosts in tax rates, but it would come at the cost of potential lower economic growth and less equity in sharing the tax burden. On the other hand, it is possible to change tax rates to share the burden more evenly, but at a cost of lower revenues and less potential growth. Or, it is also possible to have taxes that encourage rapid economic growth, but both equity and revenue might be sacrificed.

Over the past four years, the Federal government has made its first goal that of increasing revenues to support defense operations in Southeast Asia. And, it is virtually impossible to raise revenues and achieve a better deal for the average wage earner, because the areas of major inequities are just those which aid war efforts, such as oil depletion and investment credits.

As long as the defense establishment goes unchecked, chances for a meaningful tax reform are slim. I assume that any serious drive to get at the oil depletion allowance and investment credit soon will get "wrapped in the flag." Middle and low income earners suffer dearly—from both increasing inflation and from growing tax inequity. All of these conflicts must be overcome if there is to be a successful tax reform campaign. I feel my tax program confronts these conflicts and comes out with a balanced approach leading to reform and equity.

THE PROBLEM OF LUMBER PRICE INCREASES

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1969, in regular meeting, the Home Builders Association of Greater Kansas City consisting of representatives of the construction industry of Metropolitan Kansas City, did, by unanimous vote, adopt a resolution relating to the many problems of lumber pricing.

This resolution clearly outlines six key factors directly related to the appalling increases in lumber prices the construction industry has experienced in recent years, and I commend these factors to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The lumber price increases experienced by our industry are of a magnitude that can in no way be justified by natural market forces, and;

Whereas, These price increases are not in the national interest, the industry interest, and foremost, the consumer interest, and make it impossible to fulfill our goal to pro-

vide low and moderate income housing as enunciated in the 1968 Housing Act, and,

Whereas, Large lumber manufacturers have bought out the small saw mills, or cut off their supply by bidding up the price of the timber the federal government sells at auction, thus allowing the larger concerns to increase the value of their own holdings and results in increased prices;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the present administration and that all address-ees adopt the following program:

1. That we must have an immediate ban by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture of all exports of public timber; a ban to last until our internal U.S. needs are met. Having these logs available for domestic manufacture now will ease our shortage crisis and should at least hold lumber prices where they are.

2. That the federal government increase the allowable cuts by 10 per cent and thus remedy the situation which now exists.

3. That government timber auctions be discontinued and the price of timber be fixed at the 1968 level, and that the small saw mills be allocated as much of this government timber as they are able to manufacture into lumber.

4. That a time limit be set on the manufacture of all timber purchased from the government and penalties be assessed for each day exceeding this period.

5. That the small saw mills be assisted with loans from the Small Business Administration even if this involves more than the usual risk.

6. That all local associations be asked to run advertisements in their local newspapers explaining how the lumber industry has raised their prices during the past 18 months.

WHY THE REVOLT OF MODERN YOUTH?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, letters to the editor from citizens often supply constructive thoughts concerning problems challenging the Nation. Here at home few crises are greater than that of youth in rebellion. What is so wrong with what America has to offer perplexes many citizens.

In this connection a recent letter to the Washington Evening Star from Mr. Jack Markowitz of Alexandria, Va., is interesting reading. Just how to attain that "better society" without destroying the one that we have is one of the most difficult problems of our time.

The letter follows:

REVOLT ON CAMPUS

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Sir: I believe that too many people oversimplify the causes of the student rebellion on campuses and the methods for dealing with it. Contrasted with the civil rights movement, which had support from a broad spectrum of our society, the student rebellion touches a vital nerve. Civil rights could be viewed somewhat dispassionately by the middle class as "helping others" in consonance with our Judeo-Christian culture. However, the student rebellion, composed primarily of white, middle-class young people, is a direct threat to our stability as a society and our authority as parents. This has caused an emotional and panicky response referred to as the "generation gap" or preferably, "the forgetfulness gap." Forget-

fulness is a problem of both the younger and older generations, but the older generation, because of its maturity, should be "more equal."

Most parents of today's college students were born between 1918-28. This means that many of them know first-hand the false prosperity and the resulting depression of the 1920s. Furthermore, many gave three or four years of their lives to service during World War II or Korea. Depression and war have caused insecure parents who overemphasize material factors of life to make up for earlier deprivation.

While there have always been materialistic tendencies in our society, with its inherent hypocrisies of Sabbath worship and individual undercutting the rest of the week, the civil rights movements of the early 1960s forced it out into the open and imprinted itself on the consciousness of younger generation. Established institutions of church, school and parental authority were seriously questioned and found wanting. At the same time more and more of our young people were attending college because of our increased affluence and governmental policy. Also, they were being asked to stay in school longer to learn how to cope with the rapidly increased knowledge and technology of our modern society. Therefore, the problems which many of the older generation faced while in college (i.e., meaningless rules, impersonal instruction, testing for its own sake, required courses that were narrowly occupational rather than educational, etc.), became intensified.

Parents forget that they instilled a questioning attitude in their children which causes them to react skeptically to meaningless experience. Didn't we reward the children who asked good questions? Since this is also the first generation which has fully participated in a broad range of group activities from little leagues to student government, they have learned how to get things done through group action. Add to this the natural idealism of young which has been buffeted by the civil rights movement and a confusing war, we have many of the factors which are the breeding ground of an activist student rebellion.

Both students and parents must understand these causes before both over-react, cause irreparable harm and turn a "generation gap" into a chasm of misunderstanding and conflict. Students who are open and humanistic towards one another should not find it too difficult to direct the same attitude across generations. Parents must recover their latent humanism to reach out to join the young people in improving the many imperfections in our society. Both generations must remember that it is easy to destroy but infinitely more difficult to create a better society.

JACK MARKOWITZ.

JOB CORPS TO BE INTEGRATED INTO COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz has unveiled a sound and economical plan for integrating the Job Corps into the Labor Department's comprehensive manpower program.

This action, which has received President Nixon's stamp of approval, is a major step toward vastly improving the

Nation's capability of preparing seriously disadvantaged youngsters for jobs.

I am most heartened that this plan would not only retain but would strengthen those features of this activity that have helped so many young people acquire training and employment.

Significantly, the emphasis of training will be shifted from conservation to industrial employment as a result of the establishment of 30 new inner city and near-city training centers and the closing of 50 conservation centers. A net reduction of 29 centers will save the Nation approximately \$100 million without hindering the job-training services available for young men and women in our major urban and rural areas.

The 30 new inner city and near-city residential centers will enable the Labor Department to recruit, train and then place needy youths in jobs relatively near their homes.

The Secretary has made clear his intention to carefully phase out those camps which will be closed, insuring equitable treatment for trainees and personnel and making the fullest possible use of the old facilities. Corpsmen will be given the opportunity to complete their training, and discussions are now under way to consider alternative uses for the centers which will be closed.

I think this logical and well-conceived plan deserves the wholehearted support of every member of this Congress. I insert into the RECORD the "Report of the Secretary of Labor on Restructuring the Job Corps." It contains an excellent analysis of the deficiencies encountered in the old Job Corps programs and provides ample justification for the Secretary's new proposals.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR ON RESTRUCTURING THE JOB CORPS

This report reviews the basic premises of the Job Corps, briefly describes its present structure, appraises the validity of these assumptions in the light of operation experience and proposes changes which will reshape the program.

BASIC PREMISES

The Job Corps was established to meet the special needs of a specific target population—low income, disadvantaged youths "currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair prospects for successful participation" in other training programs. We know that over 800,000 youths live below the poverty level; the number of these who need all the services offered by Job Corps has not been precisely estimated.

Job Corps is not characterized simply. There is great variety among the centers in size, focus, and quality. There are, however, several central premises and distinctive elements which have remained relatively stable.

1. Residence

A central premise is that complete residential service is essential for the target population. A group living situation characterized by total life-support is provided, away from the family, on the assumption that these youths are so hampered by deprivation at home that they need a totally new environment in order to learn or acquire skills.

2. Removal from community

Residential service is generally provided away from the home community, the premise being that the youths need to get completely away, not only from a disruptive family

situation, but from their neighborhood. A key assumption on which this belief rests is that youths, particularly those from an urban slum area, will benefit if they are moved to a wholly different area, preferably rural. Rural conservation work, for example, has been made a substantial part of the program, on the assumption that it can play a useful role in rehabilitation.

3. Intensive supportive services

Of equal importance is the belief that such youth ordinarily need comprehensive and intensive supportive services. The premise here is that effective work-training alone will not entirely remove all serious obstacles to employment. The complete service includes basic education, counseling, physical and mental health services, development of improved motivation, "life skills" preparation, physical development, and recreation.

4. Self-sufficiency

And finally, Job Corps has assumed that each residential center should be substantially self-sufficient, providing all essential work-training and supportive services. This operating premise is rooted in a desire for administrative simplicity as well as in a search for a distinctive image for the program. In addition, the location of centers in relatively isolated areas requires that they be largely self-supporting.

PRESENT STRUCTURE

Although there is considerable variation in detail, the Job Corps now has basically two types of centers for men in relatively isolated rural areas (a medium-size conservation center and a large, diversified skill-training center) and one type of center for women (medium-size, located in cities, with the girls assigned from other areas). More specifically:

1. Conservation centers stress work experience in conservation activities along with some remedial education. There are 82 such centers. Modest in size (averaging 150 boys) they are generally in rural areas requiring conservation work, including such Federal lands as national forests or parks. The centers were originally focused on the needs of those who read below the 5th grade level, improving literacy so that they could go on to occupational skill training. More recently youths with higher reading levels have been enrolled and skill training in the construction trades has been added to the conservation center program.

Almost all these centers are run by units of the Agriculture and Interior Departments. This fiscal year about 37 percent of Job Corps enrollee positions were in conservation centers. (Congress mandated that 40 percent of male Corps members be in conservation centers. Currently the ratio is over 50 percent.)

2. Men's centers provide a varied array of skill training courses and a comprehensive range of supportive and other manpower-related services. There are only six such centers, all rather large (averaging 1800 youths). Five are run by private companies, the sixth by a State agency set up just for this purpose. Though sometimes termed "urban," all are about 40 miles from the nearest city in areas where large installations (generally abandoned military bases) were readily available.

Both urban and rural youths are enrolled, constituting some 33 percent of enrollee positions this fiscal year.

3. Centers for women offer skill training, together with other needed services. The 18 such centers vary in size, averaging some 500 girls. Typically located in urban areas, they enroll all girls away from their home area as a matter of policy. Most are operated under contract to private firms, with several run by nonprofit organizations.

Women's centers account for some 28 percent of all Job Corps positions this fiscal year;

the Economic Opportunity Act requires that at least 25 percent of all enrollees be women and the legislative history suggests going up to 50 percent of the Corps.

The Job Corps has a new inner-city center for men and is planning several experimental centers. These account for some two percent of all enrollee positions.

PROFILE OF ENROLLEE

The typical Job Corps enrollee is 18 years of age; has had nine years of education, but performs at only the fifth grade level. Approximately one-half of the enrollees are from small towns; the others are equally divided between rural and metropolitan areas. Less than 10 percent have been convicted for serious offenses. Almost half of the enrollees were working in such menial jobs as bus boy, car washer, or farm hand before they joined the Job Corps and were earning an average of \$1.27 an hour. Eighty percent of the enrollees have not seen a doctor or dentist in the ten years preceding their enrollment, and 60 percent come from broken homes.

PROFILE OF A JOB CORPS ENROLLEE

	Male	Female	Total
Age (years).....	17.4	18.0	17.5
Education (years):			
Years of school.....	8.8	9.8	9.0
Reading level (61 percent of			
Corpsmen in conservation			
centers read below 4th			
grade level).....	4.8	6.2	5.2
Math level.....	5.1	5.9	5.3
Home residence (percent):			
Rural (less than 2,500)			25
Small town, midcity			47
Metro (over 250,000)			28
Previous behavior (percent):			
No previous record.....			67
Minor antisocial behavior			25
1 serious conviction.....			8
Employment (percent): Working			
full or part time before Job			
Corps ¹	46	30	44
Induction status of those eligible			
for Armed Forces (percent):			
Failed test.....			63
Educational reasons.....			28
Physical reasons.....			22
Other.....			13
Health (percent): Had not seen			
doctor or dentist in last 10 years			80
Family pattern (percent):			
Broken home.....			60
Head of household unemployed			63
Family on relief.....			27
Substandard housing.....			60
Asked to leave school.....			64
Both parents had less than 8th			
grade education.....			49

¹ Of those reporting, wages averaged \$1.27 an hour; 44 percent of those working were in jobs such as busboy, carwasher, or farmhand; Social Security reports youth worked on the average 2.5 quarters with average yearly income of only \$639.

ASSESSMENT OF JOB CORPS PREMISES

Formal evaluations and the practical lessons of operating experience suggest that several of the basic Job Corps premises are highly questionable, particularly in the context of other manpower programs. The weaknesses in the organizational design of Job Corps and the way it has gone about its business, reflects the faulty underlying assumptions and point to the need for a complete reshaping of Job Corps in terms of its purposes, size, structure and relationship to other manpower programs. Nonetheless, some of the underlying premises are sound and are necessary in a comprehensive manpower system.

1. The premise of residential service, for some youth, seems to have proven sound and should be retained as an essential element in manpower programming.

It is now clear that some of the highly disadvantaged who are unable to benefit from or maintain enrollment in a training program will gain special benefits by living in a special residential setting away from their customary home and family problems.

Once we have effectively identified and recruited such youth, the most appropriate types of residential settings must be selected for them, with special reference to matters of size and location. The general judgment is that small (under 100) and medium-size residences (100-300) are most desirable for supplying individualized attention. Although large centers can provide more diversified training, specialized services, and significant cost economies, these advantages are often offset by problems of camp discipline and inter-personal relationships resulting in high dropout rates.

2. The premise that the target group needs intensive supportive services in addition to work-training is clearly sound.

It is obvious that illiterate youth urgently require remedial education and other services, but it is at least questionable whether this need is being supplied effectively in many of the camps. In addition, it does not seem that remedial education has been adequately related to the content of training and to individual employment goals, so that the youth can see its value and be motivated to apply himself. In practice, some conservation centers have placed more emphasis on performing conservation work than on raising reading levels.

Counseling, physical fitness and recreational activities, and other supportive services are definitely necessary. Continued high early dropout rates, however, particularly among the youngest enrollees indicate that substantial improvement is needed in current techniques. In addition, the program should differentiate among the needs of heterogeneous groups of youths.

3. The premise that rural youth have needs that require special considerations is valid. Youths from rural areas and small communities often need to leave their home areas, not because they require a different environment, but because they cannot obtain formal training where they live. If they are to receive training, they must leave. Job Corps centers have enrolled many such youths. There is an unmet need for training services in rural areas. Use of Job Corps centers as regional residential training centers catering to rural youth is one way to help meet this need.

Weakness in Job Corps concepts and operations are many.

1. The premise that all enrollees should be assigned to centers away from their home community rather than in or near it has proven questionable. (Job Corps emphasis has nearly all been on assignment away from the home area.)

It is doubtful, therefore, that the large away-from-home area center should remain the sole model for supplying continuing residential services and skill training to the Job Corps target group.

In part, the Job Corps has had little real choice due to the limited resources available and the necessary location of conservation centers in sparsely populated areas.

However, with the "urban" men's skill training centers a conscious choice was made to concentrate on a few large facilities. Because of the cost-of-facility and community relations problems such large undertakings generate within major cities, and because of a desire for a rural setting free of the distractions a city offers, these centers have been located in large government-owned, rent-free installations in relatively isolated areas. Other practical considerations include the economics of scale afforded by the large centers as well as the wide range of training courses offered enrollees.

Originally, assignments to these centers were made with little regard to individual geographic factors. Available openings became the key and many cross-country assignments resulted.

In practice, the great permissiveness in geographical assignment has both increased transportation costs and widened the area of

choice for enrollees in regard to the content of their program. While it also exposed them to other areas of the country, it limited home visits, created difficult logistics problems on scheduling, and complicated followup on corpsmen returning home. Although the Job Corps is now concentrating assignments within the region, enrollees are still sent out of their home city. This means continued absence from neighborhood and family, with problems of readjustment and job placement upon return. While long-distance assignment and relocation may be helpful to some enrollees, it aggravates the dropout problem and discourages other youth who need residential services from signing up. Only about 35 percent of the youths that left the Job Corps in fiscal year 1968 were graduates.

Almost 40 percent left before 90 days. Job Corps centers which are in States classified by Job Corps as "import" States had much higher 30 day drop-out rates than centers in "export" States. Import States are those where the center brings in enrollees from other States to operate at capacity. Thus, centers in import States would tend to have enrollees from further distances from their homes than centers in export States. For men's centers in import States, the 30 day dropout rate average 24.9 percent, 14 percent higher than the centers in export States. For women's centers, the import States had a dropout rate of 16.3 percent, 21 percent higher than the centers in export States.

Separation of the training site from the area in which enrollee will look for a job also limits development of on-the-job training opportunities that can lead to employment after graduation.

These are serious weaknesses that have adversely affected overall performance.

2. The premise that Job Corps centers should be self-sufficient, operating independently of other programs except for certain selection and placement assistance, has had serious shortcomings in practice. To implement this concept, all necessary services must be provided by the Job Corps itself. Though this approach may have some validity in isolated areas, elsewhere it increases administration overhead and multiplies the risk of duplication of education and training programs that are often available in the same community. The centers rarely function as preparatory or supplemental programs for other manpower development activities—yet they are often unable to provide needed long-term development without aid from other programs. Since most enrollees are retained at centers for less than six months, short-term assignments to Job Corps—as a conscious prelude to or supplement for other manpower service programs—appear most promising.

3. The conservation center concept has not been a successful manpower development device. The efficiency of the conservation concept was subject to serious question even before the Job Corps was established. Conservation work, it was argued, would add little to the employability of the youth; any work performed at the centers would not justify their cost of maintenance.

Experience with the conservation centers clearly indicates that the early fears were justified.

The relative isolation of many centers has contributed to their inability to retain enrollees for a period necessary to achieve significant improvements in educational and vocational skills.

Conservation centers have a poorer record in improving a corpsman's education than do urban centers. (Corpsmen in conservation centers only increased their verbal grade level 80 percent as much as urban corpsmen; the increase in their mathematics grade level was only 50 percent as great.)

Little attention has been devoted to the high school equivalency program at the conservation centers.

The thrust of conservation center activi-

ties has been directed toward work projects, rather than to training and skill development. In most conservation centers work projects primarily involved the use of common labor and basic hand tools, a situation not conducive to the development of marketable skills.

The gain in wages after leaving the Job Corps has been less for conservation camp corpsmen than for those in urban centers.

The isolation of the conservation centers from labor demand areas has precluded the centers from taking much responsibility in placing corpsmen after they leave the center.

These problems raise the question as to whether the conservation centers can provide the training contemplated in the act without costly upgrading; and whether such upgrading is possible at all because of the difficulty of recruiting qualified instructors at remote and isolated center locations.

ADDITIONAL OPERATIONAL WEAKNESSES

In addition to the weaknesses that arise from faulty assumptions, there are several operational inadequacies that have limited Job Corps effectiveness.

1. *First, there are critical recruitment and selection problems.*

These are apparent in the methods used by the Job Corps to reach its target group—those who need its distinctive residential service, rather than non-residential training. Unfortunately, the key factor in recruitment and selection practices has not been whether residential service is necessary in an individual case, but whether a youth is willing to leave home for training. And frequently, the mere existence of vacant "slots" becomes the stimulus for recruitment.

Consequently, many youths have been enrolled who (a) need training and other assistance but not costly residential service, or (b) are from rural areas which are not served by other programs. At the same time, young people who may need the full range of residential services are not reached by the Job Corps if they are unwilling to leave their home area. In addition, youths with police records or other evidence of antisocial behavior are often screened out in an effort to improve community relations near the residential centers and avoid disruption in the center. Thus, only 8 percent of Job Corps enrollees have had serious criminal convictions. Similarly, unwed young mothers with children are currently excluded, although this is a sizable group which may have special needs for residential training services.

This evidence indicates that the Job Corps, as presently constituted, has not been serving the target groups that can best be reached by residential services.

2. *The early dropout rate also has been unacceptably high.* The average period of enrollment at the center has not been long enough to permit progression either to other programs or to stable employment with lasting value to the corpsmen. Development of individual plans may help motivate each youth to remain in the program and to make significant progress. A shift to smaller centers located nearer the home area can also help reduce the homesickness and personal disorientation that has contributed to a high dropout rate.

3. *Job placement performance has not been good.* This, in essence, is a reflection of all of the weaknesses of the program: the high dropout rate, inadequate training, lack of program integration with other manpower programs, training sites located away from the corps members' home areas where they will seek work. If any single element of an expensive residential training program is to be regarded as basic to the program's success it is placement. Job placement performance can be improved substantially by (a) restructuring the Job Corps so that it becomes an integral part of a manpower serv-

ices continuum which includes a job placement component, (b) requiring operators of centers to take the initiative in securing placement services, (c) developing an individual placement plan for each corpsman while he is still in the center, (d) providing more "gate houses" and other readjustment aid for corpsmen returning to their home area, (e) providing relocation assistance for corpsmen recruited from a job-scarce area, and (f) establishing more specific ties to job market opportunities.

RESIDENTIAL TRAINING AND COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER SERVICES

All of the considerations noted above raise a substantial question as to whether the size and character of the Job Corps is justified. This question is underscored by the changes that have occurred in the labor market and in the availability of manpower programs since the inception of Job Corps. For example in 1964:

The number of opportunities for youth in manpower programs was 27,000; compared to over 600,000 today.

We did not have CEP, JOBS, area skill centers, and other manpower service components we have now.

The Job Corps was established, at least in part, as an experiment in reaching, teaching and training the hard-core youth—a task that the regular established programs were not then prepared to handle. Since then, however, a number of new manpower programs, specifically designed to meet the education and training needs of young, disadvantaged people have been fashioned. In addition, there have been significant changes in the statutory authority and practices of the existing institutions which should make them more responsive to the needs of the target population. These developments must be taken into account in assessing the present role of the Job Corps.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN ORGANIZATION AND EMPHASIS

If the objectives of the Job Corps, and indeed of our total manpower program, are to be realized, a major reshaping is necessary:

The identity of the Job Corps as a distinct, separate program should be minimized. Instead, it should be thought of as part of a comprehensive manpower system and identified as *Residential Manpower Centers*.

2. The number of Job Corps centers should be reduced sharply and alternative program capabilities tapped to serve the target population. Centers which have not fully performed their mandate to teach, train, retain and place enrollees, would be eliminated. The conservation camps which have been low on remedial education and meaningful skill training will be particularly affected.

3. To achieve its objective of developing innovative techniques for solving the complex teenage poverty problems, more attention must be paid to the quality of its efforts. There is little to be gained from pushing larger and larger numbers of trainees through programs of doubtful effectiveness.

4. The remaining centers would be closely integrated with the other manpower programs. The conservation centers will devote more time and resources to basic education and to training for desirable jobs in the labor market. Conservation centers that have not established effective skill training programs will be closed. "Urban" centers will be converted to regional skill centers and cater primarily to youth from rural areas.

5. In addition to the present Job Corps models, 30 new "near-city" and "inner-city" models will be developed.

In short, it is proposed that we eliminate: 50 conservation centers, 7 women's centers, 2 men's centers, and add 30 new inner-city centers.

The basic objective would be to incorporate the Job Corps into a total manpower system and to design new, smaller centers, more re-

sponsive to the manpower needs of the target youth.

INTEGRATION WITH OTHER MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The first major change is to make the Job Corps an integral part of a comprehensive manpower system—rather than continue it as another, essentially separate, program. This can benefit both Job Corps and the other manpower programs, which now generally lack intensive residential-support services.

Integration will facilitate improvement of recruitment, screening and selection practices, with material reduction of inefficient recruiting and unwarranted screening-out. The Job Corps has often received a lesser priority in overall manpower programs; that will be changed. Refinement of selection criteria can help us to identify those who have a special need for residential services as against other alternatives.

If the Job Corps used available community manpower services, such as Concentrated Employment Program, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, Manpower Development and Training Act, Neighborhood Youth Corps, all program elements will be more relevant and more readily accessible to most of the Job Corps' target population. More attention will be given to a planned sequence of integrated services. In effect, by coupling the unique residential services of the Job Corps with each of the on-going programs we will multiply the effectiveness of all our efforts.

The other manpower programs can be strengthened through the availability of Job Corps service for some of their enrollees. For example, the Concentrated Employment Program will now have an additional option for its stream of clients, while NYC and our other training and work experience programs may be able to call on Job Corps' residential support aid to meet the special needs of some participants.

Job Corps will participate in the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). This will permit better planned use of its services as an alternative to, or for linking with, non-residential services.

A MODIFIED RESIDENTIAL CENTER

The second major change is to direct part of the Job Corps resources to new organizational forms, particularly smaller inner-city or near-city residential centers.

Examination of the past, rather rigid, forms in which Job Corps has been structured suggests the need for greater flexibility. Assignment away from the home community is necessary or useful for some enrollees, but not all.

Use of a variety of new center models will generate a greater responsiveness to the differential needs of the target population. Smaller centers, located in or near cities, can recruit, train, and place youth entirely within their home State or urban area. They can serve young people who need residential support but are unwilling or do not need to move to a distant area.

Such centers will do a better job with delinquent youth, more difficult to handle in large camps and often unwelcome in strange communities. They can be developed as multi-purpose facilities; they could, for example, provide unwed young mothers, a group particularly needing residential support, with combined day-care and residential assistance for both mother and child. They can, in general, better draw on the full range of local community resources.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR EXPERIMENTS

The Labor Department has already conducted several experiments with both near-city and inner-city centers.

1. Near-city centers

These centers permit commuting home on weekends and can develop ties to other pro-

grams in the city. One, Camp Madison-Felicia, provides MDTA skill training for several dozen New York City youths in a former boys' camp near the city. A second, the small Hull House Work Camp near Chicago, enrolled NYC youths judged to have a strong need for residential support. A third project, just getting underway, is the Watts Labor Community Action Committee "training campus" near Los Angeles; here some 500 youths from that city will be trained, most of whom will already be "graduates" of in-city work experience programs.

2. Inner-city centers

But there are other models with great promise; one is an inner-city residential training center to train local youths locally for local jobs. The Job Corps has recently started such experimental inner-city centers for boys.

A significant new approach with which the Labor Department has been experimenting warrants extended consideration. Promising flexibility, personalized attention, and adaptability to local circumstances, it seeks to establish small inner-city residences for those who particularly need residential support—and then have them obtain their work-training in programs already available within the same community. Such residences, staffed with local nonprofessional personnel, can provide intensive support—and by reaching out to work with the youngsters' families can perhaps improve the home environment which so often hampers effective participation in training.

This approach holds special promise for high-risk delinquents most crucially in need of residential support, but as yet not broadly represented in Job Corps.

The Department is now running three of these inner-city residential support efforts (one for boys, two for girls) for NYC enrollees. Experience at the boys' center, initiated in New Haven two years ago, indicates that high-risk NYC youths living in a special residence are less likely to dropout, have fewer brushes with the law and a better subsequent employment experience than a comparable group which did not receive such residential support.

After six months, average weekly earnings of graduates from the New Haven center increased by 80 percent, while the control group's earnings had declined by 29 percent, largely because of poorer work habits. Arrests of graduates were cut in half while those of the control group rose by 22 percent. Half of the residents elected to return to school full time.

The following table compares Job Corpsmen with NYC out-of-school enrollees and residents of the New Haven E&D project.

The most significant comparison involves the prior arrest record of enrollees. Ninety percent of the New Haven enrollees had a record of arrests for serious offenses in contrast to only 8 percent of the Job Corps enrollees.

ENROLLEE PROFILES: A COMPARISON OF PROGRAMS

Characteristic	Job Corps enrollees	NYC out of school	Labor E. & D. (New Haven)
Age (years):			
Male.....	17.4	18.0	19.0
Female.....	18.0	18.0	18.0
Education (years):			
Median grade.....	9.0	9.0	9.5
Reading level.....	5.2	(1)	5.0
Home community (percent):			
Rural and small town.....	72	40	0
Urban.....	28	60	100
Arrest record (percent):			
None.....	67	(1)	1
Minor.....	25	(1)	9
Serious.....	8	(1)	90
Previous employment (percent):			
Male.....	46	(1)	31
Female.....	30	(1)	(1)

ENROLLEE PROFILES: A COMPARISON OF PROGRAMS—Continued

Characteristic	Job Corps enrollees	NYC out of school	Labor E. & D. (New Haven)
Draft status, male (percent):			
Failed.....	64	(1)	(1)
Health (percent): No doctor in 10 years.....	80	(1)	(1)
Family (percent):			
Broken home.....	60	(1)	39
Head of household unemployed.....	63	(1)	59
Family on relief.....	27	(1)	27
Substandard housing.....	60	(1)	(1)
Asked to leave school.....	64	77	(1)
Parents less than 8th grade education.....	49	(1)	44

¹ Not available.

The costs of an inner-city center are compared with those of the Job Corps in the following table:

COMPARISON OF MAN-YEAR COSTS, JOB CORPS AND INNER CITY CENTER

	Job Corps urban center	Labor E. & D. (New Haven) ¹
Center operating expenses.....	\$2,429	\$1,864
Enrollee expenses.....	1,176	124
Operations and maintenance.....		740
Other operative expenses (including rent).....	1,253	1,000
Center staff expenses.....	3,114	3,320
Staff salaries and benefits.....		2,880
Travel.....		240
Contracted services.....		200
Enrollee direct cost.....	1,447	40
Allowances.....		0
Travel.....		0
Insurance.....		40
Total, center and enrollee direct cost.....	6,990	5,224
Capital investment.....	251	560
Rehabilitation.....		240
Equipment.....		320
Grand total, center cost.....	7,241	5,784

¹ Includes staff cost of services to families of the center residents and followup of graduates.

² Residents are required to contribute 1/3 of earnings as rent for room and board. Amounts vary according to hours worked (out-of-school youngsters earn more than in-school). Rent receipts are used to pay food costs, which explains why this figure is so low.

³ Residents are not paid allowances because they are expected to hold jobs which can be either public or private sector jobs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW CENTERS

It is proposed to establish 30 new centers with a capacity for 4,625 enrollees. They will be linked to such existing programs as CEP, NAB JOBS, MDTA skill centers, etc. (A reasonable rule of thumb is that average enrollment will be about six months, so that this number of positions will mean nearly 10,000 enrollees a year.)

Over half (54%) are to be in 10 near-city centers. Some 38 percent are in the five inner-city residential-training centers, while the 15 inner-city residential-support centers, each small, account in total for only 8 percent of the positions.

The residential nonresidential mix in the average inner-city residential-training center is estimated at 200 residents and 150 non-residents receiving training at the center.

As to sex ratio, some 34 percent of the positions are planned for women (as compared to present Job Corps 28 percent). This is intended to take account of the special need for distinctive residential service for some young unmarried mothers; some of the women's centers will include or be linked to

child care service. Also, four centers will be tried on a "coed" basis; while separate residential quarters will be provided for men and women, they will be administered as a combined center.

SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL TRAINING CENTERS NEEDED

Several types of residential centers are required, depending on the special needs of each selectively identified segment of the target population.

1. *Comprehensive regional residential skill training centers* will be retained for those for whom full-time residence away from home area and family is necessary. These centers will provide manpower services to youth from sparsely populated rural areas which cannot support such programs. Four men's centers and 11 women's centers are proposed.

2. *Conservation centers in rural areas* will be operated for youths needing remedial education (reading below 6th grade level), skill training in less complex occupations and/or who seek outdoor-work careers. The program should lead more directly to placement in skill training or some specific occupational employment. The centers should also be used for brief summer outdoor work-experience for some inner-city residents.

3. *Near-city residential centers* will be opened for those for whom work-week residence away from home is desirable, with work-training geared to the specific occupational needs of the area served. Ten such centers should be opened. Twenty-seven conservation centers should be retained.

4. For youths unwilling or not needing to leave their city, two types of *inner-city residential support* are desirable.

One is a training facility with attached residential support which provides training in one or several skills, both for residents and nonresidents, while placing some of the former in courses already available at other training facilities in the area. Five medium size centers is recommended.

The other is a small residence with no training facilities of its own, serving simply to provide residential support for those who need it and are enrolled in area training programs. Such support is designed particularly for high-risk youths who ordinarily have high dropout rates from training programs because of home and family problems. It is suggested that 15 small centers be developed.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

1. The private sector's involvement must be expanded in both quantity and quality. This may be provided by better relating financial returns, for private operators of centers, to their performance. More effective ties will be explored with the National Alliance of Businessmen's program. The good start made on involvement of organized labor in providing trade and preapprenticeship training to corpsmen should be expanded, with emphasis on continuing union support during the formal apprenticeship period after graduation from Job Corps.

2. The distinctive capabilities of State agencies, particularly vocational education systems, should be drawn upon more fully. These agencies should utilize the experiences of the Job Corps and adapt their system to serve effectively the clientele now handled by the Job Corps. Where feasible they should participate as sponsors of centers or provide specialized services to the centers.

3. With the Job Corps part of a single manpower system there can be better coordination with the State employment agencies which are part of the same system. Screening and selection of trainees can be handled more efficiently, transportation of trainees to the centers can be arranged easier, job development and placement work for discharged corps members can be better coordinated.

4. Increased use should be made of volunteers. The Job Corps has found that a modest

investment in volunteer effort can reap valuable returns. This has been particularly true with the Women in Community Service (WICS) program. VISTA volunteers have been effective and their role will be expanded in such areas as recruiting, tutoring, "big sister" roles and other supplementary activities.

5. Continued attention must be paid to community relations. During the first few years of operation, the Job Corps suffered from an extremely bad press. Every incident, however minor, involving a Job Corps enrollee appeared to merit national attention. Some have felt that the Job Corps and its contractors failed to prepare communities and placed centers in inappropriate locations. In time, however, the novelty of the Job Corps wore off and news events involving Job Corpsmen were relegated to the back pages of the newspapers.

However, some community relations problems persist. There are still towns where corpsmen are not welcome. And "incidents" continue to occur. Finally, there is the problem of the minority of dissatisfied former corpsmen who do not look kindly on their past experiences. Perhaps the fairest characterization is that community relations, in the main, have become stabilized.

6. Additional use should be made of Job Corps facilities. During summer months, the facilities of the centers should be made available to disadvantaged children, including Neighborhood Youth Corps summer youth. Corpsmen can be used as tutors and camp counselors. Student teachers from public schools could be used in centers. This will not only provide an additional education resource for the Job Corps, but will also give the teachers-in-training a useful exposure in working with deprived young people.

PROGRAM COST ESTIMATES

The restructuring of the Job Corps discussed in this report will involve the following budget modifications:

The previous Administration proposed a 1970 budget of \$280 million to continue the 1969 level of the Job Corps program providing for 35,000 man-years with 113 centers. A preliminary review of this budget yields some tentative conclusions as to ways by which we could make a major net reduction in the program and move toward the new program emphasis proposed. Our review suggests we can achieve a net reduction of \$100 million in the budget from \$280 to \$180 million and still provide approximately \$24 million to provide the new kinds of urban centers discussed earlier in this document. We would propose to achieve the reduction by taking the following actions:

1. Reduce the conservation center program by about two-thirds. This would reduce the number of centers from 82 to 32.

2. Reduce the urban men's and urban women's center by about one-third. This would result in a closing of 7 women's and 2 men's centers.

3. Using 1969 funds which probably will not be spent by June 30. OEO has already identified \$5 million of this as available. We believe that this can be increased as action is initiated now to begin closing or phasing out centers as proposed above.

4. Reducing the overall average enrollee man-year cost for the enrollees remaining in conservation and urban centers.

Of the amount saved, approximately \$24 million will be used to open new centers near or in urban areas that would tie urban centers into continuing manpower programs and services.

It is our preliminary estimate that we would be able to open about 30 such centers providing for approximately 4,600 enrollee man-years. By tying these centers into existing manpower programs and services in the urban areas in which they would be located, it is our estimate that the total

average cost per enrollee man-year would be approximately \$5,250 in contrast with the total Johnson budget enrollee man-year of \$8,000. The difference in cost essentially reflects the training and support cost which would be provided through other manpower programs such as the Concentrated Employment Program.

ABM: A BIG MISTAKE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the President's support for deployment of an ABM system is deeply disappointing. I am hopeful that a concerted effort of education and discussion throughout the country and in the Congress will prevent the go-ahead for a wasteful project that will unleash a massive arms race without providing an appropriate gain in our national security.

There have been many excellent editorials written that expose the folly of "Safeguard" ABM. One such editorial appeared in *Newsday*, another in *Forbes*. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include these in the *RECORD* at this point:

[From *Newsday* magazine, Mar. 15, 1969]

THE SENTINEL DECISION

"There are two sides to every question," the wise man said.

"Yes," replied the fool, "and there are two sides to a sheet of flypaper. It makes no difference to anyone but the fly which side he parks on."

President Nixon has parked the country on the sticky side of the Sentinel controversy. He kept open the option of an annual review of his Sentinel decision, and it may indeed be possible one day to drop the whole project, with the nation only a few billion dollars poorer. It may, but there is precious little precedent in the history of nuclear weapons systems to suggest that such an occurrence is likely.

The President found grounds for proceeding with Sentinel, the anti-ballistic missile project, even though many eminent scientists dispute whether it will work, even though the nation is far ahead of the Soviet Union in its stock of deliverable atomic warheads, and even though shaky calculations of the potential Chinese missile threat and Peking's suicidal intentions were required to justify the project.

If a case can be made for Sentinel under these tenuous circumstances, imagine the administration encountering a new set of facts which will require its abandonment.

"There is a kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry," Robert S. McNamara said in 1967, when he reluctantly announced the decision to go ahead with Sentinel. "If a weapon system works—and works well—there is strong pressure from many directions to produce and deploy the weapon out of all proportion to the prudent level required."

COST WILL GO UP

With Sentinel, McNamara is being proved out in spades. One wrong decision made for the wrong reasons is being buttressed now by another wrong decision. Even though nobody knows whether the system will prove effective, it will cost an estimated \$6 to \$7 billion. Further upward adjustments will unquestionably occur as the bids of the defense contractors are re-negotiated, and as McNamara's "mad momentum" expands the system. Keep

in mind that almost every previous system has cost more than its original estimates.

It is, of course, good news that Sentinel, if funded by Congress, would be pulled away from the cities and deployed at missile bases on the Great Plains. But the ease with which a new justification has been found to match this forced migration suggests that the desire for Sentinel has come first, the reasons for financing and deploying it second.

Nixon asserted, for example, that the Sentinel deployment would defend "the American people against the kind of nuclear attack which Communist China is likely to be able to mount within a decade." Six months ago, this same Chinese threat was said by the Johnson administration to mandate location of the Sentinel in the suburbs.

The old Sentinel system, according to the President, could have been interpreted as a first-step toward a "thick" anti-Soviet system. Indeed it could have. But so can the new plan. It is, if anything, even more open-ended: "It will be implemented not according to some fixed, theoretical schedule, but in a manner clearly related to our periodical analysis of the threat." The language is supposed to be a concession to the possibility of arms control but it sounds more like an ABM building permit.

The greatest pessimism seems warranted in the effect the Sentinel plan will have on the possibility of arms control. "It is not provocative," Nixon said of his decision. Yet it is more provocative by far than a decision to build no new missiles at all. And coming one day after Senate ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, the Sentinel decision can hardly be viewed as a consistent approach to arms control.

Through the treaty, we are asking most of the world to forego nuclear weapons entirely. With the Sentinel decision, we are saying that nuclear self-restraint is solely for lesser powers.

The battle on Sentinel funding in Congress will be hard and bitter. President Nixon probably picked up some votes with the presentation of his decision yesterday. He stated his case concisely, but we still believe arguments against Sentinel are more convincing than the arguments for it. The present U.S. nuclear arsenal is more than sufficient for the President to enter arms talks with the Russians from a position of strength. Congress, therefore, should shoot down Sentinel once and for all.

[From Forbes Magazine, Apr. 1, 1969]

FACT AND COMMENT: NIXON'S ABM STANCE

The only encouraging thing about President Nixon's Antibalistic Missile "decision" is his vow to re-examine it every 12 months.

I remember well a few years ago when all the complexions of the Biggies in The Complex grew rosy describing how wonderful the Nike X missile was going to be. It never got done, at a saving of multiple billions of dollars, and if it had, it wouldn't today be worth doodle.

Apparently we can keep up with the ABM art without turning theories into hardware that's obsolete before the concrete gets poured.

THE RAGGED NONDEBATE ON THE ABM

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, discussion and debate should clarify complex issues. Such an issue is the anti-ballistic-missile project. But the discussion and debate

swirling around this project seems to be making less achievable a clear understanding. The project seems engulfed by its proponents and opponents in inconsistencies, overstatements and positions generating more heat than light. At this point in time, it seems to me, the arguments for and the arguments against each merit that old Scot verdict, "Not proved." I insert an article from the Washington Post of April 4, 1969, at this point in my remarks to illustrate my observations, and also an editorial that appeared in today's edition of the Wall Street Journal.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 4, 1969]

THE RAGGED NONDEBATE ON THE ABM

(By Meg Greenfield)

The other day when he was testifying on the ABM before Senator Gore's subcommittee, Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard read a couple of pages of prepared testimony into the record on the "terrifying defects" of the so-called doomsday machine strategy. That is the nuclear strategy which calls for an automatic response on warning of the approach of enemy missiles, so that we (or the Russians) could be counted on to launch a nuclear response to evidence sensed by radar of an attack—partial, total, calculated or accidental.

Whatever potential for deterrence such a willy-nilly strategy would have, its potential for disaster seemed so much greater that it has long since been consigned to the policy junkheap, Herman Kahn himself having helped dispatch it in his 1960 treatise, "On Thermonuclear War." Launch-on-warning (as variations of this strategy are known) has the principal defects of removing whatever control a President may exercise over the military response to an enemy threat of any proportion or any degree of certainty, and it also increases the danger that nuclear war will result from any of the nerve-wracking, confused, fast-moving crises around the world in which we seem all too often to be involved. It is, in short, a form of massive retaliation lacking even the elements of control and restraint with which John Foster Dulles hedged that earlier policy ("by means and at places of our choosing").

The reason Mr. Packard found it appropriate to restate the ancient case against the automatic nuclear response is that—increasingly—it has gained favor with some of those Senators who are leading the fight against the deployment of the ABM, having occasionally been espoused, it would seem, on the spur of the moment by reason of its surface attractions. Thus, in the course of the same hearing, Senator Fulbright himself joined up: "It would seem to me the assurance, the knowledge that these ICBMs, even part of them, would be released immediately without any fiddling around about it, even without asking the computer what to do, they would be very quick on that, it would be the greatest deterrence in the world." The Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee had publicly arrived at this position a few minutes earlier, owing—he said—in part to his discovery in the hearings that our nuclear missiles, once fired could be called off (destroyed). The hearing then went on to other things. There was no evidence that Senator Fulbright had paused to consider either the possibility of technical failure or of an immediate Soviet reaction or any of the other nightmare possibilities that sprang to mind as he transformed this bit of information into a pillar of newly adopted policy. For the moment, anyhow, that was the end of it.

The episode is of importance to the degree that it characterizes what is asked in the current debate, both in the Nation at large

and—more particularly—in Congress. In the weeks that have passed since the President announced his ABM decision in careful language that required elaboration and explanation, the Administration has so far failed to make its case persuasively. Its testimony, especially the oversimple, fright-peddling argumentation of Secretary Laird, has if anything tended to undermine the position originally outlined by the President. But that is only part of it. Another reason the Administration has yet to make its case is that it has not been obliged to do so by the system's opponents, many of whom are as breathtakingly playful and irresponsible in their arguments as Secretary Laird—with the result that the case against the deployment has not been cogently made yet either. It has not been a particularly rewarding or illuminating time for those who had hoped for an informative and even conclusive debate.

There are a number of circumstances which necessarily contribute to the disappointing quality of our recurrent public arguments over nuclear weaponry. One is that those authorized as watchdogs of the military on the Hill have failed spectacularly to exercise the responsibility that goes with their expertise, so that the job of oversight is left—if anywhere—to those legislators whose animosity toward the military and its programs far exceeds their knowledge about either. But nuclear technology and strategy are infinitely complicated matters, requiring more than casual study if Pentagon doctrine is to be challenged seriously. Beyond that there is the simple horror of the subject matter, which quite naturally inspires a frequent desperate sense that it ought not even to be "debated" at all, but rather inveighed against and denounced.

Finally, there is the fact that what advances have been made in the past several years toward gaining at least a modicum of control over our nuclear weapons and toward creating a strategic situation less likely than those of the past to encourage either foolhardy confidence or dangerous panic on the part of either of the great nuclear powers, are easily reducible to surface absurdity and susceptible of being distorted for the sake of seeming to score a telling point. More than one critic of the President's decision in recent days has made great fun of the Administration's desire to protect its "weapons" as distinct from its "people," for example, or has deplored its apparent lack of interest in the protection of our cities—and those arguing back the whole theory of the lesser provocation of maintaining retaliatory or second-strike weapons while leaving the cities "hostage" as an earnest of our disinclination to initiate a nuclear war know exactly what kind of hearing they are likely to get. For some of the more important critics of the ABM have been unable to resist the implication that those they are opposing somehow favor nuclear holocaust (or anyway don't much mind the prospect) or to resist the temptation to convert their own unfamiliarity with the subject at hand into a seeming virtue or to forego the easy, crowd-pleasing joke. That may prove true even when the witness is also a critic, but one who doesn't think along the same lines. Consider a moment in the appearance of Wolfgang Panofsky, the Stanford physicist, who provided perhaps the most cogent testimony against the new deployment plan. Dr. Panofsky argued that neither the present technology of the system nor the amount of intelligence suggesting a new and revised danger from the Soviets justified going ahead with the ABM at the present time. But he did, at the same time, uphold the theory purportedly behind the Nixon Administration's move—namely, the relative merit of trying to create a situation in which neither side felt its capacity to strike back was endangered to the degree that

would encourage it, under threat or pressure, to strike first. Senator Fulbright professed himself confused by this:

"If the assumption is a second strike, well that means you can completely control that without even having a force because if you are not going to strike them and they have only second strike there is never any occasion for a second strike, or is logic completely irrelevant to these scientific matters?" (Laughter)

Laughter may be the operative word: the smirk seems a favored substitute for reason in much of the attack. In the ABM debate, as in most fierce debates that take place in a congressional setting with everyone entitled to equal time, there has been a tendency not just on the part of the proponents but also on the part of the opponents to undermine their own position by an unselective and undisciplined approach to argument.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1969]

THE QUALITY OF THE ABM DEBATE

In principle the current public debate over antiballistic missiles is an altogether healthy development; too many similar decisions have been made in the past without such an airing. In practice, however, the quality of the ABM debate so far has been more on the sick side.

Both the ABM's proponents in the Pentagon and its opponents in the Senate have been playing in different ways on the public's natural fear of nuclear war. Both have been confusing the issues rather than elaborating a cogent strategic posture. Both, if this debate is going to get back on the track, will need to agree on a few fundamentals, and to start crediting the other with such agreement.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird contends, for example, that there's "no question" the Soviet Union is striving for "first-strike" missile capability. That is, the Soviets are calculating and building the number of missiles they need to so utterly destroy the United States it cannot even retaliate. Since it's hard to see any other reason why they would want such a system, the inevitable implication is that the Soviets are some kind of madmen lusting to push the button at their first safe opportunity.

This is far too simple-minded to be at all persuasive; it does not jibe with what has been observed about Soviet behavior since Stalin. For that matter, we doubt that the hawks in the Kremlin even think in such terms as "first strike" or "assured destruction." We suspect that their moving principle is nearer to "the more the better," which of course is plenty frightening enough, but shows a lack of sophistication, not of sanity.

The disturbing thing about Secretary Laird's comments, indeed, is that they suggest the Pentagon's view is none too sophisticated either. President Nixon did far better in his explanation of the decision for a limited ABM deployment. He stressed that this system is intended chiefly to protect our retaliatory capacity, and suggested that therefore it's possible to view it as a stabilizing factor in the arms race. In this view, it maintains and solidifies the strategic balance in which both sides can retaliate, but neither can attack the other without being destroyed in turn.

A massive ABM system with the capacity to defend cities, on the other hand, could prove destabilizing by tending to neutralize the other side's second-strike capability. If we deploy a limited system there will be inevitable pressures to expand it into a thick one. To resist this expensive and possibly dangerous development, the nation will need the clearest possible grip on the rationale for the original deployment. Secretary Laird's scare-talk is hardly reassuring in this regard.

The other side of the debate has been no better. At one point in the Senate hear-

ings, the opponents argued that since an incoming missile gives only about 15 minutes' warning, the ABM's nuclear missiles might have to be fired at the discretion of a relatively junior military officer. After thus establishing that the ABM was dangerous, they proceeded to demonstrate it was also unnecessary. The reason: When we detected an incoming missile strike, we could immediately launch our entire retaliatory force before the enemy warheads struck.

The crux of the opponents' case so far has not been an attempt to understand strategic reality, but the denunciation of war, armaments, nuclear devastation, the military-industrial complex, the arms race and the extinction of mankind. The implication has been that anyone who favors the ABM also favors all these things. In particular, there has been an implication that those who support the ABM automatically oppose arms control agreements with the Soviets.

It has always seemed to us, though, that the Soviets' apparent interest in possible agreements arises precisely from recognition that we will counteract their deployments, and that therefore the arms race involves a lot of expense with no net gain in security. They have already deployed a limited ABM system around Moscow, and the Administration presumably reasons that a credible start on our own system would drive home the point.

One can doubt that an ABM is in any sense essential to such a lesson, or even helpful enough to be worth the expense. The Administration nonetheless does have arms control agreements very much in mind. Starting an ABM system may or may not help negotiations. But as the restrained comments in the Soviet press indicate, there's no substance to the impression that it would automatically preclude them.

With such confusion stemming from both sides, the whole debate needs to reroot itself in some fundamentals. As a start: Our objective is to reach a solid arms control agreement with the Soviet Union. There may be room for debate over what part an ABM might play, but our general strategic posture should be designed to promote the kind of balance in which both sides might find such an agreement possible.

MY AMERICA

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride in a young lady of my district that I take this opportunity to share with the readers of the RECORD an essay which she recently wrote, and for which she won first place.

Gail Kitchens entered "My America" in a contest sponsored by the Elks Lodge No. 847 of Elizabethton, Tenn.—this outstanding work deserves such recognition, and I am happy to make it available:

MY AMERICA

(By Gail Kitchens)

What is my America?
It is a country that is more than land or sea.

One that means so much more to me.
One that is vast and ere so wide,
From beautiful lakes to mountain sides.
My America is yet somehow small and warm.

Protecting each of us from all harm.
It is strong with a battle cry.
It is honest and true, no need to lie.
My America with all of its sparkling streams,

Exists on everyone's hopes and dreams.
My America may not be perfect, yet to me it is the greatest country anywhere. Do you agree?

My America is many things. It is a vast land. It stretches from one ocean to another, covering about 3,628,130 square miles. It is divided into fifty separate states; each very proud of itself, yet each building and strengthening America into the greatest country ever.

This land is among the most fertile of the world. Not only is it fertile for food production, but also in industrial riches. America has more potential wealth in her land than any other nation. Her putting it to better use and using it wisely, keeps her number one.

We are a nation with economic growth. We measure up very well to the world's yardstick. America is opportunity. Still though opportunity knocks quite loud, it is not about to break any doors down. The opportunity is here, but you must be willing to seize it, and use it for all of its potential.

We are a nation with culture. Painters, writers and other artists flourish here, and gently mold America into a calmer, more sophisticated nation.

Though she still likes to work hard and get dirt under her fingernails, she knows how to step back and take her position as queen of the world.

Defense-wise, we are the strongest. No other nation has the power nor the ability we have. We help and protect not only ourselves but smaller nations in need. We give in defense and receive in kindness, for this is the American way.

America is the melting pot of the world. All colors, races, creeds, and religions are found in this huge nation. Though somehow, the color doesn't matter a lot here. We are one kind, Americans, united in like causes. We all search for answers to like problems, the answers are freely shared by all. The rich, the poor, the inbetween all are here together. The difference doesn't mean much. My America was founded because of a difference.

Through our gates pass many foreign people each year. They are given the title of immigrants, but the Americans give them the name of friend. We accept people from any and everywhere. This open arm policy makes friends and friends multiply.

A heritage is much alive in my America. One of which we are aware and proud. The thundering hoofbeats of Paul Revere's horse, and the cry of liberty can still be heard. The blood of the wounded and the smiles of the victors can still be seen. It is a heritage that we have fought hard for and gained. We don't plan on losing it for some while.

America is more. It is a flag which speaks of the wars we've fought to gain our independence. It is an anthem which tells of how we have kept fighting for it. It is a coat of arms which stands for our strong nation. And then, it is a motto which shows that though we are strong, we are still meek in the eyes of God.

More than anything else, America is a hope. A hope of those here and those that wish to be. A hope that is renewed each time we repeat the Pledge of Allegiance. A hope that maybe someday, someday these words that we are saying will be the truth. That we will truly be one nation, indivisible. That we will be a nation in which truth, honesty, and justice rank high. Yes, this is a hope of a perfect nation. A hope of the future, but with a past that makes it worth all we must pay.

My America means so much and has so much from the Statue of Liberty to the redwood forests. It is huge and strong, and still gentle and close. It is the firecrackers on the Fourth of July, Christmas bells ringing. It is children running and laughing freely. It is my America, forever beautiful. May I always live here.

WARTIME HERO, PEACETIME
PRESIDENT

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a tyrant is one who demands respect. A statesman is one who commands respect, but a great man earns respect.

One such man, who earned the respect of all who knew him, was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He was truly one of our country's greatest Americans and the respect that he earned was worldwide, from both his friends and foes alike. He lived his life among the great people of his time and yet, prior to the time of his death when he selected his burial site, he requested that he be laid to rest in the town where he spent his boyhood, Abilene, Kans.

He loved his country, his family, and people from all walks of life, and he never forgot his beginnings as humble as they were.

Much has been written and spoken about the admiration and respect the American people had for General Eisenhower, and this is true because year after year even following his retirement from active public service he was selected in poll after poll as one of the most admired Americans and one of the most respected men throughout the world.

As for me, I feel indeed fortunate to have had the opportunity of not only seeing General Eisenhower, but meeting and talking to him on a number of occasions. I first met the general when I was a second lieutenant with the 90th Infantry Division in England, just prior to the D-day invasion where I served as a courier instructed to deliver certain information to him regarding division deployment in connection with "Overlord," the overall plan for the invasion of Normandy.

I remember him well, although I only saw him two times in May and June of 1944, because many of us who would shortly land in France were deeply concerned about our futures. Despite the great problems and worry that were on his shoulders, he remained cheerful, but most of all humble, courteous, and unusually friendly to me even though I was only a second lieutenant and he was a general charged with winning the largest war in history.

I had seen him several times after that, but my next personal meeting with him was at the White House in 1955 when I was requested to be the Republican nominee for Congress from the old Sixth Congressional District following the death of Dwight Rogers.

Here again, my meeting with President Eisenhower was unusual because he was the President and I the candidate for Congress, and despite the fact that he had the problems of the world confronting him, he spent more than an hour in conversation with me at the White House. I might add that it was one of the most pleasant hours spent in my lifetime.

The fact that he had become President

had not changed him and to me he was the same, quick-smiling "Ike" that he had always been.

The final time I personally saw General Eisenhower was about a year ago and then I had been elected to the U.S. Congress and he was retired with his lovely wife, Mamie, in Gettysburg. A group of us had lunch with him and I was still impressed by his quick wit and charm, but what stood out in my mind was that Ike was still the kind, humble person he had always been.

General Eisenhower had a great influence on many people and in his quiet but firm manner, he instilled confidence in the American people. He gave us the feeling of pride in being part of this great Nation.

His record as a military leader cannot be questioned and his ability to unify our allies into one smoothly run unit during the invasion of Europe will go down as one of the most superb military maneuvers in history. But even while he was noted as commander of the greatest expeditionary forces ever to be assembled, General Eisenhower was respected as a peacemaker.

He was never one to believe in retribution, thus following World War II Europe was nurtured and rebuilt and once again joined in the brotherhood of free nations.

As a military man, he lent his efforts to ending the bloody conflict in Korea and from that time forward, no American boys were killed in battle while he served America as President.

He accepted his share of criticism while President, but I feel much of it was undeserved. A look at his record shows great accomplishment, for instance, the largest roadbuilding program in the history of any nation was inaugurated; he ended inflation; provided medical care for the aged; added two new States to the Union; created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; advocated and built the St. Lawrence Seaway; sought to balance the budget; initiated the American space program; conceived and advocated the need for strong ballistic missiles as a preventive to war; extended social security benefits to an additional 10 million Americans; and worked to contain the spread of communism and to generate good will among our allies.

Some say the Eisenhower years in the White House were boring, but it seems that it is nice to be bored to the extent that during those years there was no civil strife and no militant threats by certain groups to destroy life and property; and disrupt our colleges. There was peace with prosperity and the threat of communism was merely talk for we were militarily strong.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is to me a great and compassionate man, and truly a great American and now we as fellow Americans can best show our respect for him by rededicating ourselves to accepting our responsibilities as Americans as he did.

To do this we must stop being afraid to fight for what is right for our country. We should be proud to get a lump in our throats when we hear the "Star-Spangled Banner" and look to our flag.

We should recognize that appeasement is a step backward into the road of national destruction.

We should accept national pride in relationship to the true greatness of our Nation dedicated to the principles of the golden rule instead of the rule of gold. We should recognize that those who strive to divide us are the enemies of our Nation.

General Eisenhower was a brave American and a good soldier. He made mistakes because he was human, but no one can honestly doubt his dedication to his fellow Americans. It is men like General Eisenhower that gave our country the proud heritage and courage to become the strongest people and the greatest Nation on earth.

To dedicate ourselves to our country as General Eisenhower did will insure our greatness in history.

AIR POLLUTION AMERICA'S "CARBUNCLE"

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I. W. Abel, president of America's steelworkers, and Mayor John B. Nicosia, of East Chicago, Ind., are pioneer fighters for the cause of fresh air.

I submit excerpts from President Abel's and Mayor Nicosia's remarks on anti-air pollution before steelworker delegates from 20 States, made at the National Conference on Air Pollution held in Washington, D.C., 2 weeks ago.

Excerpts from a newspaper account of President Abel's remarks follow:

The industries of America, President Abel told the conference, "must accept a greater responsibility for the public welfare even though it cannot be measured in terms of profits." He declared that since 1951 the steel industry spent just over \$19-million a year on what it termed "non-revenue producing equipment." The public pays for much of this research and development and cost of abatement facilities in the form of tax credits and grants to industry, he added.

Speaking directly to the alleged economic issue often raised by some industry spokesmen, Mr. Abel emphasized that "the enforcement of emission standards will not cause economic ruin or relocation, since they will be based upon technological feasibility." He cautioned USWA members not to be swayed by arguments that say "to have industry and jobs we must have pollution."

Mr. Abel addressed to both industry and state and local government, saying "we refuse to be the buffer between positive pollution control activity by the community and resistance by industry." Quoting Sen. Edmund Muskie, he added that implementation of the Air Quality Act as "a responsibility of state and local government today must not and will not be permitted to mean what it did years ago—a way of effectively killing public action in a problem area."

Underscoring his contention that a wealthy metal mining and manufacturing industry can do more and spend more in air pollution control, conference participants "hit the floor" to relate experiences of emission conditions and health hazards, smelters, open pit and underground mines.

Mayor Nicosia has been devoting his professional experience as a physician to the fight against air pollution for years in the Indiana industrial Calumet region. Excerpts from a newspaper comment on his speech follow:

A case history of concerned community response was related to a luncheon meeting of the conference by Mayor John B. Nicosia of East Chicago, Ind., who was elected to office six years ago on the "clean air" issue in a city long associated with industrial pollution. Dr. Nicosia, a physician who entered politics after witnessing the effects of dirty air in the lungs of his patients, said that Youngstown Sheet & Tube and Inland Steel facilities in East Chicago will have spent \$60-million by 1973 in control devices and implementation. Their response came only after concerted citizen action in the political sector, he said.

WELFARE UNION BOSSES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as taxpayers threaten a tax revolt against the inequities of the income tax laws, welfare recipients are financing a union to lobby against the already overburdened taxpayer.

I include a General Features Corp., article from the Sun-Sentinel of Pompano Beach, Fla., for March 24, as follows:

HIGH-LIVING WELFARE UNION MEN ARE EATING YOUR TAX DOLLARS

Welfare recipients have now formed their own union—the National Welfare Rights Organizations (NWRO). In 45 states, 30,000 families are taking part of their welfare checks to pay dues to this union so they can hire lobbyists in Washington, D.C., to lobby for more something-for-nothing.

As with most such organizations, poor people pay the bills so that the leaders can live mighty comfortably.

Last February, 54 members of the "national co-ordinating committee" for this outfit held a convention in Jackson, Miss. They converged by jet from all sections of the country, to wine, dine and convene at a downtown hotel.

Jackson News Editor James Ward, intrigued by the way 20- and 100-dollar bills were free-flowing around this poor people's gathering, invited himself to interview some of the delegates.

"Do you have any idea what that aged U.S. prime steak you're eating is costing?"

"I don't know and I don't care!"

Not all delegates feasted so conspicuously but hotel records show there was some high-on-the-hog room service delivered to delegates that weekend.

Normally it would be none of our business, yours and mine, how these delegates comport themselves privately—except that you and I are buying those steaks.

We tax ourselves mercilessly in a conscientious effort to help the deserving poor and too frequently they get beans while the undeserving get steak.

NWRO delegates said they had summoned this national convention "to develop strategy for dealing with the Nixon administration."

The convention adopted resolutions demanding a guaranteed annual income.

We have "the right to live," Chairman Johnnie Tillmon said frequently.

The NWRO also voted to boycott Sears stores nationwide "because that chain does not extend credit to welfare recipients."

The NWRO also demanded other fringe benefits, including special clothing, basic household furnishings, and so forth.

"Present welfare assistance is destructive of dignity." They want to make it dignified.

"Instead of forcing welfare recipients to work," the NWRO resolution said, the Nixon administration should guarantee every family \$7,000 a year whether it works or not.

And if that isn't enough to rot your socks, Second Vice Chairman Mrs. Bruce Sanders was asked:

"If all 50 million persons you say are eligible for membership in the NWRO should join, what would your organization do?"

"Then," she said, "you might have to come to us for jobs."

"Welfare is a human right, a social right, a right under law," say these professional parasites.

They say they have a "right" to your money and they demand it.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE: POLITICAL ALBATROSS AROUND AMERICA'S NECK

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a nation is only as strong and viable as its institutions. This is particularly the case in a republic resting upon democratic principles, for only the will of its people and their belief in their Government and institutions maintain the stability of society. Upon such bedrock has our Nation rested.

In our Nation, the Constitution has been both shaper and preserver of these institutions. Its flexibility has allowed us to reshape those institutions in order to reflect the evolution of our Nation and needs of its people. Only in this manner have we survived and grown. Constitutional amendments have been vehicles for constructive change, and constitutional change is what is demanded today if the will of the people is to be adhered to rather than thwarted.

Our formal electoral process has a kink in it at the very end in the form of the electoral college. Long ago the need for reform of this portion of the system was proven, and a call for abolition of the electoral college was sounded. Its replacement would be direct election of the President and Vice President by the people themselves. To delay reform or dilute its pure form in this case would be denying the will of the people, abrogating our responsibility as legislators and abandoning America to vagaries of future events.

Our last national election showed that the will of our people could be thwarted because of this constitutional anachronism. In a period of national frustration the voice of hatred and bigotry appealed to many, spotlighting in the process the danger we face during every national election. For a time George Wallace was a name to conjure and reckon with in every political equation. He could have denied the majority of the American people their choice for na-

tional office, opening up the dark closet of shadowy dealings in return for his favor. We must avoid repetition of this in the future. We can avoid it by passage of a measure providing for direct election of President and Vice President by the people. I have already introduced this measure in the House.

Mr. Nixon has put forth his own electoral reform proposal, which I find wanting and an evasion of our problem. It would not provide for direct election of our national leaders. Nor would it provide a changing, growing, urban-oriented nation the political and institutional change it so overwhelmingly demands. To deny our people this right is to stand like a rock in the middle of the high road to political evolution and avoidance of electoral chaos. Our only real choice is to give power back to the people, where it belongs.

Our Federal principle enshrines the will of the people, finding its supreme expression in their choice of their own leaders. To deny them the fullest form of such a supreme right is to make a mockery of principles this Nation was founded and rests upon. It calls into question the validity and meaning of our system of government in the eyes of an increasingly aware electorate.

America has evolved to the point where the will of its people must be served by passage of simple, basic reform. The Constitution was created in less than 100 working days. Is it beyond the Congress to abolish the electoral college in one session of Congress?

Now is not a time for obfuscation, delay, and weak excuses. Nor is it a time for half measures. We are either going to act, abolish the electoral college and politically emasculate America's George Wallaces, present and future, or we shall continue to trip gaily along the brink of the abyss. A meaningful, succinct amendment has been offered. The people are with us. Delay is inexcusable. Let us act.

A NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL POLICY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee in cosponsoring a bill to set forth a congressional statement of national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study of the appropriate implementation of this policy. This policy simply and directly puts forth that—

The Congress reaffirms as a matter of highest priority the Nation's goal of educational opportunity for all of its citizens. That Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States of America that every citizen is entitled to an education of high quality from appropriate preschool levels through graduate school without financial barriers and limited only by the desire to learn and ability to absorb such education. Our nation's economic, political, and social security demands no less.

It is time to recognize that the education of America's people is an essential national resource which is entitled to the commitment of our national financial resources to its development, growth, and improvement.

It is an especially appropriate time to reaffirm and broaden our commitment to education. These are troubled times for education. We face both actual and threatened elementary and secondary school closings because of lack of funds all across the country. Daily we read about disturbances on our college campuses.

In the face of confusing and threatening student actions it is very tempting to turn against the processes and institutions of education itself. But that to me seems far too simple an answer for those who truly care about the future of this country.

So much emotionalism has been interjected into the education issue that I think it is time that we isolated ourselves from the sensationalism of a few extremist groups and go back to the basics of what education really is. Webster's Dictionary defines education as "the process of training and developing the knowledge, skill, mind, character." If one accepts this definition, then by espousing our support for education we are endorsing special things.

One is the right to knowledge—the right to know. There is a vast store of human knowledge, of accumulated wisdom, that is today inaccessible to millions of American children because they lack an adequate educational system.

Education should also develop skills; yet many of our young people today challenge the relevancy of the skills they are taught, and justly so. Technology is changing so rapidly that if we teach yesterday's honored professions we will be raising a generation unprepared for tomorrow, with nothing to contribute to the future. I remember vividly the demise of the American farmer; and I remember that our educational system was not prepared to foresee that the children of a farm economy had to be trained to meet the job demands of an industrial and urbanized society of the future. Our young people today are in many ways ahead of us for they foresee that the skills they are being taught today will be outmoded tomorrow. If we are to ask of them that they develop skills to become productive workers, we must also assure them that their skills will truly be marketable when they enter the job market. This requires advance planning and most probably a recognition that with the fast pace of technological advances today education does not end once a man begins his life's work but is a continuing process throughout his lifetime.

Another aspect of the educational process should be the development and training of the mind. When teachers successfully awaken a child's mind they are training the child to ask questions. Most parents eagerly await the stage in a young child's life when he begins to ask why—why is the grass green, why do airplanes fly; why can I not fly; and on and on. Youngsters at that age question everything. Yet when the same characteristic in the young child leads

the adolescent to question all the basic premises we accept, it is frightening to many; but it should not be.

Development of a child's mind is a necessary process of growth. If a child's mind is never challenged, he will never have an adult understanding of our society. None of us want that for our children. We want them to think, to apply their minds, to put together their skills and knowledge to make adult decisions in their lives. This they can do only if the educational process has succeeded in developing their character.

Yet the role of education in character development is where our national commitment to education is facing the gravest dangers. If I read the pulse of the Nation correctly, there is an ever-growing feeling that our schools are turning out a generation of young people who have no character at all or whose character is warped beyond our comprehension. We read about students who are not hesitant about the use of violence, who do not respect the right of the majority of students to attend classes even though there is a campus demonstration in progress, who totally disregard another person's right of free speech unless they agree with what he is saying.

The reaction to news stories of campus disturbances indicates the importance we place on the role of character development in education. In response to student demonstrations, taxpayers are refusing to pass bond issues necessary to keep local schools open, State legislatures are cutting education budgets, and Federal aid to education is facing strong opposition.

If it were any aspect of education other than character development that was viewed as being inadequate we would be reacting quite differently. When we were made aware that our educational system was totally failing to open up the accumulated knowledge of the past to millions of disadvantaged children, we responded with mass Federal compensatory education programs. When we discovered that our schools were turning out young people with no skills that would enable them to enter the job market, we responded with manpower training programs and a new emphasis on vocational training. When, with the orbit of sputnik, we were shocked into realization that our educational system was failing to develop the numbers of Americans capable of providing the scientific research that modern technology demanded, we responded with massive aid to scientific education.

Our present educational crisis cuts to the very core of what education is all about. It is essential that we respond to this challenge as we have to earlier challenges. We did not close our schools when we came face to face with failure in our educational system before; we should not do so now.

If we do not let the actions of a few extremists cloud our view I think that we can respond in a constructive way. The average student is only pointing to failures in our educational system that call for correction—not a rejection of the entire educational process. If universities are becoming impersonal multi-

versities, then the solution lies in a more personal and individualized environment for students. If universities are failing to provide equal opportunities for learning to the poor and to minority groups, then the solution is an equalization of access to education. If universities are failing to offer courses that will be relevant once a student enters the job market, then the solution is curriculum revision.

Though we have enacted a number of Federal aid to education programs at the elementary, secondary, and college levels, it is now time for the Congress to make an honest and straightforward affirmation of our recognition of the high priority which must be given to a truly meaningful Federal effort in financing education.

FROM SILENT BLACKMAIL TO OPEN ULTIMATUM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our diplomats and leaders seem undecided over any new policy to achieve peace in South Vietnam.

It is almost as if there is one party missing from the peace table talks in Paris—the most important party—that party being the great majority of American people. For despite repeated efforts by the propagandists to condition the minds of the American people they have rejected anesthetization and over the one route to peace that has never been explored.

Our leaders, as if defeat is an American trait, find offensive any mention of pursuing the war to victory should the North Vietnamese and their Red allies not immediately sit down at the negotiation table. The United States has lost no war—we have never yet allowed our troops to start a war.

Why should the Communists be any more willing to talk peace today than a month ago, a year ago or 5 years ago? Their precedent is experience. The longer they wait, the more concessions they achieve and the more help they receive from the Cong within our country. The Communist's goals are known as are ours—but ours never is victory. A new position on Vietnam is required. Why should not our leaders announce that we are going all out for peace by victory—ordering our military leaders to prepare a military plan for an all-out military victory?

Which plan offers the greater inducement—a no-win policy proven wrong—or a plan for victory to bring Ho to the peace table in earnest.

Our most powerful weapon for peace is an official announcement that we are out to win.

I have just received a position paper from a retired foreign diplomat whose life and liberty, like ours in the United States, depends upon our leadership in the free world. I insert the paper by Mr. Z. A. Rust entitled "From Silent Blackmail to Open Ultimatum" and a news

article from the April 2 Manchester Union Leader in the RECORD, and I commend them to all colleagues who seek a new policy for settling the Vietnam situation.

The material follows:

FROM SILENT BLACKMAIL TO OPEN
ULTIMATUM

(By Z. A. Rust)

"I do not believe a military victory is possible for either side in the Vietnam War", declared Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in a recent Press conference, echoing identical statements from every responsible U.S. past and present authorities, from President Johnson, Secretaries McNamara, Rusk and Clifford to President Nixon, and Secretaries Laird and Rogers.

It would be difficult to cram more perversion of truth in less words and this in a question of such vital importance not only for the United States but also for what is still called the Free World.

The Vietnam War could have been easily won and could still be won by the United States and their allies if, following a classical blue-print, under the protection of all the naval and air forces available in the Pacific area, one would have carried out a massive landing operation just north of the Demilitarized Zone, joining force across North-Vietnam territory with embattled Laos and menaced Thailand, mobilizing also the 600,000 Chang Kai-shek's hardened troops, in case of some funny Mao's move. This military feat, if executed not with the microscope optics of some Harvard professor but with the sweeping vision of a MacArthur, could have given and could give the Civilized World also the opportunity to atone for the deadly sin committed against the Chinese people when 700 millions of them were delivered to the Nameless Beast by a U.S. Administration.

As for the victory of the North-Vietnam enemy, which will be the last battle of the Third World War and the victory of the Communist World, it is not only possible but imminent and unavoidable if a total change does not occur in the way and spirit with which civilian authorities in Washington have conducted this war until now.

It is, to our knowledge, the second time in the history of warfare—the first instance having been Korea—that armies have been sent to fight and die under strict orders not to win the war they were waging, orders given by the same authorities that affirm today that this war cannot be won. It is the second time only in the history of warfare that military activities are operated in the exact terms and in the strict limits dictated by the enemy, and that a long and cruel armed conflict was not honored with the name of war, war for the defense of the Motherland and of human liberty.

It is this well calculated omission which permits the vociferous crowds, the morons, the political noodles and the conspirators at home to give support and comfort to the enemy, leaving the fighting men on the battlefields without defense against their criminal activities. And it is those activities which permit the U.S. civilian authorities to invoke an allegedly irresistible public opposition to the continuation of the Vietnam War in order to prepare the capitulation meant to prove once for all—at the price of 34,000 young lives and 200,000 young men wounded or maimed—that even for such a powerful country as the United States "the risk of intervention against Communism is greater than the risk of nonintervention" . . . to quote the New York Times.

But even this allegation of an irresistible public opinion pressure is a flagrant distortion of truth. The number of patriots is much greater in the United States than that of defeatists, and any willing government

could have found in them a giant adhesion for a victorious war. Despite the fact that every effort has been made to bring things to a point where it would not be possible to distinguish between the impatience of those who have set their heart upon a victory of Ho Chi Minh and the indignation of those who ask for an end to the betrayal of the U.S. fighting forces, the last Gallup investigation shows that 51% of the United States citizens are for victory in the Vietnam War and only 26% are prepared to accept withdrawal at any price. As for the unarticulated 27%, they would have been more vocal, to be sure, if they would have been otherwise informed and educated by their daily newspaper and the responsible authorities.

The following two episodes seem pointedly relevant.—Two years ago a delegation of mothers, wives and sisters of soldiers fighting in Vietnam presented themselves at the White House not for suggesting that their kin be brought home, but for asking that they be permitted to do the job for which it was supposed that they had been sent there. The delegation was not admitted, but detained at the gates while President Johnson was blowing off to safety from the back yard in a helicopter. Recently Mrs. Coretta King accompanied by a clergyman and a rabbi presented herself also at the gates of the White House in order to demand that the boys be brought back, that the Nonproliferation Treaty be promptly ratified, that the antimissile protecting system be not established in the United States, that the sentenced or detained draft-card burners, flag desecrators, and deserters be liberated, that Red China be recognized and, first of all, that a prompt end be put at whatever price to the Vietnam War, an agenda which could have been adopted by any ultimatum bringing Soviet Ambassador. They were received immediately by the second most important personality in the Nixon regime, by Mr. Henry Kissinger, and after a long interview they came out smiling and pleased declaring to the newspapermen who had followed them that they had been listened at "very, very respectfully".

The satisfaction of the defeatist delegation was legitimated enough. The fact is that two of their more important demands have already been satisfied: the Nonproliferation Treaty has been ratified by the United States Senate, depriving thereby the allies of the United States of any real possible defense against Soviet Russia outsized ambitions and "concentrating in the United States hands the dangerous responsibility of nuclear defense, instead of sharing it out among nations which are more directly interested in this defense than the United States themselves", nations which might have formed, if nuclearly armed, the first line of political and military defense of the threatened Free World.

As for the end of the Vietnam War, American people have been officially informed by Secretary Rogers that a program exists the nature of which the State Secretary has hinted transparently enough. The kept and well informed press, which is probably preparing the public opinion to the shock it is about to receive, mentions the following points: 1) withdrawal of 200,000 United States troops before the elections of 1970, 2) some more arm twisting of the Saigon Government to hurl it faster towards an understanding with the Communist enemy, an understanding which will eventually mean its death. Useless to observe that this new policy is in complete contradiction with President Nixon's statements in his opposition years and during his electoral campaign, but in perfect accord with Mr. Henry Kissinger's methods and recommendations as gathered from his books and articles.

Everything seems to have been taken into account, even the possibility of the enemy "launching a massive attack in the midst

of the pulling back—intended to demonstrate that the U.S. have been licked—that could decimate Saigon's troops and inflict heavy casualties upon the remaining U.S. forces." This is a risk, we are told, that the Nixon administration is prepared to accept. "A prestige defeat would be small enough cost to pay," affirms one of the most widely spread and best informed organs of the defeatist press, adding that Mr. Henry Kissinger has been one of the concoctors of this radical program.

Several circumstances, besides Secretary Rogers' intimations, give credit to this surprising announcement:

President Nixon has himself informed the press about the beginning of secret negotiations as a new feature of the Paris Conference, likely to bring favorable results. Secret negotiations have been held all along the Harriman era with far from positive results. The new feature therefore must be in some new and substantial concession which the U.S. is prepared to make besides reciprocal withdrawal, which North Vietnam has rejected with scorn, and besides even unilateral withdrawal which Hanoi is sure to get, thanks to the massively organized pressure of the liberal circles in the U.S.

Wanton and unjust attacks are launched against the Thieu-Ky Government, disarmament reminiscent of those which prepared the betrayal of Chang Kai-shek.

A combined attack has been started in the Congress and the controlled press against the U.S. military, despite the obvious fact that generals, officers and soldiers have done in Vietnam their toilsome and heroic best within the unbelievable limitations imposed by the doctrinaires of the no-win war and of sacrosanct enemy sanctuaries. Attack on the military in wartime are more than often the precursory signs of an accepted defeat.

Defense Secretary Laird has informed the Senate that for motive of economy a curb will be put from June 1st on the bombing operations of the B-52, which he and General Abrams have declared was the most powerful instrument in the breaking of Communist offensives. It would be too horrible to believe that the Nixon administration would, for a few millions of dollars economy, consent to shed uselessly still more young American blood. This loudly proclaimed decision cannot be anything else, therefore, than the beginning of a de-escalation which once started cannot be stopped anymore, as such a beginning will amount to a commitment towards Senate doves, liberal and peacenik groups and Harvard and Yale professors.

The probability of a somewhat camouflaged total surrender, as a result of the Paris public or secret negotiations, resides principally in the fact that those negotiations have been started, in their interminable length, and in the way they have been conducted until now by both the Harriman and Lodge delegations. Rebuffs after rebuffs, insolences after insolences, slaps after slaps have been accepted from the Ho Chi Minh gang, and after each of them the heads of the U.S. delegation or even the responsible members of the U.S. Government have expressed meekly their optimism and registered "some progress," in a way which irresistibly brings to our memory the never to be forgotten Khrushchev's utterance: "You spit in their face and they say it is dew."

Khrushchev knew what he was talking about.

What has been the end of World War II for the Western Powers has been for the Soviet Union—now that their only real enemy has been eliminated—the beginning of the struggle for universal domination heralded by Lenin a quarter of a century before. In this fateful encounter between two irreconcilable

worlds, Soviet Russia had from the beginning proceeded from provocations to provocations, from outrages to outrages, from robberies to robberies, even before the silent nuclear blackmail had given her agents, planted in the Western organism, the pretext and the opportunity to prevent any reaction of the Western Governments except in the circumstances desired and provoked by the Kremlin itself, as in Korea and Vietnam.

All those insolent challenges, all those acts of brigandage have been accepted by the Western World with abject condescension—the Khrushchev dew. And even now, with a Soviet nuclear stronghold in Cuba, with a cruel war in Vietnam staged, fostered and armed by the Kremlin, with Communist adepts and stooges more active than ever in the universities, churches and courts, masters of the streets, and having wormed their way in the most influential positions, the American public, conditioned by a long preparation, is told by every official and press organs that the moment has never been more propitious for a detente and a rapprochement. He is told also that just one friendly gesture towards the Soviet Union just one more sacrifice would bring the Communist World, for good and all, on the side of collaboration, peace and justice.

The new sacrifices which are asked from the United States, after the ratification of the Nonproliferation Treaty, which has deprived their allies in Europe of the only significant modern weapon, are: 1) the abandonment to Communist influence and domination of the United States friends and allies in the Far East, 2) the abandonment of the idea of establishing an efficient anti-missile defense which could be interpreted by Moscow and Peking as an act of provocation.

Isolated and anesthetized, the American people will soon be ripe for the Open Ultimatum which this time will not be presented by Mrs. Coretta King and whose specifications would be still more to the point than those of her benevolent delegation. This ultimatum will not be addressed, as at the moment of the Suez affair, to two bumper states like France and Great Britain but, this time, directly to Washington.

It is a foreigner who is writing these lines, so that it belongs to others to decide if he is wrong or right in firmly believing that an awakening of the American people, the last hope of liberty lost or liberty endangered, is still possible before it discovers, like Gulliver, that although awakened it cannot move, and in believing that the choice is still open to the Nixon administration to be only the winner in the next elections or to be the leadership which saved the United States and the World from Communist slavery.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, Apr. 2, 1969]

MARINE GENERAL TELLS HOW TO WIN VIET WAR

DONG HA, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A U.S. Marine general said yesterday allied troops could win the Vietnam war by attacking Communist bases in Laos and the southern fringes of North Vietnam.

"It makes no sense to watch 400 trucks a day moving through Laos with ammunition to kill Americans," said Maj. Gen. Raymond Davis, commander of the 3rd Marine Division.

"The quickest way to shorten this war is to destroy these sanctuaries," he said.

"I'm not trying to raise the ante. But we came here to assure the freedom of South Vietnam, and I don't think that can be accomplished with anything less than the defeat of the North Vietnamese army."

Davis, 54, leaves Vietnam April 14 to become commandant of Marine Corps schools in Quantico, Va.

In an interview with UPI Tuesday, Davis

said allied forays into Laos and the southern end of North Vietnam would be more effective than a resumption of bombing against North Vietnam because the Communists had learned to live with the air raids.

"We could win the war with the same tactics the enemy uses. We could run across the Laotian border, destroy his supply depots and pull out," Davis said.

"We could grab a chunk of real estate north of the DMZ and tell him that's all we're going to take for now. Pretty soon he's going to get the picture."

Expanding on his advocacy of forays into Communist territory, Davis said: "If you were asked at the war college what tactics to use in Vietnam, and you answered that the enemy should be allowed to operate freely in Laotian and DMZ sanctuaries, you'd flunk the course."

PUBLIC SERVICE INSTITUTIONS MUST REMAIN IMMUNE FROM FISCAL STARVATION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I note with dismay the fact that the Brooklyn Museum and Bedford-Stuyvesant branch of the Brooklyn Children's Museum are facing a proposed budget cut which will limit public access to their facilities. Again Brooklyn is the whipping boy of New York City.

The next budget of the city of New York, according to the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, contains a budget cut for these and other institutions of \$450,000. The Botanical Gardens and Academy of Music are also faced with significant limitation of their public service as a result of the proposed fiscal cutback.

We are advised by the Brooklyn Museum that an adult and child admission fee is a definite possibility, and that the facility faces imposition of a limited schedule, including total closing for a 5-week summer period, when it is so useful. I am further informed that virtually all public services performed by the Brooklyn Museum will have to be eliminated.

Once again we are faced with the spectacle of reversal of social priorities.

A museum complex is confronted with cutbacks, while other areas remain untouched by the budget paring knife. The quality of urban life is faced with further erosion because some gentlemen in the legislature and the mayor of New York City face backward socially rather than forward.

Lives of children will be culturally stunted if the threat becomes reality. Such a possibility is not to be contemplated with equanimity nor suffered in resignation.

I call upon the mayor of New York and the Governor to see to it that such appalling possibilities do not come to pass. If such actions are allowed to become public policy there will be no need to search diligently for the causes of urban decline and growth of social problems.

ELIZABETH AND TED COHEN: A DEDICATED HUMAN RELATIONS TEAM

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the friendship of Elizabeth and Ted Cohen is one of my richest possessions. They stand out as people with deep and positive concerns about their fellow men. As man and wife, they form a team that has brought rich rewards to our community and endeared them as a force for human betterment and growth. It was my great honor to be present at a recent breakfast at which this dedicated team received the coveted "Torch of Liberty Award," presented by the Cardozo Lodge and Chapter Division of the Anti-Defamation League. It was an inspirational moment; a moment to be shared with all. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Mr. Cohen and Colonel Akst from that moving ceremony:

PRESENTATION OF HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD TO THEODORE AND ELIZABETH COHEN BY COL. PAUL AKST, SELECTIVE SERVICE DIRECTOR FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK, MARCH 23, 1969, AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, Congressman Murphy, honored guests on the dais, and our most distinguished audience: I am deeply grateful and proud to have been called upon to assist in the presentation of the Human Relations Award of the Anti-Defamation League to my very dear friends, Elizabeth and Ted Cohen.

It has been my privilege to have known both of them for many long years. Additionally, it also has been my distinct pleasure to have been associated closely with Ted in the Selective Service System. It was only a few short years ago that I prevailed upon him to add to his already busy schedule and become a member of one of our local boards. It was not too long thereafter that, with his typical thorough, commanding, deliberate yet friendly and considerate manner, he was elected chairman of the local board, where he continues to serve to this day, performing in a superior and dedicated manner.

Without the generous, loyal and cheerful help of his lovely Elizabeth, I am sure his step would have slowed, his enthusiasm would have dampened, and I firmly believe his modesty and humility would have disappeared. They perfectly complement each other in a learned, accomplished and scholarly way. It is this capable and efficient team we are honoring here today.

It would be foolhardy—and well-nigh impossible—to honor one without the other. Each standing alone is fully deserving of this award.

The precociousness of Ted, was evidenced early in his native city of Nashville, Tennessee, where at the age of sixteen he served as President of the Junior Congregation of the Vine Street Temple.

Looking for greener pastures and more formidable game, Ted arrived in New York in 1938. Since then he has been actively engaged in many religious, civil, professional and charitable causes. To give you an idea of what he is presently doing would appear to me to be sufficient reason for this award. Today he is President of the Men's Club of Temple Emanu-El; President of the Manhattan-Bronx Regional Brotherhoods. He is a

member of the Executive Board, Metropolitan Conference of Brotherhoods. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods. He is President of the Benjamin Cordozo Lodge of B'nai B'rith. He is on the Foreign Affairs and Civil Rights Committee of the Anti-Defamation League. I have already referred to his dedication and devotion to duty as Chairman of Local Board 14 of the Selective Service System. He is also a member of the Grand Jurors' Association.

In the area of his profession, Ted is President of the Agents Association of Rudow Agency of Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Association of New York. He is a member of the Million Dollar Round Table Club, a member of the Massachusetts Mutual Inner Circle Club, and many more professional clubs too numerous to mention. In addition to being so actively engaged in all the previously named associations, he also lectures on brotherhood, Chautauqua and inter-faith; and in business he lectures and is an author of publications on professional underwriting and estate planning and insurance.

It is therefore any wonder that we should honor this morning a couple with such vast background, who have given of themselves repeatedly over the last thirty years to their Nation, their family, and their God. In honoring them we honor ourselves; we also honor their children and four grandchildren: David and Nancy Hollender, and Barry and Steven Anton. It is therefore with great pleasure and also with great humility that I present the Human Relations Award to my dear and deserving friends, Elizabeth and Ted Cohen.

With your kind permission I would like to read the inscription on the plaque: "To Elizabeth and Ted Cohen in recognition and appreciation of distinguished service and inspiring leadership in preserving liberty, counteracting bigotry and advancing the cause of human rights, dignity and human opportunity."

THEODORE COHEN'S SPEECH, MARCH 23, 1969

My dear friend, Col. Paul Akst, honored guests on the dais, members of the Cardozo Lodge and Chapter and dear Friends.

I must confess that this is an overwhelming and emotional moment in the lives of both my beloved wife and I since it is very much like being privileged during your lifetime to listen to a eulogy which is not often the privilege of but few men.

If you wonder why my wife would not say a few words, I should like to tell you that we have a pact between us. When we are in public, I do the talking and she listens. When we are at home, however, she does the talking and I am forced to listen.

I am truly emotionally moved when I sit and listen to so great a man, so fine a statesman and so dear a friend as our honored Mayor John V. Lindsay refer to me as a man who cares. And I look at the magnificent compliment of the Honorable John Murphy, sitting here on the dais, no less a personage than our distinguished United States Congressman, whom I am also privileged to call "dear friend." And when a man with whom I have enjoyed such a long and close friendship as Col. Paul Akst comes to pay honor to my wife and me it is only from the depth of my heart that I can express our humble gratitude and complete humility on this occasion.

As I hear these great national figures refer to my early life in Nashville, Tenn., I sat this morning and in complete nostalgia recalled my early beginnings. When I was 12 years old my ambition was to be 6 feet tall, to have black curly hair, to be good looking and to have a magnificent athletic physique. I need not tell you that by the time I was 14 my dear mother, may she rest in peace, was taking me to the doctors to find out if I would

ever outgrow the proportions of a midget. When I was 15, I need only look in a mirror and with full and complete honesty realized I would never be good looking. When I was 19 I was as bald of pate as you now see me. Shortly thereafter I endured a long and painful illness which wrecked any chance I might ever have had to develop a physique of better than average proportions. I must say that I realized very early in my life that I had to change my scale of values and recognize that while you need not suffer to have character certainly one cannot suffer and not find that it builds character.

When I sat and listened this morning to the previous speakers, my mind went back to the day some 30 years ago when I arrived in New York truly a country boy who walked from 35th Street and Fifth Avenue, up the avenue to 60th Street, in seersucker slacks and tennis sneakers, frightened, unsure and feeling like a sand-lot ballplayer coming to the major leagues. To realize now that the Mayor of our great City and a Congressman of our State and a Colonel at the Head of our Selective Service System together with our many friends have gathered with my family, children and grandchildren whom I love dearly, to honor my angel and me, I am overwhelmed.

I heard a sermon delivered by my dear and beloved Rabbi Nathan D. Perilman, Temple Emanu-El of New York, who is my friend and spiritual leader and counselor—a sermon which was entitled "The Beauty of Pain." Being a very regular attendant at our religious services, my curiosity was piqued by any subject which could indicate even by implication that pain could be construed as beautiful. Do you know that I learned one of my great lessons in life when I heard the context in which Rabbi Perilman related pain to beauty? He told how, if there was no pain and we had an itch in our eye, the constant rubbing without the reflection of discomfort could result in our completely rubbing out our eyeball. He told how if there was no sense of pain, one might place their hand over a gas stove light and completely burn a finger or a hand from the body because there would be no sense of pain.

And I now confess to you and admit, dear friends, that in effect I had learned through the early physical pain of my life that there was beauty in my suffering. There was a most definite enrichment of my life as a spiritual outgrowth of the disappointments to which I alluded earlier in my remarks.

I found that there would be no monuments built to me in concrete in Columbus Circle or elsewhere because I expected to discover nothing in my lifetime. I did not and do not expect to accumulate the wealth necessary to be memorialized by a foundation such as a Rockefeller, a Mellon or a Ford. But make no mistake about it—I do hope that my monument will live in the hearts of each and every fellow man whom I can touch and help along life's path.

And for that reason, I have dedicated much of my life to organization work and to doing things that I felt would make this a better world in which to live. Yes, I have and think we should all, respect the past, honor those who have gone before us and prepared the world for our lives and lifetime. Yes, I have tried to strengthen the present and make it a better place for us to live while we are on this earth but above everything else I have tried to resod the soil for the future. I have tried to replace for future generations all of the material gain and spiritual values that I have found and enjoyed as enriching to my life.

I might say that my philosophy through life is best expressed by a poem that only recently came my way. I do not know the author as its source was anonymous when I received it. But it reads like this:

"It matters little where I was born,
Or if my parents were rich or poor;
Whether they shrank at the cold world's
scorn,
Or walked in the pride of wealth secure.
But whether I live an honest man,
And hold my integrity firm in my clutch,
I tell you, brother, as plain as I can,
That matters much.

"It matters little how long I stay
In a world of sorrow, sin and care;
Whether in youth I am called away,
Or live till my bones and pate are bare.
But whether I do the best I can
To soften the weight of adversity's touch
On the fading cheek of my fellow man
That matters much.

"It matters little where be my grave,
Or on the land or in the sea,
By purling brook or 'neath stormy wave,
It matters little or naught to me.
But whether the Angel from on High comes
down
And marks my brow with his loving touch
As one that shall wear the victor's crown,
That matters much."

And as I look out and see our many friends gathered around us, I am reminded of another little poem that recently came across my desk. It describes friends and I would like to share it with you:

"Friends are people who think of others more
than themselves . . .
Who uplift, encourage, praise and criticize
with loving honesty . . .
Friends are people who know the worth of
silence . . .
And of having a talent for listening . . .
Who accept without trying to reform and
understand with their hearts . . .
Friends are living examples of the Golden
Rule and are strengthened by giving . . .
Friends are life's greatest treasures, found
by only the most fortunate . . ."

I feel that way about you, my friends, and may I close by giving you my favorite toast:
"May the road rise to meet you. May the wind be always at your back. May the sun shine warm upon your face, the rain fall soft upon your fields and, until we meet again, may God hold you in the palm of His hand."

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM'S EXCELLENT SERIES:
"WHAT ARE WE DOING TO OUR WORLD?"

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia Broadcasting System has earned the highest praise of the Nation for its recent two-part series entitled, "What Are We Doing to Our World?"

Isaac Kleinerman, producer of "The 21st Century," and Walter Cronkite, who brilliantly edited and narrated the series, have not only asked some extremely pointed questions about man's impact on his environment, but have taken the trouble to answer a few of those questions with bone-chilling facts.

As they eloquently stated, man has used and abused the resources of the earth and its atmosphere with little or no thought to the intricate balance among microscopic systems that make it

possible for life as we know it to exist on this planet. Despite the marvels of our technology and our headlong rush into the future, we cannot dispense with or disregard the controls which stabilize our environment. We need oxygen, clean water, food, and minerals.

Man is a thinking animal, but nonetheless dependent entirely on the ecological balance of his planet to sustain him. All the forms of life over which man has become master are similarly interrelated and dependent on one another in varying degrees.

As CBS graphically illustrates in these programs, we have already gone too far in polluting and killing substantial segments of our environment. The point is inescapable that before proceeding further, we must give equal consideration to the side effects and aftereffects resulting from any future tampering with our world.

I congratulate the Columbia Broadcasting System, Mr. Kleinerman, and Mr. Cronkite for giving both time and attention to a calamity which literally perils every living organism on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, the scripts of these remarkable, awesome, and thought-provoking programs follow:

WHAT ARE WE DOING TO OUR WORLD?—PART I (An episode in "The 21st Century" as broadcast over the CBS Television Network, Sunday, March 16, 1969)

Executive producer: Burton Benjamin.
Producer: Isaac Kleinerman.
Writer: Tom Shachtman.

CRONKITE. To many observers the 21st Century offers promises of a bright future, with great technological progress. But this not-so-far-off future may be as perilous as it is promising. Today, we focus on some of the problems that face our civilization, problems that could mean the eventual destruction of our natural environment. (BEAT) Our land and water are in danger. Our air is in danger. And there are other perils. In this two-part program, we will examine the question: *what are we doing to our world?* Here is what an expert in the field of environmental change has to say.

DR. BARRY COMMONER. We're filling up the world with smog, and asbestos, and radioactivity, and pollutants. We are going to have to choose, between the benefits of technological progress, and the necessity to maintain the integrity of the environment. And I think that until we realize that that choice is there, and that we are the only ones who can make it, there is a serious danger that we will go on the way we have been, and destroy the surface of this Earth as a proper place for people to live.

CRONKITE. Our earth is an island of life in the universe, a place of opulence, complexity, and grandeur beyond imagination. This is the way we wish it could stay—unspoiled, its natural wonders majestic in their beauty. But this cannot be. There are people on this earth. People who need room to live, food to eat, natural resources to build a civilization, industries to produce goods. The problem is that the consummate loveliness of the earth can be spoiled by civilization's demands. The environment itself has become a battleground. We need to make use of natural resources to feed, clothe, and shelter people. But in doing this, we may endanger our physical survival. Why? Because man depends on the delicate balances in the environment for air, food and water in order to live. And in some instances man is heedlessly altering these vital balances. One alteration that has already started is what

scientists call "The Greenhouse Effect." A greenhouse lets sunlight in, producing heat. The rising heat is trapped by the glass so that the greenhouse stays warm, even in winter. Carbon dioxide, CO₂, acts like a greenhouse to keep the earth warm. Air pollution gives us more CO₂ and more clouds. Some scientists believe that the CO₂ might trap more heat and raise the earth's temperature, melting the polar icecaps.

Others say that pollution clouds could bounce the sun's heat off and cool the earth. Then we'd get another Ice Age. No one knows for sure what the so-called "greenhouse" will do. The Apollo 8 astronauts saw the earth this way—the size of a quarter, Frank Borman said—and they realized that all mankind are riders in the sky—passengers on a great, revolving planet.

What is happening to our world is directly related to "too many passengers." Before there were too many people, it did not seem to matter if we used up the environment. The earth is rich in natural resources. We could use up a spot and move on. No longer. By the 21st Century, six billion people may inhabit the earth, twice as many as we have today—and most of them will live in cities. More people mean more cities and bigger cities . . . an expanding technology using up the environment and producing mountains of garbage. Fifteen hundred pounds of it per person each year. And from this garbage 142 million tons of solid pollutants rising into the air each year. Also, factories, furnaces, industrial plants, machines, machines, and more machines—all burn things. Since 1900, the carbon dioxide level has risen fifteen percent, and may rise another fifteen percent before the 21st Century.

This adds to the roof we are slowly but surely building on top of our world. In this country a baby is born every nine seconds and a car every five seconds. America has 200 million people and nearly 100 million cars and trucks. Jams in the cities, jams on the roads, jams at the airports, jams in the skies.

Jet aircraft today fly seven miles up, and pour some 300 million tons of carbon dioxide into the air annually. Tomorrow's planes, like the supersonic Concorde, will fly twice as high. SSTs will pour even more carbon dioxide into the air and leave more pollution particles behind. Could the contrails from supersonic transports bring disastrous weather changes? Meteorologist Dr. Vincent Schaefer.

DR. VINCENT SCHAEFER. When you have a thousand jet airplanes of the type that are being planned, and the kind that Russia has recently flown, then you have a very serious problem, because the effluence from the exhaust, and I'm not talking about just moisture, I'm talking about the combustion products, are going into a region of the atmosphere—the Stratosphere, that is extremely stable. The air is warmer up there, than at what we call the Tropopause. Now, whenever you have warm air above cold air, you have an inversion. And we all know that inversions are extremely stable. That's why we have air pollution problems down near the cities, because they're capped by inversion. So that when you put impurities into the higher atmosphere, you not only are putting them in a very stable region, but a region that we know has very slow transport of particles. So, if you have 1000 airplanes flying around the globe, most of the time which is what they'll have to do to be economically feasible, then, after a few years, I'm very much afraid that we're going to find a level of "build-up" of pollution that we can't tolerate.

CRONKITE. In addition to problems in the skies, we may have serious ones on the land. Experts believe that Western Civilization always has acted as though the environment existed solely for its own benefit. They also point out that the central dogma of our

technological society is the importance of continuous growth. But unrestricted growth may have serious consequences. We eat away two acres of countryside in the United States every minute, more than a million acres a year. We take undeveloped land that produces oxygen and in its place create thousands of miles of roads and highways for our machines. Scientists warn that our society has not stopped to realize a basic fact of life about our environment: that all living things—plants, animals, microbes—are linked together in what is known as the "oxygen cycle".

Green plants give off oxygen to the atmosphere. Animals—including man—must take in oxygen to live.

We use it not only for breathing, but also to burn things. Automobile engines, factories, industrial processes, all burn oxygen. And they give off carbon dioxide, just as we do when we exhale. Carbon dioxide is vital to plant life. Plants need it to carry on photosynthesis and live. Only thirty percent of the oxygen we need is produced by land plants. Seventy percent of the earth's oxygen is produced by microscopic water plants and bacteria. Dr. Lamont Cole, an ecologist at Cornell University.

DR. LAMONT COLE. Most people don't realize that we're absolutely dependent for survival on a number of types of bacteria, living in the soil and in the water. And yet we throw these pollutants around without ever testing them for their effects on these organisms. If we should have the bad luck to throw out some chemical that is toxic to the bacteria that are responsible for keeping nitrogen in the atmosphere, or for replenishing the oxygen in the atmosphere, then we could render the Earth uninhabitable. The frightening thing is that we don't even test for the possibility that something like this might be happening.

CRONKITE. These are diatoms, microscopic plants found in the ocean. Through photosynthesis, they take in sunlight and carbon dioxide, and produce oxygen. Since we are destroying the green plants on land, we are more dependent on these ocean creatures to provide much of the air we need to breathe. Yet we are dumping half a million pollutants into the ocean each year, some of which kill diatoms. Others may only alter the diatom's ability to make oxygen. Either way, they could endanger our oxygen supply.

It might take only an accident or two. This is the Torrey Canyon, an oil tanker which broke up in the English Channel in 1968 and leaked 90,000 tons of crude oil into the sea. New tankers are three times its size.

Suppose one of them had an accident while carrying—not oil, but herbicides to Vietnam? Such an accident could kill off diatoms, scientists say, with disastrous effects. Off Santa Barbara, California, another accident. An underground oil deposit being tapped sprung a leak, and left an oil slick a hundred miles wide and a thousand miles long. There was damage to beaches, and to the off-shore fish and birds. Clean-up and claims may total more than a billion dollars. But a far greater potential danger than to birds or beaches exists here. Oil-soaked diatoms could die in large numbers and this could affect the oxygen level in frequently smoggy Los Angeles. Pollution in the ocean reaches the far corners of the world. Penguins in the Antarctic have DDT in their fat. It comes from sprays like this, thousands of miles away. A million metric tons of DDT have been used since World War II for killing bugs and controlling disease. Sometimes DDT affects birds and fish as well. These birds are dying because of DDT from a tree-spraying program. Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis.

DR. BARRY COMMONER. If we use a chemical insecticide to protect elm trees from the bark beetle—one can preserve the shade of the elm in that way. But at the same time, since

this is, after all, a killing chemical, it can get into birds, and kill birds. And so when you use an insecticide like DDT, on the one hand you may help preserve the shade of the elm tree, on the other hand, you may be diminishing the song of the robin. Now, the point I want to make is—that there is no scientific way to judge the relative value of the shade of an elm tree, or a robin's song. It's an ethical question, an aesthetic question, a moral question. This same kind of a problem faces us everywhere as the result of the intrusion of modern technology on the environment.

CRONKITE. Samuel Rotrosen of the National Agricultural Chemical Association, speaking for the DDT manufacturers.

Why does DDT have a bad reputation these days?

SAMUEL ROTROSEN. I think the chief reason is the attacks by the ornithologists who are concerned with decreasing populations among fish-eating and other birds of prey. Many of them rare birds, that very few of us see, birds like the Bermuda Petrel, the California Pelican, Peregrine Falcons.

There's no question, some robins have been killed; some fish have been killed by one of our spraying programs. Particularly these forest spraying programs. But despite the occasional accidental deaths from misuse, there are more fish today, more birds being reported. When you look at the benefits that DDT has brought. It has saved lives, it has made—it has wiped out epidemic diseases in large parts of the world. I think you've got to weigh this against the possible danger to birds, which may not in fact be disappearing.

CRONKITE. The controversy continues to rage. DDT is currently on trial in the State of Wisconsin where a citizens' group, the Environmental Defense Fund, charges it is a dangerous pollutant. Pesticides like DDT which leak steadily into our oceans also could kill diatoms and compound air pollution problems and air pollution already is a serious concern. This 1953 London inversion held pollution near the ground and killed several hundred pigeons. Thanksgiving week-end 1966, the New York City death rate rose ten percent because of pollution. Some scientists believe we are going to have more of these crises—and worse ones—in the years ahead.

Technological progress often brings technological problems. The automobile is but one example. Dr. Barry Commoner.

DR. BARRY COMMONER. The automobile could be regarded as a nearly perfect technological object. Up until the point that you turn the key on, and start driving it. Then it becomes what? It becomes an agent for causing lung cancer, as a result of asbestos coming off the brake linings, it becomes an agent for producing smog, it becomes an agent which is harmful by way of its intrusion in the environment. The same thing is true of a nuclear reactor. You know an exquisite technological accomplishment. But when you turn it on, it puts radiation into the environment. We are very good with our technology, up until the point when we start running the machines.

CRONKITE. A hundred nuclear power plants are being planned in the United States. Plants that will emit some radiation and can have accidents. Since 1949 there have been ten serious reactor accidents in the United States. But a more immediate problem may be atomic waste, the nuclear garbage that accumulates at these plants, the question is what to do with it. Today much of it is buried in the ground. If there were an accident, concentrated wastes could endanger human life. Not all scientists are convinced that our storage facilities are safe. British science writer Lord Ritchie Calder.

LORD RITCHIE CALDER. There always will be this fear, particularly in terms of fission energy, that this vast accumulation of waste, radioactive waste—we won't know what to

do with it. This is of course, one of the biggest problems we've got is the disposal of waste and it is said that the Hanford Graveyard in Washington State has cost more in the last twenty years to bury the live atoms than it cost to bury all the kings of Egypt in the pyramids and it's going to go on mounting in these proportions. I shudder to think what would happen with these great boiling kilns of radioactive waste at Hanford if it was affected by an earthquake.

DR. GLENN SEABORG. I think this is pretty unlikely of course. Hanford happens to be a site where earthquakes are almost unknown. However, I do believe that the wastes are in a situation there where they could resist an earthquake. So that I don't believe we have anything to worry about there.

CRONKITE. You don't have any concern then about the waste problem?

DR. GLENN SEABORG. No, I think that this is a problem that we had been planning for from the beginning. The radioactivity remains in the nuclear fuel elements, and these remain intact at the site of the nuclear power plants and are shipped off to central chemical reprocessing stations. Then after the chemical reprocessing, the radioactive by-products are stored in storage tanks and in other repositories of a type that we are developing in such a manner that they will be completely safe.

CRONKITE. One new method the Atomic Energy Commission is developing to get rid of the future wastes is "hydraulic fracturing." Liquid wastes are mixed with cement and pumped down hundreds of feet into bedrock and shale to harden in layers. The AEC maintains that earthquakes will not disturb the layers. Almost permanent storage is needed for solid wastes that will be kept in underground salt caves like this one. These wastes will remain radioactive for more than a thousand years. Another problem with nuclear plants that is receiving much attention today is thermal pollution. Thermal pollution is not dumping waste in water, but dumping heat in water.

Nuclear plants use tremendous amounts of water to make electricity. This water is then returned to rivers and bays, and it is 14 to 25 degrees hotter than when it was taken in. Some new plants may heat as much as a billion gallons of water per day. This one on Biscayne Bay near Miami, now being built, is under fire as a potential culprit. What will be the outpouring of heat into the bay do? Scientists maintain that thermal pollution can kill fish and plants, and spur the growth of algae.

Algae take most of the oxygen out of the water and make it unfit to drink. By 1980, they estimate that one-sixth of the water flow in this country may be needed to cool nuclear plants. One power plant may use half the flow of the Connecticut River. A hundred nuclear power plants will be built by the turn of the century and no one really knows what effect they will have.

The Atomic Energy Commission points out that today's conventional plants which burn fossil fuel also heat up water. Nuclear plants use more water—cause more "thermal pollution." The AEC believes technology will find ways to ease the problem and make nuclear plants no worse than fossil fuel plants. One way would be to build cooling towers and let the excess heat go into the air. But this would cost more money and might create changes in the atmosphere as well. Three controversial nuclear plants are being built along the Hudson River to serve New York City's ever-increasing need for electrical power. But they will throw two million gallons of hot water into the river every minute. Thermal pollution, like the "greenhouse effect," the oxygen crisis, and nuclear wastes, is an ever-increasing problem. As civilization grows, these problems will become larger and more dangerous. Where will it all end?

There are scientists who believe that these

problems could eventually lead to the destruction of many of our most precious natural resources.

This is Lake Erie, which has been described as the world's largest cesspool. Its 10,000 square miles of water are, for most purposes, dead. Thoroughly polluted. Biologically inert. Eighty percent of its beaches are unsafe for swimming. Two-thirds of the streams feeding the lake have water unfit for human use. Fishing in the lake has declined from a major industry to a handful of small boats. The fishlife has been pushed out by the uncontrolled growth of algae, which feeds on wastes. Sewage, industrial wastes, silt, hot water—the cumulative effect has aged the lake, experts say, a million years in the past fifty years. Who is responsible? Dr. Herbert Borman, Yale University.

DR. HERBERT BORMAN. We, as individuals, do make a very major contribution to our environment crisis. We see pollution all around us. And it's—I think it's the general tendency of many of us to look about us for victims. It's easy to castigate the industrialist, pouring smoke into the air, pollution into the river. Or, to find some bureaucrat, who's making improper decisions and adding to it. And to look outward. But my feeling is that perhaps we ought to look more inward, and that to recognize the fact that all of us have a part in this.

CRONKITE. To clear up Lake Erie could cost as much as fifteen billion dollars, almost as much as the man-in-space program. To treat our wastes adequately in this country could cost us fifteen billion dollars annually, ten times more than we now spend. More than a hundred years ago, Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "The end of the human race will be that it will eventually die of civilization." Today, contemplating this vast dumping ground, this dying natural resource, Emerson's words are being echoed by many scientists. They are sounding a solemn warning. We do not know, they say, all the consequences of what we are doing to our world. But we must find out, because technology is altering our environment radically, on a grand scale. For many years into the future, man must continue to live on this earth. If he continues to act heedlessly, the future will be dangerous for our children, and they are the ones who will inherit this earth.

Next week, the 21st Century presents part two of *What are we doing to our world?* Pollution is not the only threat to life. New technologies can produce sweeping changes on our planet. Will the Everglades be wiped out? Will sea-level canals mix oceans with drastic effects on the balance of life? Next week, *"What Are We Doing To Our World, Part 2."* This is Walter Cronkite reporting.

WHAT ARE WE DOING TO OUR WORLD?—PART II (An episode in "The 21st Century," as broadcast over the CBS Television Network, Sunday, March 23, 1969)

Executive producer: Burton Benjamin.
Producer: Isaac Kleinerman.
Writer: Fred Warshofsky.

CRONKITE. Pollution appears to be a part of the American way of life. A growing population utilizing a technology that satisfies not only our needs but our whims, pollutes our environment. There is scarcely a major city in the world that is not affected by air pollution, water pollution, and other poisons that we spew into our environment.

What was once merely a minor problem, a question of discomfort, has become a health hazard and is now becoming a threat to life itself. What was once a question of conservation is now becoming a question of survival.

We have reached a time when man the builder threatens to become man the destroyer. Too often, in engineering the globe to suit our own demands, the effects on soil, air, and ocean are totally unforeseen. In an age where global engineering is a reality, men

must ask, "What Are We Doing To Our World?"

"Water, soil, and the earth's green mantle of plants make up the world that supports the animal life of the earth." So wrote Rachel Carson.

Ecology is the study of this complex, exquisitely intertwined network that makes life possible. In these New Hampshire mountains, one such network, called an ecosystem, is being studied. The Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest is a natural laboratory where ecologists seek to learn the effects of man's technology on but one strand of the delicate web that links each part of the environment to the other.

Every drop of water that enters Hubbard Brook Forest is measured. Rain that passes through the tree canopy, that reaches the soil and enters the streams is all recorded by special instruments. The ecologists now know just how much water flows over the many watersheds in this ecosystem and into the streams.

But what happens to an ecosystem when man intervenes, when he logs a forest or cuts a road through its trees, or denudes it completely for a housing development?

To find out, this watershed at Hubbard Brook was leveled. Without trees to take up rain and ground water, and hold the top soil, the amount of water that rushed to the streams increased. That was expected, but other effects were not.

Many of the soil nutrients, such as nitrates that nourished the trees and underbrush, were swept away by the water. The final result was that the entire balance of the system was altered. One of the directors of the Hubbard Brook Experiment, Dr. Eugene Likens of Dartmouth College.

Dr. EUGENE LIKENS. The drainage water from this cut over watershed, looks to be as pure as the water from any of the other water sheds in the system here at Hubbard Brook. It's clear, it's cold, it looks to be pure, but it's not. The nitrate concentrations in this water are at a dangerous level, at least for human consumption, according to published standards. The broad scale studies at the ecosystem level, must be done before we understand how these things interact, and what happens when you add a pesticide, when you add radio-activity, when you add a toxic poison of some sort. How is man going to be affected? We really don't know. Our answers are very meager at this point.

Dr. BORMAN. I think that one of our problems is that we're taught in school to think in a certain way, and it isn't a holistic way. We're not taught to think about society in a total way. Where we understand how things interact, the one with the other. And this is what leads us to many of our environmental problems. We have engineers drawing straight lines on maps, because this is the easiest and the most convenient way to build a road. The cheapest way. But they don't consider what that road may do, to sociological relationships or ecological relationships. And in sum total, although they may build a cheap and fast road, they may upset the environment and create many difficulties. You know, many of us have the view that we have to fight nature, that we have to overcome it. It's an opponent that we have to conquer. I think this is what gets us into much of our trouble. What we have to do, is to understand Nature, to find out how it works, the intimate details of how Nature proceeds. And once we have that understanding, then we have to work with it. We have to gently "nudge" it along the proper courses to achieve the ends we want. In this way, we can maintain our environment, and still maintain ourselves.

CRONKITE. In some cases, the environment is not being nudged, it is being dislocated. These are the Everglades, in reality, a huge river as much as 70 miles wide in places, flowing through the flatlands of south central Florida. They are a vast marshland, filled with

some of the most exotic and unique forms of animal and plant life in the world.

Here, saw grass and cypress trees, alligators, fresh water shrimp, wood storks and otters, have lived together in superb balance for thousands of years. Now they are threatened with extinction because the Everglades are threatened.

The glades have suffered four years of drought, and now face strangulation from flood control locks, such as these along the Tamiami Trail, which divert the waters so desperately needed. Water is the life blood of the Everglades. It comes, in the main, from the flood waters of Lake Okeechobee. Every summer for 10,000 years, a torrent of rain would fall on Okeechobee and the overflow would spill South, and nourish the vast stretches of the Everglades.

Now the burgeoning population in nearby Miami, industrial demands, and agricultural needs clamor for water that once only fed the Everglades. Marshes and wetlands that were once flooded nine months of the year now are covered for less than five months.

As the waters recede, the land is uncovered and dries out. The felt-like floor of the marshland composed of billions of microscopic animals and lacy filaments of algae dies, and a choking underbrush replaces it, blocking the water holes that are the habitat of the alligator.

The waters of the Everglades attract migrating birds from as far north as the Arctic Circle. Here they feed and spend the winter, waiting for spring so they can return north to lay their eggs and perpetuate their life cycle. But as the Everglades dry up, the fish and shrimp that live in the water cannot survive. Without them, the birds' chief source of food is gone. An entire cycle of life, that reaches from the far north to the southern United States, is threatened.

The character of the wildlife in the glades already has begun to change. Land predators, such as snakes, rats and raccoons are increasing. They are replacing the alligators and other aquatic animals that are unique to this region.

Because the seaward flow of fresh water has been halted, salt water from the Gulf of Mexico sweeps inland across the lower end of the Everglades with every tide. Vast fields of saw grass, that grow here and in the West Indies and nowhere else in the world, are being wiped out by the salt water.

As the fresh waters recede, they pool and puddle, trapping fish. Birds glut themselves on the easy prey and soon hunter and hunted will vanish, for the fish cannot escape to bear their young and replenish their numbers. Without fish to eat, the birds will soon disappear.

CRONKITE. Secretary of the Interior Hickel and Governor Kirk of Florida have made arrangements which should insure an adequate water supply for the Everglades, to halt further deterioration. But another danger still remains. North of the Everglades, construction has begun on a gigantic ribbon of concrete, the largest jetport in the world. Also planned is a new city that eventually will house one million people near the airport. Neither project has yet included any plans to protect the Everglades. Planes and people will emit noise and pollutants. Pollution will seep into the water, and then into the Everglades, possibly completing the destruction of that intricate ecosystem.

As man's technical skills blossom, so do his ambitions. This is the Aswan High Dam, once a cold war prize that the United States left to the Soviet Union. Russian money and technical aid has built Aswan, the largest dam in the world. The idea of the dam is to hold back the flood waters of this river that has meant life for Egypt throughout her history.

The floods were unpredictable and watered only a narrow strip of land along each bank.

The new dam was designed to bring year-round irrigation to new areas of land, and also produce electricity. This it has done, but it also has produced other effects that were totally unforeseen. With an end to the natural floods, the mineral nutrients that were formerly deposited on the land, and the minute plant life that was carried into the Mediterranean to nourish the fish, now collect in a reservoir above the dam—totally unusable.

The loss of nutrients may starve the fish population of the eastern Mediterranean, and thus destroy a great food source for the people of the area. On land, the lack of nutrients plus other effects actually may reduce the land's ability to grow food. The lessons of Aswan may prove to be among the most expensive in history, for here we can see that large-scale engineering and agricultural projects can and do have effects that may be unforeseen and dangerous in the extreme.

Much of our technology is devoted to increasing food production. One of the chief means of doing this is with chemical fertilizers. Yet these fertilizers, like drugs, can have dangerous side effects. Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis:

Dr. BARRY COMMONER. In the last 20 years, we have used increasing amounts of nitrogen fertilizer in the United States in order to increase our food production. But we've been doing it in a soil situation which doesn't operate efficiently. As a result, probably a third, at least, of the fertilizer that we put on our soil—nitrogen fertilizer doesn't remain in the soil, or get into the crop. It runs off into rivers and lakes. And there, it becomes a pollutant. The reason is that it fertilizes the growth of algae, and the result is, that by using fertilizer on the land, we help asphyxiate the biological systems in the water. This is a network, a cycle, this is typical of a biological cycle, that we talk about so much. By stressing it too hard, by putting in too much fertilizer, the algae grow heavily, producing a lot of organic matter. The bacteria faced with that amount of organic matter use up all the oxygen and asphyxiate themselves. And the whole cycle breaks down.

CRONKITE. Can there really be too much of a good thing where food is concerned? Is it possible to overfarm, to turn fertile soil into barren land? Hundreds of thousands of miles that once supported many different types of vegetation are now geared to but one type of harvest.

These wheat fields, that stretch for hundreds of miles in every direction across the American midwest, represent the most advanced farming methods, and the most dangerous. This is monobiotic, or one-crop farming. The problem is that a plant disease such as wheat rust could wipe out hundreds of thousands of acres in a season. And the land, overfertilized and geared to growing wheat, may become incapable of supporting other crops.

Since man first invented agriculture, he has pushed the land to extremes, until it broke down. When it could give nothing more, he moved on to another field. Now we are running out of new, fertile fields. We pour fertilizer and pesticides onto the land, forcing it to yield not what it can, but what we demand. But when our demands can no longer be met, the earth rebels and nothing grows, and the land blows away. So might we create another American Dust Bowl. Many experts feel that it is not only technology that needs to be reconsidered, but our philosophy. Dr. Emmanuel Mesthene of Harvard University.

Dr. EMMANUEL MESTHENE. One of the concerns that is being—beginning to be voiced now, is that we do not spend enough time anticipating all of the foreseeable consequences of the technology, as a result of which you introduce the technology of deter-

gents and you wind up with polluted—polluted streams—or you introduce the technology of nuclear weapons, and you wind up with polluted atmosphere . . . The effects of scientific experiments and of technologies are now themselves so wide, so widespread and occur so quickly that you might—there is a danger at least implicitly, that you will induce a permanent change in the nature of nature before you have a chance to see it coming . . . And I think that's what makes the problem more poignant now than perhaps it has been before. But certainly it's what—one wants to do has always been the more difficult problem.

CRONKITE.—The Panama Canal is an example of technology that was used to meet a need, but fortunately—or fortuitously, because no one gave it any thought—it did not affect the ecology. Finished in 1914, the canal today can no longer meet the needs of world trade. Its narrow staircase of locks, that compensate for the difference in sea levels between the Atlantic and Pacific, impede the free flow of traffic. On any given day the canal passes 30 to 40 ships through its locks, while other vessels must stand and wait at both ends to pass from one ocean to the other.

No one questions the obsolescence of the present canal. And so, a new canal has been proposed and a cluster of sites suggested, two in Panama, one in Nicaragua, and yet another in Colombia.

The new Central American Canal would be a sea level canal, which would allow the two oceans to adjust their levels so that the slow, lock system would not be needed. It would be dug in a radically different way. Atomic bombs are proposed to blast a new ditch across Central America. This animation shows how nuclear explosives might be used.

The Atomic Energy Commission says that with nuclear explosives, there would be little if any fallout in the atmosphere. Some scientists disagree. Dr. Lamont Cole of Cornell University:

DR. LAMONT COLE.—I think the suggestion for using Nuclear explosives to dig a new Central American canal is absolutely irresponsible. The estimate that it's going to take 170 megatons of explosives to dig it by the shortest route. Even if they use the cleanest bombs they can construct, I've made some calculations on this that shows that pollution of the oceans with Cesium-137, which is a very dangerous isotope, will be way beyond the permissible limit. It will be—would give a number of lethal doses to every person on earth. And Cesium will not be trapped in the craters, because it comes out as a gas. And will escape, will pollute the atmosphere. The winds in that region are from East to West, so that the Pacific Ocean will be polluted first, and then this will wash through into the Atlantic. And this Cesium will get into all living things.

CRONKITE. There is another question: What happens when two bodies of water mix through a sea-level canal? The Welland Ship Canal which links the Great Lakes with the Atlantic is a case history. It is a sea level canal opened in 1932. In the almost 40 years experience gained here, are lessons that cannot be ignored.

For it soon became apparent that ships were not all that passed through the canal and into the Great Lakes.

The lamprey eel passed through. It is a prehistoric killer that has survived unchanged for 200 million years. Its normal hunting grounds are the chilly waters of the Atlantic, but with no natural enemies in the lakes, the lamprey exploded like a bomb among the whitefish and lake trout. Once a great fishing industry thrived there. No longer. The lampreys with their needle sharp teeth and voracious suckers have decimated the trout and white fish populations of the Great Lakes.

In their wake have come trash fish called alewives. The trout once kept the alewife

population in check. Now millions of alewives clog the Great Lakes, washing ashore to pollute the beaches with their rotting carcasses. Belatedly an effort is being made to restore some biological balance to the Great Lakes.

There are Coho Salmon, transplanted from their native Pacific Northwest. They eat the eggs of the alewives and may reduce that pest to manageable numbers. But now the Coho population maybe threatened by the tons of pesticides that wash into the lakes from the surrounding farm lands.

Man is learning that nature's biological balance, once tipped, is not easily restored.

More than thirty years ago, we began to change the character of five Great Lakes. Now, our powers are far greater. In the next thirty years we may forever alter the biological balance of the world's two mightiest oceans. Millions of years ago, the Atlantic and Pacific were one ocean. Then, there was a great upheaval and the Isthmus of Panama became a land bridge between North and South America, separating the Atlantic Ocean from the Pacific. Identical creatures also were separated. Evolving in two oceans, they have now had time to become genetically different species. Predator and prey in each ocean adapted to each other, creating a mutual dependency that ensured the survival of all species.

The locks and fresh water lake that make traffic so slow moving through the present canal also prevent the whole-sale passage of fish and other marine animals from one ocean to the other. A sea level canal would allow the waters of both oceans, and the life forms they contain, to mix freely. What might the result be?

Is this Pacific water snake a deadly parallel of the Lamprey eel? Are we about to repeat the mistake of the Welland Canal?

These are some of the questions Dr. Ira Rubinfof of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute hopes to answer in his laboratory in the Panama Canal Zone.

What happens if fish that have evolved in different environments are suddenly thrown together and mate? They may produce a hybrid form that would thrive in both oceans. Or, they may produce a weaker species that soon would succumb to predators or the environment itself.

In this experiment Pacific females were mated with Atlantic males. The results suggest a third alternative. The offspring were sterile. In a future mingling of species on a two-ocean scale, two similar forms might mate and produce no offspring—both would then disappear. The sudden break in the food chain might have disastrous effects up and down the line, and remove forever a vital food element from the human diet.

Has man the right to intrude upon nature to such an extent? Can we continue to batter and assault the planet as if it were a feather pillow that can always be plumped back up again? Are we independent of our environment, or are we a part of it?

Many scientists feel that we can no longer afford to remake the earth without also understanding in advance, what the effects will be on our ecology. Only by looking with extreme care, before we taken any more great technological leaps, can we control what will happen to our world in the 21st Century.

**DWIGHT EISENHOWER: GENERAL,
PRESIDENT, AMERICAN**

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, our late beloved President Dwight David Eisenhower has left an indelible mark on our

Nation. It is the mark of a proud American who provided outstanding leadership in war and in peace. President Eisenhower's mark is that of a soldier-statesman who saw his duty and then filled it in the highest standards of the United States and the free world.

There have been appropriate eulogies for President Eisenhower since his recent passing. Among those that I feel best captured the spirit, drive, and success of this great man were editorials on March 29 in *Newsday* and the *Long Island Press*.

In memory of President Eisenhower I include those editorials in the *RECORD*:

[From *Newsday*, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Commander of the mightiest armada the world has ever known, he hated war. Twice elected to the White House by landslide votes, he detested partisan politics. A national and world hero, he never lost touch with the values he learned as a Kansas farm boy.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was an American original, his life a mirror of traditional virtues: honesty, hard work, religious faith, respect for authority, love of country, honor and devotion to duty. An Horatio Alger in uniform, he fulfilled the American promise that a boy from the humblest origins can grow up to be President of the United States.

Faith in America and in its democratic institutions was the central theme to which Ike was devoted. "I am proud to say," he once declared, "that I am a fanatical devotee of the American system of democracy. I believe that the two fundamentals of the American democracy are, first, a deep and abiding religious faith, and second, a system of freedoms and rights for the individual that we generally refer to loosely and roughly as 'free enterprise.'"

Although he had devoted his life to the military, Ike wished to be known as a "soldier of peace." "You help man the fortress for which freedom still finds need," he told the West Point Class of 1947. "But this service does not imply subscription to the rule of might. War is mankind's most tragic and stupid folly; to seek or advise its deliberate provocation is a black crime against all men. Though you follow the trade of the warrior, you do so in the spirit of Washington—not Ghengis Khan."

Dwight D. Eisenhower never lost faith in America, though his concern for the future of his country increased with each passing day. As he watched turmoil and disorder sweep the nation, he pleaded with his countrymen to heed the rule of law and to fight for the concept of an orderly society—lest society be destroyed.

In time, history will write its verdict on the eight Eisenhower years in the White House. Whether Ike was a weak President who failed to inspire the nation to attack the urgent domestic tasks at hand . . . or whether he was a strong President who, by holding together the western alliance, saved the world from a new holocaust . . . will be debated endlessly.

But whatever the findings of history, Americans of his generation have already made their own judgment about Dwight D. Eisenhower.

They said it loud and clear: We Like Ike.

[From the *Long Island (N.Y.) Press*,
Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT EISENHOWER, 1890-1969

In mourning Dwight David Eisenhower, the sorrow is eased by the fact that his 78 years of life mirrored a glowing picture of all that is best in American life.

His initial impact upon his countrymen was as a military leader, but his first achieve-

ment as President was as a man of peace, fulfilling his campaign promise to go to Korea to end the slaughter.

Born in Denison, Tex., he grew up in near-poverty in Abilene, his mother a pacifist who wept when her boy was appointed to West Point. Perhaps that is why he was a warrior who hated what he called "this damnable thing of war," and as a President, he wielded power sparingly.

He was also a politician who told a news conference: "I think in the general derogatory sense you can say . . . that I do not like politics."

As a soldier he commanded the greatest military machine in the history of mankind and led it to victory over the most infamous enemy in memory.

A measure of this man was his popularity with the troops. Traditionally generals are fair game for the men in the ranks, but not General Ike. One of the reasons may have been his "enlisted man response" to the ingrained "chicken" of Army life.

For example, at the end of the war soldiers on leave flocked to Berchtesgarden, Hitler's Bavarian retreat. Only one elevator was available to take visitors to the top of the mountain fortress. The alternative was a long, winding climb up a path. The elevator bore a sign: "For Field Grade Officers Only." When Gen. Eisenhower saw it, he yanked the sign off and scaled it down the hillside. After that, field officers stood in line with privates to ride the elevator.

As President, he gave America no ringing slogans and made no glowing promises, but he was elected by majorities matched previously only by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The same warmth that existed between Gen. Eisenhower and his troops carried over to civilian life. "I like Ike" was more fact than slogan, and his appeal was so magnetic that the Democrats sought him as a candidate before he identified himself as a Republican.

As he rode in an open car through Long Island—as in other parts of the nation—tens of thousands turned out to see the tanned, fit hero, and to smile back at his famous grin.

Under the Eisenhower Administration the Korean War was brought to an end, the hydrogen bomb was developed and America entered the space age.

It was President Eisenhower who appointed Earl Warren Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and later sent federal troops to enforce the court's order to integrate the schools in Little Rock, Ark. He sent Marines into Lebanon at that country's request, but he avoided massive involvement in French Indo-China when Dien Bien Phu fell.

The cocktail party psychologists talked glibly of the "father image" when he was in the White House. And there may have been some truth in the trite phrases because he came at a time when America yearned for the comfort of a fatherly leader.

Although he was of the military, his outlook was never narrowly militaristic. The generals and admirals enjoyed no special influence over policy or budget decisions while he was President.

His military leadership made him aware of the parallel interests of the makers of arms, and military careerists. When he left the Presidency, he warned the nation to beware of an alliance between these parallel forces, and to guard against the danger of inertia in the defense establishment.

History may not rank him as our most brilliant general or our most extraordinary President, but history occasionally does not measure the quality of integrity or nobility in a man.

He was as popular when he left office as when he entered it, and there is little doubt he could have won a third term had he not been barred by the Constitution from running again.

The affection the nation felt for Ike did

not diminish in the years afterward. He was always the elder statesman of the nation more than of his party.

His typically American optimism was deeply rooted in his firm faith in the strength of America. In his last public address—via television to the 1968 Republican convention in Miami—he said: "Let us first remind ourselves of the greatness of this nation and of its people. Let's not waste time this year searching out someone to blame, even though some seem more disposed to concede rather than to stand firmly for America."

A gentle man and a patriot has left us.

WISE COUNSEL FOR WORLD PEACE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) spoke before an audience in Milwaukee last Friday evening on the most critical issue which confronts us today—the choice between building new armaments or seeking to negotiate their limitation. At a time when new weapons systems are being paraded before us for approval, this cogent plea for an immediate halt to the arms race merits the careful attention of every Member of this House. In order to insure its ready availability, I am inserting the text at this point in the RECORD:

THE TIME TO STOP THE ARMS RACE IS NOW
(Remarks of Representative HENRY S. REUSS, First Unitarian Church, East Ogden Avenue, Milwaukee, Friday evening, April 11, 1969)

We are now spending upwards of \$80 billion a year for national security. When I first entered public life a generation ago, the hawks in the Truman Administration were plumping for defense expenditures of \$15 billion a year, and the doves were for restricting the defense budget to \$10 billion. Twenty years later, the defense budget absorbs more than half of our federal expenditures—and the end is not yet in sight.

Since all of this is done in the name of national security, we have a right and duty to ask whether our national security is in fact enhanced by such an endless expansion of military expenditures. We have reached the point, I believe, where your security is being diminished, not helped.

In the first place, the aim of our security policy ought to be a union of 50 states in which tranquility reigns, progress and opportunity are the order of the day, and we are strong and united at home. The fact is that the concentration of our financial resources and our scientific and manpower resources on the military means that we are grossly short-changing those elements of our national life which really contribute to a strong America—the reconstruction of our cities, the control over our environment with particular reference to air and water pollution, the up-building of our educational and health resources, the reconciliation of the races. Because we are over-spending on the military, we lack the resources to attend to our problems at home. Security, like charity, should begin at home.

Even more important is the fact that we are now at a crossroads where the arms race threatens to engulf us. The Administration has proposed an ABM system known as Safeguard which would protect—so it is alleged—our Minuteman missile sites, our bomber

bases, and perhaps the city of Washington, against Russian missiles, and against Chinese missiles if they acquire them. The Soviet Union is similarly toying with an ABM system around Moscow. Although the exact state of this deployment is subject to dispute, the system is considerably more primitive than the one we contemplate.

Furthermore, both we and the Russians are embarking on a new generation of offensive missiles designed to circumvent the enemy's anti-ballistic missile system. Our missiles are to be equipped with multiple warheads known as MIRVs—Multiple Independently-Targetable Reentry Vehicles—as many as ten warheads on one missile, each capable of being detached during flight and independently guided toward its separate target. We appear to be well ahead of the Russians at the moment. They have tested only multiple warheads, not the independently guided ones we have tested.

Once the two antagonists have even completed successful testing of MIRVs, let alone begun deployment, the chances of an effective arms control agreement substantially disappear. Air monitoring, such as by spy satellites, can readily detect the very distinctive MIRV tests; but there are no known means to detect the number of warheads on a missile, or to determine whether they are independently targetable.

The Soviet Union will probably remain unwilling to permit us to inspect their territory on the ground. It is unlikely that the United States Government would enter into an "arms control agreement" without any effective policing powers, and which relied mainly on trust in our adversaries.

And so the genie of destruction will truly have gotten out of the bottle. We shall then be launched on an uncontrollable arms race, of which the bankruptcy of both adversaries is perhaps the kindest consequence, and the launching of the war that would make our planet lifeless as the moon an increasing possibility when madmen in power think of themselves as possessing a momentary advantage, and thus strike.

My message tonight, therefore, is that we must make a last all-out effort to negotiate an enforceable arms control agreement with our adversaries, and we must do it now—not later after ABMs and MIRVs render it impossible. Such an arms control agreement should include a comprehensive ban on all nuclear testing, including underground testing, which would add some meaning to the recent nonproliferation treaty. It should also include a stand-still on the deployment of ABMs, and a ban on the deployment and any further testing of MIRVs.

It shall discuss mainly the ABM, because that is the issue before us—the issue for public education and debate, and for a congressional vote within the next few months. But I discuss it in the context of the world arms race, with its twin dangers of national bankruptcy and World War III.

Now, what of the ABM?

Its aim is to protect two of our Minuteman missile sites—in North Dakota and Montana, by 1973. Later, similar "protection" would be afforded two other Minuteman sites, plus some bomber bases in the continental United States.

I use "protect" in quotes, because an overwhelming array of scientific witnesses has expressed real doubt that the ABM will in fact protect our Minuteman sites. Enemy decoys and multiple warheads could be devised to overwhelm ABM warheads at any site. The radar detection device, which in its nature cannot be put in a concrete silo underground, would be particularly vulnerable, perhaps 50 times more vulnerable than the missiles it is meant to protect.

Our hemisphere is cluttered with obsolete Maginot lines that no longer work. At a multi-billion dollar cost, we built the DEW line across the Arctic to detect Russian

bombers and activate an air defense system. Meanwhile, the Russians deployed missiles which could overfly the DEW line, or could take out the DEW line radars and clear the way for their bombers. The point is simply that each defense has promptly produced a new offense which renders the defense unworkable.

If we want to improve the invulnerability of our Minuteman missile sites, which can already withstand a direct hit one mile away by the largest Soviet missile, there is abundant testimony that the missile silos can be further hardened at a cost vastly less than that of an ABM system.

But one may ask: What is the point of an ABM, even supposing that it worked to protect two, or four, Minuteman missile sites? The most reliable long-run deterrent that protects us against Moscow's sending atomic warheads into the United States is the Polaris Submarine, which cruises under the seven seas and can send A-bombs over the Soviet Union from below the surface. The Soviet Union now has no effective anti-Polaris capability. To the extent that it may be trying to develop one—the probabilities of success are doubtful—our task ought to be to pursue the effective counter measures we have already begun to develop.

As for protecting our bombers—and it is doubtful that with or without an ABM they can be saved from obsolescence for many more years—it is cheaper, more feasible, and far less provocative to keep some of them off the apron and on air alert as we did until recently.

So it is hard to see how an ABM, even if successful, would increase our security.

It surely would be hideously costly. While the Administration estimates the cost of its program as \$7 billion, a recent Brookings Institution study has shown that weapons systems tend when actually produced to cost 300 to 700 percent above the Pentagon's estimated figure. This lends support to the assertion that the ABM system, if deployed, could end up costing us at least \$30 to \$40 billion.

It would be one thing if I were here pitting my judgment against that of the scientific community. In fact, I am simply pitting my judgment against the military-industrial complex—those in the Pentagon who have so often led us astray, and the huge array of equipment manufacturers whose nest is about to be feathered once again by the lucrative ABM contracts.

On the other side, this time, are ranged the greatest brains of our scientific community. George Kistiakowsky, President Eisenhower's scientific adviser; Jerome Wiesner, President Kennedy's science adviser; Donald Hornig, President Johnson's Scientific adviser—they and thousands of other leading scientists oppose the deployment of the ABM.

The average citizen is fully justified in feeling himself the victim of a snow job on the ABM by the Pentagon and the contractors who are about to profit from the ABM. A few weeks ago there came to light a plan by Army Secretary Resor for the two elements of the complex—the military and the industrialists—to collaborate on a huge public relations campaign to sell the American people on the ABM.

The plan had to be dropped when it was publicly exposed. Meanwhile, the Pentagon's credibility in its public justification of the ABM is declining steadily. For example:

1. The Pentagon has shifted its rationale for the ABM many times. For years, the Joint Chiefs of Staff formally recommended a heavy ABM system to defend our cities against Soviet attack. Nevertheless, when Secretary of Defense McNamara gave the go-ahead for the ABM in 1967, it was proposed as a means of warding off atomic missiles from Communist China. When this appeared too thin, the anti-Soviet justification began

to pick up steam again, especially when sites were chosen near cities so the system could be expanded to provide a heavy defense.

When people from the cities began to protest, the protect-our-cities rationale was virtually dropped. Instead, the present ABM rationale was adopted—that it is to protect our Minuteman missile sites, and later our bomber bases and possibly neighboring cities, mostly against the Soviet Union but with Red China as an after-thought.

The shift in "justification" from one ground to another does not inspire confidence. No one should be surprised if we are told a year hence that we need a heavy defense of our cities, and that Safeguard, after all, can be expanded to provide that defense.

2. Nor does it inspire confidence to have Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird differ fundamentally in their sensing of Soviet intentions. Secretary Rogers has testified that the United States would be "delighted" to abandon our proposed ABM deployment if the Soviet Union abandoned its ABM deployment. Indeed, that is the mutual self-control which would be the object of arms control talks if we ever started on them.

But Secretary Laird is hooked on the idea that the Soviet Union is developing a super-destructive missile known as the SS-9, and is "definitely going for a first strike capability". Here again many* defense and intelligence experts disagree with this interpretation of both Soviet intentions and capabilities. But if Mr. Laird is right, would we not be improvident to abandon ABM, in return for the Soviet Union's abandoning its ABM if we thus expose our Minuteman missile sites to the Soviet super-weapon? The Administration is confused; the public has every right to ask searching questions.

3. Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard has also made his contribution to the Pentagon's credibility gap. When pressed before the Senate to name scientific experts he had consulted on the ABM, he could name only Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, a leading high energy physicist. Unknown to Mr. Packard, Dr. Panofsky happened to be in the hearing room. He asked to testify, and did testify, that his only encounter with Mr. Packard was a chance one at the San Francisco Airport, and went on to say that deploying the ABM now is wasteful of resources, premature, and dangerously provocative.

4. Both Secretary Laird and Deputy Secretary Packard testified the other day before the Senate that an American inter-continental ballistic missile, once launched from the site, can be disarmed in the air and a nuclear explosion thus prevented. As Secretary Laird said, "You could have it land without a nuclear explosion". As Deputy Secretary Packard said: "The most important thing about all these weapons is that you have to provide a continuing command to keep them going, and if they don't get the command, then they won't continue. This is the safe protection that is used." When their statements were challenged, the Pentagon issued a "clarification": "While it is technically possible to provide air missiles with disarm or destruct capability, we do not now provide nor do we plan to provide that capability for our operational offensive missile force." George Orwell, here we come.

But even if it could be established beyond doubt that the ABM is needed; that the ABM would be effective when deployed; that it will not in fact diminish rather than enhance our security—one thing is clear.

That is that we must start arms control negotiations—on underground testing, on the ABM, and on the MIRV—right now. As I have said, efforts to develop a MIRV can be detected by the other side. Our instrumentation can show the configuration caused by the testing of a multiple independently directed warhead. But once a MIRV is suc-

cessfully developed—by either side, or by both—its deployment in secret cannot be monitored. Even to the gimlet eye of our spy satellite, a MIRV needed look no different from any other missile warhead on the ground.

And when that happens, the arms race is out of control!

To delay arms talks with the Soviet Union now is thus the purest of brinkmanship. The Soviet Union has for more than a year made clear its desire to talk. But Secretary Laird says that strategic arms control discussions with the Soviet Union should wait until we have made "progress not only in Paris, but also in the Middle East." We are obviously not going to make progress in the Vietnam talks in Paris under Secretary Laird's formula: on March 27 he told the House Armed Services Committee that "the basic problem remains that of achieving permanent South Vietnamese governmental control over the country." A goal of maintaining the Saigon government in power permanently is obviously not going to lead to "progress in Paris" with Hanoi and the NLF. Neither, given the attitudes of the Israelis and the Arabs, is progress in the Middle East definitely foreseeable.

Meanwhile, we are proceeding full speed to test both ABM and MIRVs—the ABM warheads with a huge series of underground explosions planned by the Atomic Energy Commission for next fall, the MIRVs under Secretary Laird's beefed-up budget for the fiscal year starting next June 30.

President Nixon should overrule Secretary of Defense Laird, and come out squarely behind Secretary of State Rogers, who has said that arms control talks with the Soviet Union could start in the "late spring or early summer." Preparations for those talks should be accelerated. Meanwhile, the President should order a halt to plans for the further testing and deployment of MIRVs and for the testing of ABM nuclear warheads. The time to stop the arms race is now.

HIGH SCHOOL DISORDERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider H.R. 514, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969. During the hearings on the bill before the House Education and Labor Committee the question was raised as to whether the problem of the lack of discipline in some of the schools might not work to the disadvantage of school officials in the use of Federal funds. The problem is different from that of the college campuses where the withdrawal of Federal funds from troublemakers has been proposed. Nevertheless, the record shows that in certain areas disruptive tactics in high schools have been serious, and the point may possibly be reached where it might be even irresponsible for us to put more money into areas that cannot spend the money properly.

On January 23 of this year I inserted in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Turmoil in Schools Drives Out Teachers," citing the case of New York City which has been hit hard by school strife.

On the same day that the Monitor article appeared, January 23, the New

York Daily News ran an editorial which stated in part:

Beatings in the hallways, assaults on teachers and students, terrorism in the classroom. These, according to a report released Tuesday by the High School Principals Association of New York City, are as common a part of school life nowadays as reading, writing and arithmetic.

Less than 2 months later, Mayor John Lindsay of New York City named a 13-member committee, including top city officials to "coordinate" efforts to stem student violence in the city schools. According to the New York Times of March 13, Lindsay was quoted as saying:

The danger is there. It's a very real problem. I do have a sense of urgency about it.

On March 16 the New York City Superintendent of School Bernard E. Donovan ordered every high school and junior high school in the city to name a security official as part of a plan to stem increasing student disruptions and violence.

New York City is not alone regarding student disruptions in high schools. A sampling of newspaper headlines of recent dates indicates the scope of the problem:

"Disorders Erupt and Subside at High Schools Across Jersey," New York Times, March 14.

"Parents, Upset Over Attacks, Threaten to Boycott School," Baltimore Sun, February 22.

"Eleven Hurt in Fights at Bloom High School," Chicago Tribune, March 18, 1969.

"School Discipline Study Ordered in Alexandria," Washington Star, February 20.

"Student Mobs Rampage Thru Schools in New York," Chicago Tribune, December 3, 1968.

"Fists Fly and Bombs Explode as Violence Racks Some High Schools," the National Observer, March 17.

Teachers in some areas might be justified in asking for a form of combat pay if cases such as the following become more widespread:

"Teacher Beaten, Clothing Ignited," New York Times, January 21.

"Los Angeles Principal Is Injured in Rampage," Philadelphia Inquirer, March 13.

"Woman Who Struck Teacher Gets 90-Day Term in School," New York Times, March 9.

"Orders Trial for Boy in Teacher Assault," New York Daily News, March 14.

The Chicago Tribune of April 13, 1969, carried an extensive article on violence in schools in the Chicago area entitled, "Act to Halt Terror in City Schools—An Aura of Fear and Violence." The lead paragraph of the article by William Jones of the Tribune staff reads:

Chicago public school teachers are working under a reign of terror that includes attacks with Mace and other weapons, physical beatings and threats, and gangs of intruders that roam hallways preying on teachers and students, a Tribune investigation has disclosed.

More specifically, the Tribune account outlines by month the number of assaults reported:

Reported assaults received by the board of education's safety department show 104 attacks against public school teachers and principals for the 20 school days in October. The same records show 44 attacks in September, 63 in November, 52 in December, 71 in January, and 65 in February. These totals do not include the dozens of reported threats and obscenities hurled at educators every month.

I fully realize that the above sampling of situations and incidents does not constitute an adequate cross section of conditions nationally. However, if conditions do not improve in some areas, review of the use of Federal funds in some cases might perhaps be in order.

I also realize that this problem is primarily one for the local authorities, and I certainly appreciate the extent of the financial burden which confronts school systems throughout the country. Legislation which I, and other Members, have proposed in the past sought to both assist States financially and retain authority at the State level. This proposal, tax sharing for educational purposes, prescribed an arrangement whereby a certain percentage of income taxes collected on individual incomes under Federal statutes be deemed to be revenue for the State or territory within which all of it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

Recently, the present administration has indicated that the tax-sharing approach on a wider basis is being considered. It is to be hoped that workable plans will soon be forthcoming to assist the State financially, while at the same time supporting the communities and municipalities to cope with their problems in the educational and other fields.

I request that the above-mentioned articles from the Chicago Tribune of April 13, written by William Jones, be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 13, 1969]
ACT TO HALT TERROR IN CITY SCHOOLS—AN AURA OF FEAR AND VIOLENCE

(By William Jones)

Chicago public school teachers are working under a reign of terror that includes attacks with Mace and other weapons, physical beatings and threats, and gangs of intruders that roam hallways preying on teachers and students, a Tribune investigation has disclosed.

Violence and threats against teachers and principals during the current school year have at times averaged more than six a day and caused educators to plead for more security in their classrooms, according to board of education records.

The incidents have reached such crisis proportions, it was learned, that School Supt. James F. Redmond and his deputy superintendent, Manford Byrd Jr., are preparing a security plan that would create the first full time security staff in the history of the public school system.

REPORTS ARE LISTED

Among the reports obtained during an investigation of teacher assaults and intimidation are:

1. A 60-year-old music teacher at Steinmetz High school, 3030 N. Mobile av., was taking attendance when an unidentified intruder sprayed Mace into her classroom. She was treated at Passavant hospital, and later reported her "nose and throat seared by noxious Mace fumes." Another woman teacher at Lawson Elementary school, 1256 S. Homan av., was the victim of a similar attack and fell down a flight of stairs attempting to escape her attacker.

2. Reported assaults received by the board of education's safety department show 104 attacks against public school teachers and principals for the 20 school days in October. The same records show 44 attacks in September, 63 in November, 52 in December, 71 in January, and 65 in February. These totals do not include the dozens of reported threats and obscenities hurled at educators every month.

TEACHERS TELL OF TERROR IN CLASSROOMS—MANY ARE INJURED BY STUDENTS

"Assaults against teachers are increasing, there's no question about it," said Lt. Vincent Burke, a veteran of 19 years with the youth division. "Some of it is racial, some of it is gang competition to see who can get the most recognition, and some of it is the examples we are setting for pupils."

MANY CLASSES TOO BIG

"A kid today who wants recognition can sit in front of a television set and see a bizarre act committed by some punk in Detroit two hours after it happens," he added. "It gives him ideas.

"I also see classrooms of 40 to 50 kids where it becomes virtually impossible for the teacher to separate trouble makers. We have to get these problem kids in the lower grades before they wind up as a security problem."

Mary A. Saxton, principal of Parker High school, 6800 S. Stewart av., said six white teachers sought protection in her office March 28, after "some of our students warned them in a friendly fashion that it would be to their benefit to leave the classroom. We promised we would protect them and called in extra security.

A teacher at the Ward school, 2701 Shields av., was the victim of an armed holdup Feb. 20. The assault report noted:

"Teacher was seated at desk. A man entered the room, pulled a gun from his coat and ordered the teacher to unlock the closet and steel cabinet while he emptied the contents of her purse. He started to lock the teacher in the closet, but decided not to go out of the room or near the windows until the children had arrived." The man later left without causing any further disturbance.

STUDENT THROWS DESKS

Some of the assault reports merely described the act of violence without going into detail.

"Student threw two desks at me over his head and hit me with both," is the teacher's explanation of an attack at Drake Educational and Vocational Guidance center, 2641 S. Calumet av.

Teachers and students also are being injured outside school buildings.

A 37-year-old Avalon Park school teacher suffered neck bruises and skin punctures when she was attacked while walking from her car to the school at 8:25 a.m. She asked in her injury report that security guards be assigned to the employe parking lot.

BOTTLES ARE HURLED

In another case, a teacher at the Yale Primary-Intermediate school was escorting a class of sixth grade pupils outside the school when three truants hurled a quantity of broken bottles from the top of a three story apartment building. The teacher was hit by glass fragments, a girl suffered a deep gash on her left leg and a boy's ankle was cut.

"This incident, unfortunately, according to other sources in the community, is not an isolated one," wrote Principal Gerald J. O'Connor in a letter attached to the assault report. "Similar assaults have been committed against other passers-by in the vicinity for a period of several weeks. Glass bottles are in my opinion an extremely deadly menace in our community.

"I recommend that the board of education thru its various departments have designated agents endeavor to secure the dispensing of all beverages on the premises of public schools in containers other than glass. This

recommendation should receive urgent and immediate attention."

3. Intimidation and threats against teachers at Crane High school, 2245 W. Jackson blvd., became so blatant two weeks ago that black militant students hung wanted posters in the hallways carrying the names and physical descriptions of 15 white and Negro teachers. The posters invited acts of violence against the teachers, describing them as "hogs and racists. My teachers are afraid," said Principal James Maloney. "Some of them have made arrangements to teach elsewhere in the fall."

TEACHER BADLY CUT

4. A 28-year-old teacher at Penn Elementary school, 1616 S. Avers av., required 11 stitches to close a gash in her scalp after a 14-year-old pupil attacked her with the leg of a piano. The same pupil was accused of threatening another teacher at the same school with a knife three weeks earlier.

5. The principals of Goudy Elementary school, 5120 N. Winthrop av., and Avalon Park Elementary school, 8045 S. Kenwood av., were whipped with auto antennas in separate incidents. Thomas J. Kernan, principal of Avalon Park, reported bruises on his arms, chest, and back, and a cut lip as a result of the attack March 21, by a former student. He asked for more police protection at the school.

"Teaching in Chicago has become a hazardous profession," said John Desmond, president of the Chicago Teachers union. "It stems from a basic collapse in respect for authority and a lack of principals and other administrators with enough guts to handle these situations. Teachers today are on the firing line along with policemen and firemen."

Edward D. Brady, director of the buro of socially maladjusted children, admitted that teacher assaults are on the rise. Brady, who hires and directs the 270 Chicago policemen who work part time as school security guards, is the closest thing to the board of education has to a school security chief.

PLAN STRONGER FORCE

"We are doing the best we can with what we have," said Brady. "Dr. Redmond and Dr. Byrd are now in the process of formulating an all out attack against crime in the schools. It will include a larger budget, full time security staff and stepped up prosecutions against those who attack teachers."

Brady said security funds now consist of one million dollars a year which is used to pay part time policemen. In addition to this force, the police department's youth division assigns 63 men to patrol the schools, and additional manpower is available from police districts.

EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER'S VALEDICTORY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, one of the most distinguished newspapermen in American history wrote his valedictory. This occurred when Edgar Ansel Mowrer reviewed his 55 years as reporter-commentator on world affairs in a final column for Bell-McClure Syndicate of New York City. Starting in 1914 Mowrer reported the world's trouble spots, warned of the rise of Mussolini fascism and Hitler nazism and since World War II has consistently called upon the nations of the Atlantic com-

munity to form a federal government in order to avert a new worldwide catastrophe.

In addition to distinguished reporting for the Chicago Daily News foreign service for many years, he was the author of a long series of challenging books on world affairs. The most notable of these was "Germany Turns the Clock Back," which early in the 1930's sounded a warning about Adolf Hitler and his designs.

During the past 8 years it has been my privilege to be with Mr. Mowrer on numerous occasions and to have the advantage of his vast knowledge and keen intellect. He has given generously of his time and energy to those in public office. I for one am deeply indebted to him and count his retirement from regular reporting a great personal loss. At the same time it is only fair to say that his contributions to the cause of freedom have been immense. If anyone deserved on merit an easier pace it is Edgar Ansel Mowrer. Here is the text of his valedictory:

WORLD-FAMOUS REPORTER WRITES HIS VALEDICTORY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

After almost 55 years, this reporter-commentator on world affairs is letting up and will no longer write four columns a week. This is a final attempt to make clear my position.

During most of this time, starting September 1, 1914, as a war correspondent in France, I have recorded international trouble, sometimes amounting to catastrophe.

Almost alone, from Rome in 1922, I warned that Mussolini would really try to revive a "Roman Empire" whenever he thought he could do so safely.

From Berlin, in 1930, I irritated many Americans by predicting that Adolf Hitler meant business.

In 1943, as a political columnist in Washington, D.C., I lost popularity by criticizing FDR's notion that he could handle Stalin.

AMERICAN MISTAKES

Ever since then I have felt obliged to chronicle the worsening of the world situation, following such American mistakes as:

Truman's neutrality toward the Chinese civil war of 1945-49 and his failure to reunite Korea;

Eisenhower's refusal to help the Hungarian Freedom Fighters, his handing the Suez Canal to Egypt's little Hitler, his failure to help France produce nuclear weapons and consolidate NATO, his original support of communist Castro against Batista and his revival of the myth concerning the "maturing" of the Soviet rulers;

Kennedy's failures at the Bay of Pigs and the Berlin Wall, his unnecessary concessions to Khrushchev after scoring in the missile crisis, his acceptance of something like nuclear parity with Moscow, his compromise over Laos, and finally, his tacit agreements with our enemies to limit our efforts to defend South Vietnam.

For all these mistakes the world is still paying heavily.

AMERICAN VICTORIES

To be sure, we have also had victories like the successful defense of Europe as well as strokes of undeserved luck—Chaing Kai-shek's superb performance on Taiwan, the anti-communist revolution in Indonesia, the near collapse of Red China and above all, its worsening feud with the U.S.S.R.

Unhappily, I have felt obliged to call my readers' attention less to these than to our defeats in spite of our unequalled power.

For while we were seeking peace through compromise, the other side was seeking victory.

For this reason, too, at the last election, I supported Dick Nixon in the hope of a new American foreign policy based on a revived will to win.

This policy Nixon has been slow in revealing. Nevertheless, I am heartened by the testimony of Defense Secretary Laird to the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee:

"Never have the challenges to our national security exceeded in number and gravity those which we found on taking office."

Finally the truth is out, confirming a process which, to the best of my ability, I have chronicled for a quarter of a century.

NOT PESSIMISTIC

Nonetheless, I am not a pessimist! For in my opinion, there is another and heartening truth upon which I wish to insist, in this, my last, four-a-week news column: With our allies, we Americans still have all it takes to win without major war—if we are ready to pay the price!

An Atlantic Community plus Japan with a common policy and pooled resources still possess overwhelming military, economic, scientific and political superiority over our enemies, present or potential.

To be effective we need a President who, accepting the dismal diagnosis of his Defense Secretary as correct, calls upon Americans and allies to cease from the kind of wishful thinking that brought about the loss of East Europe, China and Cuba, and instead, to concentrate on the supreme challenge of our time—whether the coming world is to be free or utterly devastated by nuclear war. For the latter—or ignominious surrender—we shall surely know if we permit those who wish to reduce the world to a pattern of common slavery to equal us in strength while surpassing us in seeking victory.

Can we Americans pull ourselves together, silence those who for whatever reason are urging us down the road to decay and defeat, and prove ourselves worthy of our Founding Fathers?

I for one believe that we can and will.

In this spirit, to all readers whether they agree with me or not, I offer my thanks and best wishes.

CRASH LOCATOR BEACONS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last month 28 Members of this House joined me in introducing legislation directing the Federal Aviation Administration to require crash locator beacons on all civil aircraft in the United States. A week later, the FAA issued a proposed rule requiring this equipment on air taxis—a small but positive step forward.

While the crash locator beacon issue is just one aspect of a very complex aviation safety problem, it deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. In this regard, I am presenting today for inclusion in the RECORD, a paper on crash locator beacons by Mr. C. G. Inskeep, of San Diego, Calif. Mr. Inskeep is an electrical engineer and physicist, as well as a private pilot. He has been actively involved in the development of crash locator beacons since 1965.

Mr. Inskeep's paper will be presented at the National Aerospace Electronics

Conference at Dayton, Ohio, next month. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR THE AIRCRAFT DOWNED POSITION INDICATOR AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

(National Aerospace Electronics Conference, Dayton, Ohio, May 19, 20, 21, 1969, by C. G. Inskeep, Pacific Telephone, San Diego, Calif., March 1969)

Bill and Jacqueline Clark and their two young daughters, Julie and Laurie, were returning to El Cajon on a Labor Day weekend in Big Bear, California. They took off about 5:30 p.m. Monday, September 3, 1962, to fly home in a new Piper Cherokee. There was a full complement of radio equipment on board. The aircraft carried enough fuel for a four hour flight although the trip to Gillespie Field in El Cajon would take only a little over an hour. The trip spanned some of the most rugged mountainous country in the Southwest United States.

Only minutes after takeoff, the aircraft crashed at 7,900 feet into a group of trees, coming to rest with both wings sheared off, nose crumpled, and tail section high in the air. At impact, or shortly thereafter, Bill and Jacqueline Clark succumbed to injuries and the two young sisters began their long fight for survival. They had only one-half gallon of water, a few cookies, and some extra clothes. A search directed by the Civil Air Patrol and the Air Force was started Tuesday after the Clarks failed to answer a phone call from Mrs. Scott King, Julia and Laurie's grandmother. For three sub-zero temperature nights and above 80 degrees days, the young girls stayed near the plane, once climbing up a hill to call for help—then returning to the plane—all this while scores of search aircraft flew overhead in one of the biggest search and rescue operations in years. Scott King was convinced that he knew where to find the crash. Finally on September 6, about 10:40 a.m., some 65 hours after the tragic event, he sighted the crash scene at about 100 feet altitude from a rented helicopter. Miraculously, both girls survived the ordeal and were rescued only in the "nick of time".

There were literally hundreds of hours of exposure while pilots searched for the downed aircraft. How much safer, faster, and easier would it have been if some electronic device had been activated at the time of the crash on which searching aircraft could home in? How many lives would be saved by being able to locate a crashed aircraft much sooner with search at higher altitudes, faster speeds, in all types of weather, and more efficiently with reduced numbers of searching aircraft?

The Aerospace Rescue and Recovery records for 1961-1967 show 215,404 SAR hours, 135,855 of which were flown by the CAP. In fiscal 1966, the Air Force alone flew 57,585 hours at a total cost to the taxpayers of \$59,224,142. (The Air Force claims to have saved 525 persons that year as a result—at a cost of \$112,808 per person saved.) In the last 10 years over 70 planes and their occupants have yet to be found. There is an over abundance of statistics to emphasize the pressing need for an immediate implementation of a plan which will minimize this tragic waste of lives, suffering, and economic resource.

There were years before life preservers were required on boats. The industry did not choose to initiate such action themselves because of the inference that boating may be unsafe. Legislation had to correct this shortsightedness.

Automobile seatbelts have been recognized for years as a real lifesaving necessity. Yet legislation was necessary to make them standard equipment. It is gratifying indeed to now see that Detroit experts are spending much time and money in developing prototypes of automobile using electronic devices and systems for furthering passenger safety.

Yet few have devoted much attention to assuring the safety of a pilot and his passengers in the event of aircraft disaster. We certainly do not plan on such an event in what is one of the safest modes of transportation—yet we can and should be prepared. Even though organizations, including the far-sighted AOPA, have encouraged the use of emergency downed position indicators, the response is almost negligible. It would appear that the air-frame manufacturers, as others have in the past, do not want to infer to any potential customer that there is anything unsafe about flying—and, perhaps, understandably so. However, one cannot as of this writing, order from the air-frame manufacturer an emergency downed position indicator from the optional equipment list because it is not listed.

Once again we must call for legislation to correct this uneasy situation. The FAA has already taken the first major step in issuing an Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making on February 26, 1968, which would make such units mandatory, if accepted. When it is accepted, we can expect a sigh of relief from the air-frame manufacturers.

We must have a mandatory system to insure maximum effectiveness in locating downed aircraft. A system that requires emergency downed position indicators on all aircraft less than 12,500 pounds gross. A system which will save lives, reduce suffering, and avoid costly low level search sweeps. This system must include not only a transmitter on each aircraft, but a method of obtaining adequate listening watch over the United States to further increase the effectiveness of coverage.

Considering first the transmitter portion, Gloria Heath of the Guggenheim Aviation Safety Center at Cornell has quite clearly shown that there is no one device that satisfies every requirement and condition that may exist. However, the approach proposed here statistically and practically would have been adequate to cover all but a few isolated cases over the past several years. It is not realistic to specify a different piece of equipment for each type of geography over which a plane may be flown. The "general" approach discussed here is economical and serviceable. It does not consider aircraft that spend a considerable portion of their time over water. There have been arguments in the past that would like you to believe that accidents are seasonalized in certain types of geography. After considerable research, Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado said his studies "... indicate clearly that these aircraft were lost in all corners of the United States and were not losses limited to mountainous areas, large bodies of water, or sparsely settled areas".

Therefore, we must ask that all aircraft of less than 12,500 pounds gross be equipped with the transmitter. (Larger aircraft are not a significant part of the problem.)

In addition to meeting the FCC type acceptable minimums, the aircraft transmitter should have the following minimum performance criteria.

Frequency: 121.500 MHz. There is little doubt that this is the primary frequency. It has been recognized as the international distress VHF frequency and insures maximum effectiveness. All aircraft, generally speaking, can now receive this frequency without additional equipment. Successful search patterns can be flown without DF equipment merely by using existing radio receivers.

Power Output: 250 mw effective radiated power. In order to insure a high degree of probability of receiving a signal at 100 miles out, many studies indicate that this is a realistic power level. Making some assumptions about receiver sensitivity, antenna gain, and using free space attenuation at 121.5 MHz, a theoretical distance of 280 miles can be obtained. Considering altitude, 85+ miles at 5,000 feet and 240+ miles at 40,000 feet can theoretically be obtained. Typically, however,

70-100 miles at 10,000 feet is realistic. At this power level providing an approximate 100 mile range for search patterns, a high degree of probability exists in finding a location within a couple of hours without DF capability. (Much shorter time if DF is employed.)

Modulation: Amplitude modulation is desirable for economic reasons. The modulation factor should not exceed 3. If the carrier is not on for at least 33 1/3 % of the time, DF equipment may not be reliable. A single tone is not distinctive. It is not necessary to have voice modulation. The modulating signal should be the distinctive swept tone covering at least 700 Hz within a range from 100 Hz to 1600 Hz at a 2-3 Hz rate. Since some military receivers do not unscquelch unless a 300 Hz signal is detected, this frequency should be covered in the sweep.

Operating Life: The power output should be within 3db of original power at 24 hours at 0° C. It is desirable to have a usable output to 48 hours. The FAA reports that 50% of those persons who are rescued are found within the first 12 hours and 75% of the persons saved are within the first 24 hours. Thereafter, the probability diminishes sharply. With electronic search, we would expect the time intervals to decrease sharply for comparable percentages saved, as well as a further diminishing response after the 24 hour period.

It is recognized that there is a direct relationship between power output and operating life. Common household variety batteries are not sufficient, particularly at low temperatures. Most manufacturers have found that particular NiCd, Mercury or Alkaline cells are necessary in this installation.

Non-Operating Life: At least 2 years. This life is limited by the shelf life of the battery selected. Although some manufacturers may claim a longer shelf life, the 2 year battery replacement life is necessary for maximum probability of effective operation. The unit should also be checked at each annual inspection to insure proper operation. Each manufacturer should outline the test to be performed.

Antenna and Pattern: 1/4 wave or less; essentially omnidirectional. The 1/2 wave antenna is omnidirectional independent of the location of the ground plane. However, it is high impedance which can be seriously degraded by proximity of conducting surroundings. It is also relatively long. For a hand held unit it has valid arguments, but for aircraft mounted equipment it must be ruled out. The 1/4 wave antenna is low impedance and considerably shorter. The major disadvantage is the effect of the location of the ground plane in determining the spectral distribution pattern of the antenna's radiation. For a beacon antenna located on an aircraft, the ground plane is in a fixed relationship to the beacon antenna and therefore the 1/4 wave antenna is satisfactory. If less than a 1/4 wave antenna, it can be matched to space by means of an appropriate network within the transmitter output. In this case the shortened length has aerodynamic advantages. It also has the advantage of being in a fixed relationship to its environment with the result that the matching conditions can be optimized.

Shock and Vibration: Normal airborne environment.

Impact tolerance: 50 g's in any plane. According to Garrett Corporation, data they obtained from the Flight Test Center in Phoenix revealed that in a light plane crash, the impact in the tail section almost never exceeds 20 to 25 g's. In larger, highly stressed fuselage, high performance aircraft, it may exceed this limit. However, our minimum standard is for general aviation aircraft of 12,500 pounds or less and the 50 g value offers a nominal 100% tolerance factor as the minimum.

Activation: Manual and automatic. 5 g's

$\pm 1g$ for single axis sensing, 7 g's $\pm 1g$ for omnidirectional sensing. In single axis switches, the response axis is directed along the longitudinal axis of the aircraft. There must be some angle of tolerance from the axis which would still trigger the switch. As a minimum variation from the axis, it is suggested that if the direction of the force lies within 30°-40° of this axis (i.e., within a cone having a 60°-80° apex angle) the variation in sensitivity of the switch should not be significant. According to A. G. Sahr of Garrett Corporation, "From our study of actual crashes, we have concluded that in the case of light, fixed wing aircraft, forces having the magnitude and direction to activate such a switch do exist at some point during the crash sequence, regardless of the attitude at which the aircraft comes to rest." This observation is consistent with the fact that with very rare exceptions the aircraft will have a significant forward component of velocity which must be absorbed upon contact with an obstacle.

If omnidirectional switches are used, a higher impact tolerance is suggested in order to minimize false triggering such as might be encountered in a hard landing. In this case, the switch might respond to the gravitational component and therefore a 7 g switch has been proposed.

In addition to any automatic means of activation, a simple method of manual operation is an absolute necessity. In cases of forced landings, testing, identification when lost, or other emergency conditions, a manual switch must be easily accessible.

Mounting: Empennage. According to Gary Rose of Garrett Corporation, "In the Flight Safety Foundation files of 686 cases, 143 involved search, only 3 in water. Of the remaining 140, only 2 involved destruction of the tail by fire. In only 7 cases was there damage to the empennage. In over 90% of these cases a device mounted in the tail would have led searchers to the location. The aircraft tail showed a remarkably high percentage of survival in virtually every case. The risk of fire associated with the crash of a light aircraft is remarkably low, so low in fact that it does not justify elaborate and costly fire protection of the equipment."

In addition, we recognize definite advantages of portable or hand held units. These, however, should be in addition to the automatic, permanently mounted transmitter in the rear portion of the aircraft.

Weight: 4 Pounds nominal. It has been reported that this weight does not significantly alter the center of gravity in even the smallest aircraft.

In summary of the transmitter minimum performance criteria, you will note that it closely parallels those recommendations of the RTCA Study Committee published January 14, 1965.

As David Rush, President of ACR Electronics, has stated, "There are two areas of performance that are of major importance in order to make sure of the system's concept. The crash locator is unfortunately, one-half of the system and the receiver and/or homing device on the search aircraft represents the rest of the system." He continues, "From a technical point of view, setting up requirements for a Crash Locator Beacon without taking into account the performance requirements of the DF receivers would be just fooling the Public." As was pointed out earlier, the duty cycle of the transmitter must be 33 1/3% or greater in order to be compatible with the DF-systems that are on the majority of aircraft in use today.

This certainly is not to say, however, that successful searches cannot be conducted without DF equipment. Non DF search exercises have proven quite successful in recent tests. One manufacturer has designed his unit to emit a cone of signals specifically for non DF receivers.

We must consider, however, that DF capability does enhance the effectiveness of locating a position. Low cost VHF-DF is now on the market and is certain to become more popular.

Up until now, we have discussed search and rescue after an alarm has been received or an overdue report has been filed. There is a second phase of this system that can easily provide an economical blanket listening watch over the United States, thus reducing the time interval from emergency to search initiation.

We often hear "there isn't anyone listening up there on 121.5". The second part of this system calls for (1) a reemphasis of the FAA listening watch on 121.5 MHz, and (2) the installation of a simple crystal receiver for 121.5 MHz in each of some 2500 scheduled airliners.

Each unit would merely have a light which would flash when a signal is detected. The crew then tunes in his VHF radio to 121.5 MHz to confirm the reception of a distress signal. With DME and high altitude transponders, an accurate reporting fix can be obtained quickly and easily.

One of the best publicized search and non-rescue crashes in recent years took place in the Trinity Mountains of Northern California. All 3 members of Alvin F. Oien's family survived the crash of their Cessna 195. For the next 7 weeks, Mrs. Oien, and later her 16 year old daughter, Clara, kept a diary on the borders of an Airman's Guide. Five months later a deer hunter discovered the wreckage and two bodies. Yet 59 scheduled airline flights flew over or near the crash sight every 24 hours!

We know that the range increases as the square of the altitude and loss of signal strength is minimal. An airliner at 40,000 feet has a high probability of easily picking up a good signal at 50 to 100 miles. I ask you to draw circles that size over regularly scheduled airline routes in the United States. One can easily see that only an isolated spot or two exists where a signal will not be picked up in an hour or two.

In summary, we find it is necessary to implement a program now of installing emergency downed position indicators on all aircraft less than 12,500 pounds gross. From the National Conference on Aircraft Locator Beacon Implementation held in April 1968 we know that economical equipment is now available. There is no reason that by January 1970 all new aircraft cannot be equipped with transmitters, and by January 1971 all currently active aircraft could not be retrofitted concurrent with annual licensing.

We as the Industry ask that receivers be installed on all scheduled airliners to effectively insure a listening watch over the country.

We ask that the FAA include a designation on the flight plan which would indicate that the pilot has an emergency transmitter on board.

We encourage insurance companies to offer incentives for their clients who carry the emergency transmitter.

It is time for legislation! As a recent article in the AOPA "Pilot" said, "Let's take the search out of rescue".

Rescue yes . . . search is automatic!

A DESPERATE NEED FOR REFORM IN NEW DRUG EVALUATION

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, there exists today a desperate, crying need for the complete overhaul of our new-drug eval-

uation machinery, indeed, the evaluation machinery for all medical products.

Congress acted in 1962 to protect the American public's health by enacting the far-reaching Kefauver amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The concept is as sound today as it was then. Premarketing clearance of drugs, on the basis of safety and efficacy, is essential to the well-being of those receiving drugs for their medical care.

The Food and Drug Administration was given the primary responsibility of seeing that the law was carried out. But in the ensuing years, since the Kefauver amendments were passed, the Food and Drug Administration has grown from a small, ineffective agency into a monster bureaucracy.

In fact, the FDA has grown so large and has assumed so much power over the last 7 years that it is no longer capable of discharging its duties in the manner intended by the Congress. The inertia, so inherent in our large Government agencies, has set in.

The growth of the FDA and the red-tape that becomes part of such growth has led us to the point, today, where the public may be in as much danger from the delays in drug approval as it was in the days before drugs were even evaluated for safety and efficacy.

In addition, the FDA makes up a large segment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is, therefore, subject to the myriad political pressures besetting that highly sensitive Department.

Because employees of the FDA are subject to Government pay scales, it has been difficult to keep men with outstanding medical credentials in that agency's employ. The rapid turnover in staff and the comparatively low pay have led to a "competence gap." This is a particularly ominous situation in an agency so crucial to the health of this Nation's people. We should have men of outstanding qualifications and with the most eminent medical standing overseeing the evaluation of drugs and medical products.

Today I, along with 16 other Representatives, have introduced a bill in the House designed to remedy the ills that have come to plague the development, evaluation and regulation of new drugs and medical products. A similar measure has been introduced in the other body by Senator MARK HATFIELD. Sponsors of this legislation come from both parties, and represent 10 of the 50 States.

With the widespread and increasing concern over the enormous problems now surrounding new drug evaluation, it has become imperative that Congress act quickly and positively to completely overhaul the present system of new-drug evaluation.

Delay in processing new-drug applications has had a profoundly deleterious effect upon drug development in this Nation already. While the safety and effectiveness of these drugs is paramount, the swift and professional evaluation of new drugs is also highly significant.

What good would it do us to develop a general cure for cancer if that cure were to be held up in bureaucratic delays for

7 to 10 years after it had been proved conclusively both safe and effective? Is it reasonable to expect the American public to suffer, even die, simply because their Government has delayed for no reason in allowing their cure to be made available for general use? The answer must be a resounding "No."

Though a cure for cancer has not yet been found, there are well-documented cases of drugs, found useful in the treatment and cure of conditions not quite so widespread, which have been held up for many years through FDA delay.

Let us look at just one case. In 1965 the FDA received a new-drug application for a medicine called desferrioxamine. This medicine was the only known treatment for acute iron poisoning, a condition primarily occurring in children. This is not a widespread condition, but when it occurs the patient's life is at stake and a remedy is needed immediately.

The drug had been a prescription item in 22 foreign countries when our FDA received the application. Testing on the drug in this country had been carried on since 1962. Despite the great reservoir of information available on this drug, the FDA required four separate extensions of time to consider the application. Desferrioxamine was finally okayed by FDA in April of 1968—2 years and 9 months after it had been submitted.

Other cases include DMSO, useful in treating arthritis and many other diseases, still not approved after 7 years of testing in humans, and with no major side effects reported. Over 800 medical research papers attest to its safety and efficacy.

Another case yet is that of Daroil, an agent for carrying anti-allergens in repository therapy. This mineral-oil liquid has been used in over 100,000 documented cases, for over 20 years in human clinical testing. Yet the Food and Drug Administration still has not given it approval, despite the overwhelming evidence of safety, efficacy and need.

Some other drugs that have been delayed prior to approval or are still being held up in FDA redtape include cothyrobal for use in diabetic retinitis, lithium carbonate in the treatment of manic-depression, 5-fluorouracil in skin cancer, and drugs such as Emivan, Dyrenium, and Flagyl, all of which took at least 2 years between submission of an application and final FDA approval.

On the other side of the fence there are drugs that the FDA may have okayed because of political pressures, drugs now showing signs that may eventually prove them unsafe. Birth control pills may be causing deaths through blood clotting. Sodium and calcium cyclamates, used as artificial sweeteners, may cause diarrhea and even chromosomal damage.

What is needed is an entirely new agency to oversee the evaluation and regulation of these new drugs. This agency should be headed by not one man, but by a panel of the most outstanding doctors, researchers, and scientists.

Where the health and welfare of this Nation's people is concerned so directly, there should be no long delays or incompetent decisions on new drugs. Compe-

tent evaluation by a team of highly professional men should be mandatory. The competence gap in drug evaluation must be closed.

After the great Thalidomide catastrophe, Great Britain established a Committee on the Safety of Drugs. This committee has a permanent staff of approximately 25 people. Yet, overseen by a committee of outstanding doctors and scientists, they have managed to do a truly outstanding job.

Without a record of a single medical disaster, and without compromising the safety of the British public, the Dunlop Committee on the Safety of Drugs evaluated and reached decisions on 1,041 drugs in 1965, passing 807 of these; 1,004 drugs in 1966, passing 771 of these; and 888 drugs in 1967, passing 698 of these. And this was done on a budget of less than \$200,000 a year.

By comparison, let us look at similar figures for the Food and Drug Administration.

The FDA has a permanent staff of over 400 people directly involved in drug evaluation and regulation. Of these nearly 120 are involved in the medical section. The FDA budget for this is over \$4,500,000.

Yet how efficient is the FDA? In 1966 they examined 147 drugs and approved 40 of these. In 1967 they examined approximately 335 drugs and passed about 100.

Although the comparison may not be completely accurate, in 1966 alone the British Dunlop Committee evaluated over seven times the number of new drugs and did that with one-sixteenth the number of staff people. That makes the British system approximately 112 times as efficient as our own.

Furthermore, the British are getting safe and effective new drugs and medicines from 1 to 4 years earlier than our American people.

This must be changed.

Our FDA bureaucracy has become unwieldy, oversized, inefficient, and unable to do its job. Within the FDA bureaucracy there are over 15 ways in which new drug applications can be classified and processed.

The average time for processing an application is approaching 2 years. And even this is slowing down. Soon it may be 3, 5, even 10 years between the time a new drug is ready for evaluation and the time it is finally approved for use by the public as safe and effective.

While medical devices are not now covered by law, the FDA has been using every means at its command to gain control over them. It has used labeling provisions in present law to try and encompass therapeutic and diagnostic machinery.

The public should be assured that new medical devices are as safe and effective as the drugs they use. But this area as well as that of new drugs should be removed from FDA jurisdiction and placed under a board of men qualified and competent to evaluate such medical products in medical terms.

The FDA should retain the enforcement powers that it was given originally. But all medical decisions, evaluations,

and regulatory powers over medical products should be removed from FDA domain.

These decisions of a medical and scientific nature should be handled by men with outstanding qualifications in the relevant fields.

I would like to present at this time the provisions of my bill and some articles citing the urgent need for a major overhaul of the mechanism for evaluating drugs and medical products:

A BILL TO CREATE A FEDERAL MEDICAL EVALUATIONS BOARD

PURPOSE

To provide for a maximum of professional competence and swift, thorough review in the evaluation of medical products, so that the highest standards of protection for the public are maintained, yet so medical products which have shown proven efficacy and safety shall be made available to the public without undue delay.

To centralize and upgrade the evaluation of all medical products, and to cut down the expense of overlapping jurisdictions and duplicative efforts in this field.

To assure all medical products of a fair, swift, and highly professional evaluation in terms relevant to protection of the public.

To provide for an independent appeals mechanism in cases where there may be an honest dispute over the safety or efficacy of a medical product or a decision of the Board.

To separate evaluation, primarily a professional scientific and clinical judgment, from enforcement powers in the regulation of medical products.

To establish standards for the evaluation of medical devices in terms of safety and efficacy (not, now provided for in the law) for the increased protection of the public.

PROVIDES

For the establishment of a 15 member Federal Medical Evaluations Board, to be composed of highly qualified, eminent scientists, physicians and clinical researchers, to be appointed by the President.

For the jurisdiction of the Board to encompass evaluation of all medical products, including drugs, antibiotics and medical devices, and regulatory authority over the same.

For the appointment by the Board of an Executive Director and a highly competent medical staff to aid the Board in its evaluations.

For the use by the Board of Advisory Panels to be called in cases where the Board may deem more professional expertise is necessary to making evaluative judgment.

For the mandatory establishment by the Board of ad hoc Independent Advisory Appeals Panels in cases where there may be a disagreement over the decision or judgment of the Board.

For the review and evaluation of medical devices, both diagnostic and therapeutic, on the basis of safety and efficacy.

[From Medical World News, Feb. 17, 1967]
NEW-DRUG APPROVALS CONTINUE TO DECLINE

The number of new drugs introduced in the U.S. during 1966 was less than in any of the previous 18 years. This decline is a continuation of a trend that has been observed for the past nine years. Other trends noted during this period include the increased time required by the Food and Drug Administration to give approval to new drugs, the increasing number of new drugs being marketed overseas before they are available to physicians in this country, and the decline in the number of American companies that are introducing new medicines.

The latest new-product survey, made by Paul de Haen, pharmaceutical industry consultant, shows that the number of prescrip-

tion drug products introduced last year dropped to 80 from 112 the year before. Since 1957, the number of new drugs approved by the FDA for marketing has declined 80%.

Categorizing new products as single new chemical agents, duplicates of existing products, combinations of existing products, or new dosage forms, the survey reveals that the sharpest decline was in the number of single new chemical agents. That figure reached a new low of 12, after a high of 63 in 1959. The 1966 figure was lower than that for any of the four major countries of western Europe. In France, 34 single new chemical agents were marketed, in Germany 42, in Great Britain 20, and in Italy 21. One third of all the foregoing drugs were developed by American scientists.

During 1968, the American drug industry marketed abroad seven single new chemical agents that were not available to physicians in the U.S. Two of the seven, however, were approved for marketing here just last month. The seven drugs include a highly potent diuretic, an antituberculosis agent, two tranquilizers, an antidepressant, an antiarthritic, and a drug for anemia.

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 17, 1967]
SYSTEM "BOGGED DOWN," DOCTOR CHARGES—
U.S. CONTROL OF DRUGS QUESTIONED
(By Martin Bander)

One of the stormy petrels of the current drug regulation controversy Monday night questioned the federal government's way of controlling the sale and use of prescription items.

In a speech taped for television next month, Dr. Louis Lasagna of Johns Hopkins University warned of possible harm from failure to develop new drugs. Conceding the need for some form of drug control, he said in the opening talk of the annual Lowell Lecture Series:

BRITISH SYSTEM

"Whether such control is optimal in the U.S. at present is doubtful. Many feel that our system is bogged down in bureaucratic inefficiency and some have suggested that we might take a page from the infinitely simpler British system.

"Whatever the best solution may be, society cannot afford impasses or obstructionism in this area, anymore than it can afford reckless, irresponsible and premature regulatory actions.

"The recent publicity over patient consent in clinical trials has triggered shrill demands for restrictions which not only ignore certain fundamental aspects of the patient-doctor relationship, but promise to prevent completely some kinds of research.

"No one wishes to trample on the rights of human beings, but it would be cruel indeed to trade theoretic civil libertarian gains for actual public harm from failure to develop new drugs or to keep useless drugs off the market."

ALWAYS A PRICE

Dr. Lasagna said man will always have to pay some price in reaping the benefits of powerful chemicals.

"Our job," he said, "is to maximize the benefits while minimizing the risks. This effort will require the talents, interests, and good will of laboratory scientists, physicians, business men, politicians, regulatory agencies and you, the consumers.

"We might begin our journey by agreeing that the goal we wish to reach is not a 'medicated society' but 'a healthy one.'"

The government controls over drug use and sale has been hotly debated since Dr. Robert L. Goddard became chief of the U.S. Food and Drug Commission. Partly because of the deforming of numerous European infants born to mothers who took thalidomide during pregnancy, controls have been stringently tightened.

Dr. Lasagna also had mixed words for drug companies.

INVITED CRITICISM

He said drug firms asked for criticism by their "shoddy performance" in the past, but, in part, also the industry has probably suffered from resentment at the power and success of modern drug houses.

"Not only have drug firms made tremendous profits in the last 20 years, but by their advertising and 'educational' techniques, they have guided the practice of medicine in a way which is galling to those who would like to see such guidance in the hands of groups less likely to have a bias arising out of the need to earn money for stockholders."

Dr. Lasagna heads the division of clinical pharmacology at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine in Baltimore and is associate professor of medicine and of pharmacology. Presented in the studio of WGBH-TV, the talk was taped for telecast in February.

All lectures in the series will be shown over Channel 2 Sundays beginning Feb. 5.

NEW DRUGS: THE TORTUOUS ROAD TO APPROVAL

It is time that a public dialogue should begin again with regard to the control of investigation into the usefulness of potential new drugs. These controls are administered by the Food and Drug Administration under a new law and under regulations which are not always interpreted so that the public interest is advanced. If these regulations are legally correct, it is clear that the law should be changed in some respects to prevent harm to the public welfare. Specifically, there should be clear recognition of the difference between giving clearance for scientific studies on a small number of subjects who voluntarily elect to participate in the study of an experimental drug, and giving sanction to the general sale and use of a new drug. The latter deserves great caution and exhaustive study of all possible ill effects because of the much wider range of subjects and conditions of use. But when excessively elaborate toxicity studies are required prior to approval of limited clinical studies of a new drug, four results follow. First, there is unfortunately an incomplete correspondence in some cases between the toxicity predicted from animal tests and that encountered under use conditions. Second, there is unjustified delay in obtaining a useful product if the drug proves to be valuable. Many more lives may be lost by such delay than might be saved by excessive caution. Third, there is a serious diversion and therefore a waste of investigative effort in making many unnecessarily complete toxicity studies if it turns out, as it most frequently does during pilot studies, that the new drugs are not actually clinically useful. Fourth, many competent medical scientists have found that their efforts to test new drugs are hampered by the FDA's elaborate restrictions.

Unfortunately, Commissioner Goddard has not been able to recruit a full complement of scientifically competent and experienced personnel. For example, two persons in immediate charge of decisions affecting the clinical testing of cardiovascular drugs are not members of the relevant scientific society dealing with pharmacological matters. The society in question is not an honor society. Any modest scientific qualifications would meet the requirements for membership. If they have not sought to join, they betray lack of interest in their science.

Dedication is not enough to satisfy the real public interest. Furthermore, the stultifying effect of subconscious preference for inaction rather than action in politically sensitive decisions frequently paralyzes public employees. Errors of omission are easily glossed over as compared with errors of commission. An example of the politically gen-

erated paralysis was described by John C. Pollard of the University of Michigan (Lectures, 18 Nov., p. 844) who indicated that he found it impossible to continue scientific studies of LSD. An example of general bureaucratic preference for negative rather than positive action is the case of a colleague who was for more than 3 months refused permission to test for a new purpose a potentially life-saving drug which had already been used, without evidence of toxicity, on half a million humans in other countries for a different purpose. He had submitted a great deal of toxicity data but still more was demanded. It happens that a million or more persons a year die of ventricular fibrillation, which this drug might prevent in many instances.

My points are that: (i) The public interest demands that risks of inaction as well as of action be taken into consideration in decision-making regarding the clinical testing of drugs. (ii) The FDA should use more outside civilian consultant committees of highly qualified experts rather than its own staff to make crucial decisions concerning testing of important new drugs. These experts, while not full-time employees of regulatory agencies, would be willing to serve their turns as decision-making consultants. The responsibility should not rest entirely upon hapless civil servants whose careers could be wrecked by an unfortunate positive decision, but will never be injured by even worse negative decisions. The use of such civilian panels of experts has many precedents in this country and elsewhere. (iii) The FDA should exhaust the opportunities for conference with parties at issue to attempt to resolve gray areas of scientific interpretation before resorting to heavyhanded and precipitate legal action. It should abandon the practice of issuing administrative orders without prior offering of opportunity for constructive criticism. The order of 30 August 1966 on experimental drugs is a case in point. (iv) Congress should reinvestigate through appropriate committees the actual operation of the new drug aspects of present laws and act to correct any defects it finds which are adverse to the public welfare. Congress did not intend to write laws that would improperly inhibit research on new drugs or on new uses of old drugs. But it has written laws which, in their effect, do exactly that.

MAURICE B. VISSCHER,

Department of Physiology, University of
Minnesota Medical School, Minneapolis.

[From Headache, January 1966]

BACK TO THE MIDDLE AGES

(By Seymour Diamond, M.D.)

No one can condone the basic dishonesty of the thalidomide fiasco. However, one wrongful act by a member of the drug industry cannot and should not set off a series of impediments to research that actually will be harmful to the health of our nation. I am not referring to drugs that do not materially influence life or death, i.e., a contraceptive drug. What I am referring to is existing, life-saving drugs which are now being held from the American public.

A potent diuretic, that works in intractable pulmonary edema and irreversible heart failure, has been withheld from general use for months because of unnecessary red tape. The Federal Drug Authorities have insisted on setting the standards for the physician use of this product. Can a government agency determine and set up rules by which the individual physician should practice medicine? Can they determine by regulation the severity of illness and situation of use for each individual patient? Is not the practice of medicine in itself an art which the individual physician must develop for himself? He must be the one to determine the type of drug to use on each individual patient. Isn't

government control going too far when they dictate the degree of the illness governing use of the drug? Rather the FDA should limit its jurisdiction. It should provide for descriptive literature to accompany any pharmaceutical, carefully listing its actions, side effects and contraindications.

The general public is quickly appraised of the side effects and deleterious effects of a product. They are also readily familiarized with unconventional and useless projects even though these are rare exceptions in research.

They should instead be made aware of the consequences of this present government policy.

The President of the United States stated in his message to Congress, "that the consumers interest is the American interest; and in guarding this interest, we improve the lives of the people in our nation." Is the consumer, the American public, really being served by over-policing?

The wrong perpetrated by the horror of Thalidomide has been over-corrected to the extent of setting our drug research back to the middle ages.

[From Medical Tribune, Aug. 14, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—1: NEED FOR REORGANIZATION FOUND IN NEW REAPPRAISAL

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D.)

On July 6, 1967, in Washington, D.C., before a packed audience of drug industry officials, Dr. Dennis Cahal, medical assessor of Britain's Committee on Safety of Drugs, explained how new drugs are approved in his country. He told a fascinating story of how some really tough decision making goes on within a framework of regulation that is entirely voluntary, without force of law. This system, he said, yields final decisions on major submissions—approvals, of course, because the others are withdrawn—usually within three months. Minor submissions or supplemental applications are disposed of within a few days. The work of his permanent secretariat is done by nine professionals and 16 auxiliaries and clericals. The committee and its three subcommittees meet once a month, serving without pay.

This report to America was most timely, because at this very moment top officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are studying what, if anything, to do about the future organization of the Food and Drug Administration in the light of plans for reorganizing the over-all department along Pentagon lines to include a subsidiary Department of Health.

Of course, Dr. Cahal had much more to say, not relevant to this discussion of FDA's future. One year ago, in England, I was privileged to ask Dr. Cahal most of the same questions put to him by his Washington audience. The essence of his most recent remarks can be found in the articles I wrote for MEDICAL TRIBUNE last year (August 22 to September 19, 1966). In the concluding article I drew inferences for the future organization of the FDA.

Now, one year later, much has occurred in the United States with implications for the FDA future. The consumer protection movement has become stronger, especially in the political sector. Both the FDA and industry have had some experience in dealing with the efficacy review panels of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, which have been examining drugs approved by the FDA prior to the passage of the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962. Increasing attention has been given to manufacturing and quality controls in the light of the national debate on generic prescribing. The country, the medical profession, and the industry have had one more year of reacting to the dynamic leadership of FDA Commissioner Dr. James L. Goddard, who probably introduced more change in the regulation of drugs within the past year and a

half than his predecessors had since passage of the 1938 Food and Drug Act.

The time is ripe for open dialogue. The future of the FDA is not a matter solely for the bureaucratic and political judgment of the elders of the HEW in consultation with key members of the Congress and the Executive Office of the President. For one thing, HEW is now a party at interest in the outcome of FDA decisions. It has an economic interest in the approval of drugs from the standpoint of efficacy, in the light of its responsibilities for Medicare and Medicaid. It has a program interest in having new drugs—and potentially devices—approved in the light of its heavy investments in medical research and development.

From the standpoint of practicing physicians, it has never been more timely to get into the debate, for upon its outcome may depend the extent to which professional medical practices are to be centrally dictated, covering availability and choice of drugs and determination of dosages.

POLICIES SHOULD AID DOCTORS

To put this discussion into perspective, I suggest that the value of anything the FDA does in the drug area, as well as how it is organized and staffed, must be measured from the standpoint of how doctors are helped or hindered in their practice of medicine. We are concerned here mainly with prescription drugs, whose availability and use are controlled for the patient through the medium of the physician. In a broad sense, the effectiveness of FDA operations should be measured in terms of effect upon public health, but practically this might be an exercise in counting angels on a pinhead.

How do we know whether tougher reviews of ethical drug advertising and insistence upon fair balance in describing the advantages and disadvantages of a drug will make any or much difference in prescribing practices and public health? How do we know whether prescribing practices will be altered or improved by imposing a generic name on a label every time the brand name is used? How do we know whether a master drug compendium, kept current through a revision service and occupying a 5-foot shelf, would help or hinder a physician in his own practice of medicine? How do we know whether FDA's Bureau of Medicine is overstuffed or understaffed or whether adding more people would help or hinder the drug review process and ultimately help or hinder the physician in his care of patients? And so on.

Such questions may have been asked in the past, but they certainly have not been answered. The fact is that no one knows the answers. From a political standpoint it may not be important to know, for the politician may be concerned only with assuring a constituency that *something* is being done. In this regard, it is fair to say that the Government must accord some value, in planning its organization, to the illusion of accomplishment. Whether or not one has proof of effective action, the public wants to know that in some sensitive area—as with drugs—its government is doing something. Thereby, if something goes wrong, someone can be held accountable.

MORE GROWTH CALLED FOR

Ever since its creation in 1906, in another form, the FDA has grown by addition of responsibilities and staff. Always the question has been: What must be done to strengthen the FDA? Present projections call for even more growth. While Congress, before 1962, occasionally cut back on FDA appropriations for purely political reasons, no one seems to have asked seriously whether we could have a more effective FDA through cutting back on its staff operations. To do so would, of course, call for major reconstructions of philosophy and technique. It is at least worth considering, and I so propose. In a crude way of putting it, one can obstruct the progress

of the meal by having too many functionaries in the kitchen, all doing seemingly worth-while things.

In my articles last year I said that the FDA is an anachronism in an age of science. New concepts of organization and decision making are needed. The FDA cannot really be strengthened from within. It cannot assemble within its own walls the technical competence needed to make judgments on Today's drugs, let alone the much more complex products it will be called upon to review in the future. The fact is that the greatest competence is to be found in the laboratories of the major drug companies and leading medical schools. The FDA does occasionally attract competent people, but they do not stay. Many join for reasons of convenience in the absence of other alternatives. The FDA does not offer an atmosphere of career ladder for creative advancement and recognition in the various areas of scientific and clinical judgment in which it desperately needs expertise. Whatever else might be done to improve FDA organization, the upgrading of its scientific posture is a must.

[From Medical Tribune, Aug. 17, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—II: A SINGLE DRUG AGENCY URGED UTILIZING REFERENCE PANELS

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D.)

In reviewing my conclusions concerning the organization of the Food and Drug Administration published in MEDICAL TRIBUNE last year, I find little to change, other than to add and explain. The comments which follow are based on interactions after publication and on discussions held since then with scores of authorities.

The first problem to be faced is that of scope. Should there continue to be a single agency with responsibility for regulating foods, drugs, cosmetics, and hazardous substances, with the possible addition of medical devices? Are these still a homogeneous assortment requiring common direction, or have we reached a stage of scope and sophistication in the medical area which requires that it be separated out for independent attention?

The time is perhaps ripe for change by both exclusion and inclusion. The main distinguishing feature between prescription drugs and all the other objects of current FDA control is the intermediary role of the physician, who is FDA's main client. The counting of rat droppings in grain elevators, the checking of weight fill in cereal boxes, the labeling of the potential hazards of tear-gas guns, and the control of food and color additives, among other duties, all call for different judgmental processes.

The scope of a Federal drug agency should include only drugs and biologicals now under the control of the National Institutes of Health, Division of Biologics Standards. (No such transfer should be made, however, unless other upgrading proposals are adopted to assure maintenance of a viable scientific environment for DBS.) If over-the-counter drugs are kept within the scope of the Federal drug agency—for they need not be—then it should be complete, including the transfer out of the Federal Trade Commission of responsibility for policing advertising of generally available drug products.

Nondrug responsibilities could go into an environmental health agency, with the possible exception of foods, which might also be so disposed or might be reassigned to the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission.

The important point is that drug responsibilities alone are of sufficient magnitude to warrant the full-time attention of the over-all drug authority. I wonder if the public even thinks of food when it identifies with the FDA, whose news headlines predominate in the drug area almost exclusively and whose Congressional investigations are sim-

ilarly skewed. Instead of bureaucratic growth, I propose bureaucratic devolution.

This proposal might not accord with aspirations in some circles for an expanded structure of consumer protection. Without detracting from the importance of the latter, I suggest the difficulty of housing all consumer-protection activities under one roof, for they are disseminated among many different Federal departments and agencies. Nor does it necessarily follow that all consumer-oriented activities within HEW need be under integrated direction. Again, the drug situation is different because of its involvement of the whole medical-scientific community in addition to the existence of the physician as intermediary client.

SHOULD FUNCTION INDEPENDENTLY

Ideally, the drug agency should be completely divorced from the interested influence of HEW, functioning as an independent agency. This would minimize the possibility of political interference with aspects of the professional practice of medicine, apart from influences on its organization stemming from various Public Health Service programs in addition to Medicare and Medicaid.

All agencies cannot be independent, however, so an alternative would be to accord the drug agency a semiautonomous status, as was done in Britain. When its Committee on Safety of Drugs was created, the Government decided for about the same reasons given above that it would avoid influencing drug decisions in view of the economic leverage of the Ministry of Health. The latter, therefore, merely provides secretariat support. It does not enter into decision making in any way.

Whatever the arrangement, I return to the organization format proposed in my earlier articles. The drug agency would be headed by a board of commissioners who could be full- or part-time (although its chairman should probably be full-time), whose membership would be drawn from medical scientists, medical practitioners, and social scientists. The commissioners would be appointed by the President, without Senate confirmation, from among nominees proposed by accredited professional bodies. The commissioners would establish policies and standards, issue regulations, take appeals on decisions of advisory panels, appoint an agency administrator, and evaluate staff performance generally.

Actually, decision making on professional matters, including new-drug applications, would be vested in reference panels which would operate somewhat along the same line as NIH study sections. To the extent practicable, these might be organized along therapeutic specialty lines. Membership of the reference panels would be nominated to the Board of Commissioners by professional bodies. Their qualifications would be investigated and submitted to the board by its own secretariat, which would be independent of the administrator. The decisions of the panels would be published in the Federal Register and would automatically become binding unless appealed by any aggrieved party at interest, as administratively defined, including the administrator, the latter on advice of the Bureau of Medicine. The bureau would provide work-up services for the panels. It would also dispose of minor submissions, under delegation, when these would not have to go forward to the full panels. The last is an important point. The FDA has not made any distinctions in its published statistics as to minor submissions and major new submissions—which call for, or should receive, entirely different processing.

VESTIBULE PERIOD SUGGESTED

In the work-up of cases, the Bureau of Medicine, cut loose from the legalistics which now so heavily dominate proceedings, would put them through an initial vestibule period, during which informal conferences would be held with manufacturers to assure that all

needed information for prompt decision making has been submitted. Such informal reviews should be without commitment to any parties, both as a means of speeding the movement of the file and as assurance that the Government would still be free to request additional data submissions.

One of the problems with the present regulatory setup, which is not in the public interest, is the arms-length dealing of two adversaries, warily seeking to catch or evade the other, with respective legal resources in depth. The public pays for this through increased costs on both sides as well as through deprivation of the use of occasionally important drugs. The probability of correcting this is not very great under present procedural arrangements. Some big change is needed, such as the reorganization proposed here or a new regulatory philosophy, or both. I choose both.

Furthermore, the approval of new drugs must be linked more closely to the stages of clinical experience. The approval of a new-drug application is presently a formal gesture subject to revocation in the event of bad conduct reports. Approval must still be regarded as an important action, not lightly retrieved, but the emphasis should be on tentative approvals at the earliest stages of clinical trial, broadening out progressively in line with clinical experience, properly monitored and reported.

The use of reference panels will provide a buffer zone in the relationships between government and industry. Presently, drug companies avoid any open, critical expression for fear of reprisal.

[From Medical Tribune, Aug. 21, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—III: BEST CONTROL OF DRUGS SEEN BY LICENSED SELF-REGULATION

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D.)

One major change in regulatory philosophy for the Government's drug agency would be a real commitment to maximum self-administration by industry, with Federal monitoring at key leverage points. In fact, except for obtaining approvals every time anything at all is changed, no matter how inconsequential, the drug industry already operates on a self-administering basis. The FDA is so thinly spread on plant inspections and quality controls as to be only slightly more than symbolic. This may be one of the reasons it makes use of snoop-and-swoop tactics, reinforced with threats of criminal proceedings in the best (or worst) style of a law enforcement agency.

FDA Commissioner James L. Goddard said it would cost \$90,000,000 for batch certification of ethical drug products of all kinds, while continuous plant inspection would add another \$30,000,000-\$50,000,000. I think his staff underestimated badly. One of the biggest problems, anyway, would be to find the inspectors, whose training, directly or indirectly, would have to come from the drug companies themselves. Even surmounting this difficulty, the task could probably be done more effectively and less expensively by putting more responsibility on drug companies through a licensing system.

Each company would have to demonstrate its ability to produce products of specific categories whose quality would be reliably assured. Plant facilities would be inspected. The adequacy of quality control procedures would be reviewed. Independence of the quality control function would be verified. A qualified producer would be licensed for his capabilities. A qualified research, development, and production facility would be given a broader certification.

Such licenses would not relieve companies of making defined types of new-drug submissions, but they could be given more latitude for making minor changes, subject to simultaneous filing and to post-audit. Li-

censees would be obliged to keep their own batch test records, which would accord with good industrial practice. The drug agency would continue to make independent checks, but these could be made more selectively and with greater sophistication. The power of this method of control lies in the fear of the company that part or all of its license might be revoked either for willful violation or for consistent deviation from standard.

This concept of self-regulation is not new or unique. The Division of Biologics Standards operates through a licensing system for vaccines and other biologics. I had personal acquaintance with a system I once designed as a regulatory official in another area. Commissioner Goddard has asserted he is in favor of this licensing approach but fears many or most drug companies are not yet willing or able to embrace the concept.

He told me he is willing to trade off freedom of action on minor matters which now require prior approval for licensed or certified companies under such a contemplated system. This is not to be confused with recent statements by the Commissioner on self-regulation in which he merely advised drug companies to do voluntarily that which his inspectors would subsequently check on, without any changes in the presently oppressive prior approval system.

HOW MUCH CONTROL IS NEEDED?

Another philosophical question to be faced is: How much control is needed to assure effective control? For each additional measure of control added, does the taxpayer equivalent benefit? Some people suggest that computers can be used to facilitate control. Would this be more effective from a qualitative standpoint? If not, would it be more expensive? Do mountains of data in support of new-drug applications better enable reviewing officers to ascertain whether proper toxicity and efficacy studies have been made, or does superabundance obscure significance?

In other words, does the insistence of the FDA on more and more data lead to more rational decision making, or does it merely establish that a bureaucracy has not been remiss in covering every contingency? What we must not overlook is that control costs money for the drug company and the Government. These costs are ultimately passed on directly to drug users and indirectly to all taxpayers.

Such questions are aimed at a larger phenomenon of bureaucracy from which the FDA is singularly not exempt. Bureaucratic regulation tends to acquire an elegance of its own—a baroque elegance. It propels into the future the protective devices engineered to assure that mishaps encountered in the past are not repeated, regardless of probability. Rules, regulations, record keeping, and reporting requirements grow like barnacles on the hull of a ship, slowing its passage and adding to the cost of the journey.

Let there be no mistake: control is necessary, and with control go regulations and paper work. The question is, how much? The FDA must be called upon to demonstrate a cost/benefit relationship in its control processes. More critically, how much real difference will a measure of control make in how the doctor prescribes and administers drugs? Tangibly and practically, how is the patient to be benefited?

COMPENDIUM PROPOSED

This brings up the matter of central dictum on prescribing practice. Commissioner Goddard acknowledges that package inserts are rarely seen by physicians and that, anyway, they are finely printed on Bible paper. He proposes, instead, the publication of an all-embracing compendium that would contain what are now the package inserts for all drugs, covering indications, contraindications, side effects, pharmacologic action,

etc. Officially recognized dosages would be included. Physicians could deviate from these under special procedures and at their own risk. The movement in this direction is bureaucratic, logic, which formalizes current judgment as to the handling of modalities, judgments arbitrated by bureaucratic physicians.

Conceivably, this might assure rational therapy from a statistical standpoint. As an occasional patient, however, I would prefer that my physician have maximum latitude in prescribing in the light of my own medical history, conditioned by the uniqueness of my current circumstances. More broadly, for the practice of medicine, the question is whether rulebook medicine is to supersede professional judgment. Does the FDA now believe medicine has reached a state of being more science than art? How wonderful that would be!

Besides, does anyone familiar with rulebook systems believe a massive compendium would be read and used? Here again the system's wish and assertion must be put to human engineering tests.

The proposals for reorganization and self-regulation would both require and make possible an upgrading in professional capabilities of the drug agency and in management perspectives of drug companies. The FDA successor should have its own intramural staff engaged in pharmacologic, toxicologic, and other biochemical researches. In parallel, the drug agency should be the funding source of the pharmacology-toxicology centers now under grant from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. Together with the transferred-in Division of Biologics Standards these associated activities would constitute a critical mass of creative endeavor, attracting to it and influencing biomedical scientists of promise and stature. Rotating fellowships could also be provided as a means of extending the inputs and outputs of such a science center.

PUBLIC INSPECTION URGED

Of course, these scientists would have to be insulated from the police-oriented functions of the drug agency. These, too, should have their orientations converted more constructively. Also, the affairs of the drug agency should be open for closer public inspection, as with other regulatory agencies. The FDA tags practically everything as being secret, for reasons of protecting doctor-patient relationships, trade secrets, and privileged administrative information. Each of these has a validity factor, but the FDA does not mention its dominant concern that its own fallibilities not be held open to public view.

The drug industry has been going through its own stages of maturation and in many respects has advanced its standards and capabilities at a faster pace than has the FDA. The industry as it now exists is relatively young, dating mainly from World War II production expansion and the therapeutic explosion following immediately thereafter. It has lagged somewhat—but not uniformly so—in putting at its helm a professional management leadership. It needs to accord a heavier weight in top-management decision-making processes to medical-scientific judgments than to those of marketing and legal departments, although their inputs must necessarily also find proper place.

In many respects, forces in being in the drug industry are moving it to an ever higher level of scientific sophistication. The FDA will thereby be under challenge to keep pace if it is not to stultify industrial creative processes. Recent developments, such as establishment of the Syntex research center and the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology, will be taking drug industry scientists far out onto the creative frontiers of medicine. This trend may be accelerated by parallel trends toward oligopoly, under which a few major companies will account for most

pharmaceutical activity. It is a trend not unique to the drug industry. After World War II there were some 450 luggage companies in the United States. Currently there are about 150. Of these, from five to 10 account for most of the business. And so it has been going in other industries. These trends have implications also for regulatory control processes.

Finally, although I counsel the need for pluralistic mechanisms of scientific decision making, situated mainly outside of the drug agency, where knowledge is concentrated, I do not wish to minimize the need for aggressive administrative leadership. Boards, commissions, and panels do not easily provide coherent leadership and direction. To the administrator of the drug agency would be given most of the responsibility he now has. Little would be taken from him. In fact, through his increased use of extramural advisory bodies, Commissioner Goddard has already ceded *de facto* decision making. How could he really overrule the judgments of the peers of the realm empaneled by the august National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council?

Dr. Goddard has undoubtedly been the most dynamic of Food and Drug Commissioners in history. He has drawn both praise and criticism. Considering the tasks and organization he inherited, he has made remarkable progress in restructuring FDA's processes. Without doubt, the public was in the mood for a "man of the hour" who would be active as well as expressive. Anyone who surveys the scene dispassionately must conclude that the country needed a Goddard, at least for a while, and will be better off for the experience. In the longer reach of public affairs and of trends in medical practice and organization, however, the concentration of too much power over the rules of medicine in a single person is to be avoided.

While I have presented these notions as personal observations and proposals, they stem from my own dialogues with people whose experiences are infinitely broader and deeper than mine in their respective areas. What is so urgently needed now is open, constructive dialogue on a much greater scale, to bring out differing ideas and at least some consensus.

[From the Hospital Tribune, July 29, 1968]

THE END AND THE MEANS

You can measure a wall's dimensions by shooting missiles at it. The end point is the destruction of the wall, and there is a real, if approximate, correspondence between the three dimensions of the wall and the number of projectiles it takes to raze it. But if you wind up knowing its size, you do not wind up with a wall. The end may or may not justify the means, but the means cannot usefully be chosen without evaluating the end to be achieved.

When Dr. Louis Lasagna, Associate Professor of Medicine and of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics at the Johns Hopkins University, spoke on pharmaceutical communications at a recent meeting of the American Marketing Association he in effect discussed the ends sought by the Food and Drug Administration in a number of its regulations and the means utilized to achieve them. It was Dr. Lasagna's opinion that the large amount of detailed data required by the FDA regulations for drug advertising may be defeating the purpose of the regulations. The "excessive" information required in pharmaceutical ads is harder to grasp and retain, said Dr. Lasagna, than data conveyed briefly and may serve to confuse rather than to enlighten. We take it that Dr. Lasagna was referring to the "brief summary," required by Congress, relating to side effects, contraindications, and effectiveness of a drug.

The Congressman responsible for this sec-

tion of the Food and Drug Act of 1962 said that he wanted "to see to it that information in capsule form goes to doctors in connection with the advertising." He cited as an example a drug with severe side effects permitted to go on the market with the requirement that these side effects be listed. They were covered, he pointed out, "in about six lines, about six words across."

But if this is what the Congressman sought to accomplish, it was expanded far beyond his intent by the FDA. Shakespeare in a somewhat different context spoke about "wasteful and ridiculous excess." We think a comment of Samuel Taylor Coleridge is even more applicable. That poet said, "Every reform, however necessary, will by weak minds be carried to an excess, that itself will need reforming." Coleridge made this statement in 1817, but poets have a knack for putting their fingers on imperishable truths.

A HOME EMERGENCY GUIDE TO SAVE LIVES

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, often in our country a life is lost or a person crippled for life for lack of some simple, easily obtained knowledge on how to react to a medical emergency. For this reason, a home emergency guide is utterly essential. One way to fill this need is to make available to constituents such a home emergency guide. Its text should be readable and it must lay out for the person in danger how to react to basic emergencies.

I have provided such a pamphlet to the people of the 13th Congressional District, and include its text here:

EMERGENCY TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

Dear Neighbor: I believe that emergency information should be available to everyone. I have compiled this guide which includes telephone numbers, first aid instruction, and emergency behavior.

This booklet doesn't cover all possible contingencies, but I think if you keep it close at hand, near the phone, you will be ready to meet most emergencies calmly, quickly and capably.

This first aid guide in no way replaces a doctor's care. In all cases your first move should be to contact a doctor or the police.

BERTRAM L. PODELL,

Member of Congress.

Police: Emergency, 911; Headquarters, 625-4400.

Fire: On the street: Pull lever at the nearest fire alarm box. Stay by the fire alarm box to direct firemen to the fire.

Ambulance, 911.

Poison: Poison Control Center, 566-8020.

Hospitals: Brookdale Hospital, Linden Boulevard & Rockaway Parkway, 495-6800; Caledonian Hospital, 10 St. Pauls Place, 469-1000; Community Hospital of Brooklyn, 2525 Kings Highway, 252-2600; Kings Highway Hospital, 3201 Kings Highway, 252-3000; Maimonides Medical Center, 4802 10th Avenue, 853-1200; Coney Island Hospital, Ocean & Shore Parkways, 743-4100; Kings County Hospital, 451 Clarkson Avenue, 462-4000.

Dental Emergency: NE 8-0400.

All Night Pharmacy: Neergaard Pharmacy, 454 5 Avenue, Brooklyn, SO 8-0600.

Animals: ASPCA, TR 5-9580; Dog Bites, 566-7105.

This guide is no substitute for your doctor! Don't hesitate to call him.

Telephone number of your personal physician —

Congressional office, 1507 Ave. M, 336-7575.

MOUTH-TO-MOUTH RESCUE BREATHING

The following are the Red Cross directions for Mouth to Mouth Rescue Breathing: Turn victim on his back.

1. Wipe out victim's mouth quickly. Turn his head to the side. Use your fingers to get rid of mucus, food, sand, and other matter.

2. Straighten victim's head and tilt back so that chin points up. Push or pull his jaw up into jutting out position to keep his tongue from blocking air passage. This position is essential for keeping the air passage open throughout the procedure.

3. Place your mouth tightly over victim's mouth and pinch nostrils closed to prevent air leakage. For a child, cover both nose and mouth tightly with your mouth. (Breathing through handkerchief or cloth placed over victim's mouth or nose will not greatly affect the exchange of air.)

4. Breathe into victim's mouth or nose until you see his chest rise. (Air may be blown through victim's teeth, even though they may be clenched.)

5. Remove your mouth and listen for the sound of returning air. If there is no exchange, recheck jaw and head position. If you still do not get air exchange, turn victim on side and slap him on back between shoulder blades to dislodge matter that may be in throat. Again, wipe his mouth to remove foreign matter.

6. Repeat breathing, removing mouth each time to allow for escape of air. For an adult breathe about 12 times per minute. For a child, take relatively shallow breaths, about 20 per minute. Continue until victim breathes for himself.

TREATMENT FOR POISONING

Poisoning treatment must be administered immediately. Consult label on packaging for antidote. Call doctor, police or poison control center for instructions.

In treatment of poisoning there are two primary concerns (1) to expel the poison from the body through vomiting where possible. (2) to protect body passages from harm through neutralization of chemical.

Poisons

Acids, see 16.
Alcohol: Denatured, see 15; rubbing, see 10; wood, see 15.
Ammonia (Household), see 13.
Antifreeze: with ethyl alcohol or ethylene glycol, see 10; with methyl alcohol, see 15.
Bleach (Chlorine), see 17.
Camphor, see 1.
Carbon Monoxide, see 18.
Cleaning Fluids (carbon tet. types), see 9.
Disinfectant: with chlorine, see 17; with carbolic acid, see 12.
Fluorescent Tube Powder, see 1.
Food Poisoning, see 3.
Gasoline, see 19.
Insect & Rat Poisons: arsenic, see 21; DDT, see 3; phosphorus, see 8; sodium fluoride, see 20.
Iodine Tincture, see 11.
Kerosene, see 19.
Lye, see 13.
Mushrooms (Poisonous), see 3.
Oil of Wintergreen, see 10.
Paint (Lead), see 3.
Solvents, see 19.
Turpentine, see 3.
Washing Soda, see 13.

Overdoses

Alcohol (Liquors), see 10.
Aspirin, see 10.
Barbiturates, see 5.
Bromides, see 3.
Codeine, see 7.
Headache & Cold Remedies, see 10.
Laxatives (Candy or other), see 6.
Morphine, Opium, see 7.
Paregoric, see 7.
"Pep" Drugs, see 21.
Sleeping Drugs, see 5.

Antidotes to use

1. If victim is conscious, cause vomiting by giving either: Teaspoon of powdered mustard in glass of warm water, or Teaspoon salt in water, or Inserting finger in throat. For vomiting, place victim face down with head lower than hips.

2. Give a mixture consisting of: 2 tablespoons of powdered charcoal or powdered burnt toast, 1 tablespoon milk of magnesia, 4 tablespoons very strong tea.

3. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in pint (2 glasses) of water. Finally give 2 or 3 cups of hot coffee or strong tea.

5. Cause vomiting (#1). Give same mixture as #2. Give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in pint (2 glasses) of water. Then give several cups of hot coffee or very strong tea. Keep patient walking or moving.

6. Cause vomiting (#1). Keep patient warm. Give steamed dry rice or dry toast. Replace body fluids with water or weak tea. Never give cathartics.

7. Give same mixture as #2. Give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in pint (2 glasses) of water. Force patient to remain awake.

8. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 1 tablespoon epsom salts in glass of warm water. Then give half cup mineral oil. Never vegetable or animal oil.

9. Fresh air immediately. If unconscious, give artificial respiration. Summon police emergency for oxygen. If conscious, cause vomiting (#1). Then give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in glass of water. Never give alcohol.

10. Cause vomiting (#1). Give same mixture as #2. Give 2 cups strong tea or coffee.

11. Give 6 tablespoons thick starch paste—made by mixing cornstarch or flour in water. Then give 6 tablespoons salt in quart of warm water. Drink until vomit liquid is no longer blue in color. Then give several glasses of milk, or egg whites in cooking oil or milk.

12. Give 4 tablespoons olive oil, or castor oil, or cooking oil. Then give glass of milk or beaten white of 2 eggs in glass of water. Then 1 or 2 cups coffee or tea. Avoid causing vomiting.

13. Give 2 tablespoons vinegar in pint (2 glasses) of water. Give white of 2 eggs or 6 tbsps. olive or cooking oil. Coffee. Avoid causing vomiting.

15. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 1 tablespoon bicarbonate of soda (baking soda) in pint (2 glasses) of water. Vomit. Repeat until alcohol odor disappears. Then 1 teaspoon baking soda in glass of milk. Protect patient's eyes from light.

16. Mix either 3 tablespoons milk of magnesia or whites of 12 eggs in several glasses of water—or give several glasses of milk. Avoid causing vomiting. For acids on skin, flush with water for 15 minutes.

17. Give 1 teaspoon of spirits of ammonia (not household ammonia) in glass of water. 2 cups hot coffee or very strong tea mixed with whites of 3 eggs.

18. Get victim into fresh air. If unconscious, give artificial respiration. Summon police emergency for oxygen. Several cups hot coffee or very strong tea after patient revives.

19. Give half cup of olive oil or cooking oil. Several cups coffee or strong tea. Avoid causing vomiting.

20. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 2 tablespoons milk or magnesia or 4 egg whites in milk. Then 2 or 3 glasses of plain milk.

21. Cause vomiting (#1). Give same mixture as #2. Get patient to a hospital.

SHOCK

Cause: Depressed condition of many of the body functions due to the failure of enough blood to circulate through the body due to injury.

Symptoms: Eyes: vacant, lackluster; Pupils: dilated; Breathing: shallow; Pulse: weak or absent; Skin: pale, moist, cold.

Treatment: Lay person down. Elevate lower portion of body except if there is head injury,

if breathing difficulty is increased, or if patient complains of increased pain.

Cover patient only enough to prevent large loss of body heat. Do not attempt to add heat to body. It is better if the patient is slightly cool than too warm.

Do not administer stimulants.

You may give the patient small sips of water.

BLEEDING

Bleeding can almost always be controlled by direct pressure with a clean cloth over the wound.

Application of bare hand may be necessary in stemming major blood loss until cloth is available.

After bleeding is controlled apply additional layers of cloth to form a good sized covering, bandage snugly and firmly. Do not remove dressing. If blood saturates dressing apply more layers of cloth.

In case of severe wounds, compression of main supplying blood vessel against underlying bone may be helpful for quick, temporary, partial control until cloth can be applied.

Caution: Tourniquets should be used only when there is a decision to risk sacrifice of a limb in order to save a life. A tourniquet patient must be taken to a hospital promptly.

ELECTRIC SHOCK

Cut electric power—either pull fuse in your fuse box or use a dry dish towel, dry rag, or dry rubber glove to pull the cord, disconnect the appliance.

If you can't cut the electric power, use a long dry stick, or long length of dry cloth to jerk the person free from contact with the electric power.

If breathing stops start mouth to mouth breathing and call police—911.

CHOKING

Observe patient for 30 seconds to see if he can cough up object. After 30 seconds slap patient sharply on the back between shoulder blades or try to dislodge object from his throat with your forefinger.

BURNS

Mild Burns: Hold burn under cold running water or submerge in ice water until pain subsides.

Severe Burns: Call Police—911.

Never put butter, oil, or unguents on severe burns. Use only cold running water, or ice water on burns.

Keep air from burn. Application of a loose thick dressing relieves pain and if sterile prevents further contamination. Dressing should be dry because wet dressings stick to wound and allow germs to enter from outside.

Burned persons need fluids, but fluids often cause nausea. Judgment is therefore needed to administer fluids properly. Give only enough fluid to quench thirst.

FROST BITE

Warming hand against frost bitten part is helpful, but rubbing is harmful.

Cover frozen parts with woolen material and provide extra clothing or blankets for patient.

Give patient warm drinks.

If part of body is still cold place it in warm water at body temperature.

ETHICS IN SCHOOLS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently the Community Newspapers, a chain of five, vital weekly newspapers on Long Island, carried an editorial that eloquently ex-

pressed the need for teaching our young people self-discipline and the basic difference between right and wrong. The editorial, entitled "Ethics in Schools," made the interesting point that "Unprincipled children will grow up into unprincipled businessmen, lawyers, teachers, and Congressmen."

As the loss of principle and discipline grows in our schools, this is a potential consequence for us to ponder. I, therefore, commend the aforementioned editorial to my colleagues' attention and, under leave to extend my remarks, wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

ETHICS IN SCHOOLS

A hard-leftish academic person whom we admired for his genuine enthusiasm and tolerance of the mannerless student fringe has come a bad cropper. The objects of his now unrequited crush have labeled him a phony conservative bum. In another sector, a N.Y. columnist of vastly liberal persuasion, and now a simple fascist pig like the rest of us over 30, showed his trauma and ignorance the other day as he sensed a newsy paradox in the sameness of the no-nonsense admonitions to the student crazies by Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame and Morris Abrams of Brandeis University. He missed the point. In these two great seats of Jewish and Catholic learning there still lives a little faith in God, respect for right and wrong and great traditions of ethical instruction.

Among our public teachers the most noise is created by an overly permissive minority who are themselves intolerant of any authority and steadfast only in their own lack of moral purpose. If we can't get God (not dogma) back in the public schools and universities, shouldn't we at least insist on teaching His once famous 10 guides to a better society and the ethics to apply them?

Unprincipled children will grow up into unprincipled businessmen, lawyers, teachers and Congressmen. Is there anything wrong with a good stiff course in ethics in our public schools and universities? What do you think?

THE LIFE OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY SHOULD BE EXTENDED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will extend the life of the National Commission on Product Safety until 1970.

I have been quite impressed by the work the Commission is doing in a variety of areas. Earlier this year I sponsored H.R. 8377 which amended the Hazardous Substances Act to include additional categories of hazards found in many currently manufactured toys so that our children will not suffer the loss of life and limb because of the propensity of some toy manufactures to make and sell toys which are fashionable but not safe. This legislation was drafted by the Commission.

I do not think any parent would want his daughter to play with a toy stove that heats up to 660 degrees, hotter than a home oven, or a soldering kit that heats up to 800 degrees and involves the use of molten lead. Most recently, members of the Commission staff were of invaluable assistance to me in helping demonstrate to television viewers in the

Philadelphia area some of the most dangerous toys on the market.

The mandate of the Commission authorizes it to explore the safety aspects of products used in the home. To fulfill its mandate, the Commission has conducted four sets of public hearings, each designed to look into a special phase of products and safety standards, and important future hearings are planned. In addition, it has conducted staff evaluations of standards, codes, and laws relating to product safety. It has planned special surveys in cooperation with insurance associations and received the approval of four medical groups to send questionnaires on product-related injuries to 85,000 physicians.

I believe the Commission has certainly demonstrated its worth. It has been successful in creating a new awareness of the need for safety standards not only among consumers but also within industry. Throughout its hearings attention has been focused on laxity as well as efficiency; on irresponsibility as well as responsibility. Its successes point up the welcome fact that many industries are often ready and eager to cooperate when the facts are revealed to them in public hearings.

In January of this year, the Commission held hearings on the dangers of ordinary glass patio doors. Subsequently, the Federal Housing Administration announced its intention to make safety glass a requirement of its minimum property standards.

In December, after hearings were held on hazardous toys, a manufacturer of a toy tunnel which was found to be highly flammable issued a call for the return of those still on the shelves of retail merchants. These tunnels now will be flame-proofed.

The Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers voluntarily adopted a standard to require that doors of new freezers be designed to open from the inside, as refrigerator doors have been required to operate since 1958.

The American Gas Association, as a result of the evidence given in hearings conducted by the Commission in February of this year, has agreed to consider changes in the standards for floor furnaces which are capable of inflicting serious burns, especially on children. Also, Underwriters Laboratories have upgraded a number of their standards and are exercising greater control over the use of the UL seal.

As you can all see, the Commission is engaged in important work. It is work which perhaps many of us as consumers do not appreciate because all we see are the unsafe products which are still produced because the Commission has not had the staff or the time to investigate them as yet. I believe the consumer receives a service of inestimable value from the work of the Commission. This work must be continued. To achieve this, the legislation I have introduced today will extend the life of the Commission until 1970. The Commission has proved to be a powerful weapon in the consumer protection arsenal.

The consumer needs and deserves all the protection he can get. It certainly is not inconceivable that the Commission could save one life or perhaps prevent

one disabling injury from an unsafe product for each dollar we spend to keep it operating. In these days when the dollar seems to be worth less and less, I believe the Commission is the exception. It performs an invaluable service to the Nation, a service we should continue.

**PROGRESS, AMERICAN STYLE:
PROGRESS, RHODESIAN STYLE**

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this congressional session I introduced House Resolution 244 which calls for legislative approval of the expanded United Nations sanctions of Rhodesia's Ian Smith regime.

Recently, Roy Wilkins' column in the Los Angeles Times offered a vivid comparison of participatory government concepts, taking as one example the ongoing strides made by black Americans, and looking at comparable opportunities and advancement "allowed" black Rhodesians by their government. The article reinforces my strong belief that Congress must make a positive stand in behalf of the oppressed peoples of Rhodesia.

I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 26, 1969]

U.S. NEGROES AND GOVERNMENT

(By Roy Wilkins)

While a minority of Negro college students over here seeks curriculum control in institutions where they are sometimes as few as 1/10 of 1% of the enrollment, Rhodesia has proposed a constitution which will lock more than 4 million black Rhodesians forever out of any voice in the government of their homeland.

White Rhodesians number 228,000 while the black Rhodesian population is estimated at 4,280,000.

The new constitution, "racially segregating the electorate and designed to insure that there will never be black African majority rule in Rhodesia," was hailed by Prime Minister Ian D. Smith as one placing the government "in the hands of civilized Rhodesians for all time."

The key gimmick is the racially segregated election roll. The United States stood by the principle of the free democratic election process, but we fought the practice of including Negroes as voters all the way from the Convention of 1787 down to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We are still fighting this battle in some localities.

But the U.S.A., stubborn and cunning as it has been in denying the vote to Negro Americans, never adopted the separate racial voting lists. Perhaps it was easier and cheaper to frighten Negroes away from the ballot box. Rhodesia, however, has gone the way of the separate voting list. Blacks will be on one list and can elect only 16 of the total of 66 in Parliament. The other 50 members will be elected from the list containing the names of whites, mixed bloods and Asians. Thus, some 250,000 people will choose 50 legislators and 4 million people will choose 16. This is bad, but the white Rhodesian diehards wanted blacks excluded completely from voting.

Smith feels that his version can be argued "with a clear conscience" outside the borders of Rhodesia. He will have the aid of the apartheid government of South Africa in trying to make the world agree.

It is hard to see how such a Rhodesian government can live in perpetuity. Pressures from within and without cannot help but affect change. Black African nations will not forever be occupied with growing pains and internal rivalries. The surge for individual freedom will drive black Rhodesians to change an intolerable condition.

The chief value in this for Negro Americans is the pointing up of the steady advances—too slow, but advances, nevertheless—of the participation of the American black population in its government. It is not that they are better off than black Rhodesians who are now where they were 75 years ago. It is that they are within striking distance of full citizenship equality, not on a separate racial voting list, but in open competition with all others on a common voting list.

This underscores the warning against black separatism, a form of apartheid which some American black students profess to prefer. In order to chain the blacks more securely, the white Rhodesians first separated them into their black (and unequal) world.

The truth is that the Negro American, despite the acknowledge hobbles, is still the one black minority in all the world that comes closest to meaningful political participation in his government. Sixteen black Rhodesians in parliament? Why Negro Americans have 11 in the Georgia legislature alone. If the men be forgotten for a moment, they have one black woman state senator in Texas and one black woman in the national Congress.

This is not good enough for 10% of the U.S. population, but it is on its way to being good enough. Moreover, it makes Ian Smith's "for all time" one with Hitler's "thousand years" and kissing kin to the "never" bloc of white Americans.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC NEEDS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in our effort to encourage Arab-Israel negotiations toward a peace settlement, we must not overlook the pressing social and economic needs of the Middle East. I propose today a project aimed at supplying huge quantities of water to the people of that region, which would ultimately benefit Arab and Jew alike—and provide a solid basis for reconciliation and lasting peace. For, the shortage of water—historically a cause of great conflict between Israel and her neighbors—remains a source of continued rivalry.

My bill, which I first introduced in January 1968, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the construction of a large desalting plant in Israel. The plant would be an integral part of a dual purpose power and desalting project which will produce significant quantities of electrical power and fresh water urgently needed by Israel.

This bill would harness unequal American financial and technical resources to the Israeli talent for developing her water resources. Throughout her 20 years of independence, Israel scientists and farmers have applied new methods and techniques to agriculture, along with two vital ingredients—hard work and determination. During this period Israel has increased the amount of land

under cultivation fivefold—a clear demonstration of her ability to transform deserts into fields and orchards, and exploit and utilize sources of water to their fullest.

The dual purpose power and desalting plant would produce about 100 to 150 million gallons of fresh water per day—enough water for the intensive irrigation of approximately 50,000 acres of land. The plant would also produce about 300,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical power per day—enough power to provide electricity for the homes of some 30,000 people who will be directly involved in the farming of the land under irrigation as well as for an industrial complex attached to the plant. The output of that industrial complex will include fertilizer for over 3 million acres of land.

What will be the benefits of this project? Employment opportunities could be afforded to refugees. The desalting plant would contribute substantially to agricultural and industrial growth. It would serve as a model for power and water resources development throughout the Middle East. The project will also provide us with valuable technical information for future desalination programs throughout the world.

The most valuable effect of this venture is that it would add immeasurably to the long-range possibility of a durable Arab-Israel peace. Electricity and large quantities of low-cost water could ultimately be produced cooperatively by the Arabs and the Jews in a region that needs water, food, and power so urgently.

This is a challenging plan—but the human problems of the Middle East—finding a place for men to work and provide for their families—requires a plan of this scope.

I urge my colleagues to strengthen our commitment to the economic and social renewal of Israel—and all other nations in that area. Let us seize this chance to help shift the energies and attention of the people of the Middle East from the antagonisms of the past to the opportunities of the future.

THE VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the student newspaper of Winchester, Ill., High School recently carried a comment about the volunteer army proposal written by a member of the student body, David Worrell. In my view, this young man has set forth very clearly and cogently the central arguments for a transition from compulsion to voluntarism in our armed services. Here is the text of his comments:

THE VOLUNTEER ARMY

Our country has been using the present draft system since 1948. Many people feel that now is the time for a change in our old draft laws.

In almost any newspaper throughout the country you can read stories of draft card burning, riots, and demonstrations over our present system. Many feel that the volun-

teer army is the proper thing. I believe this is a step in the right direction.

Some type of volunteer system would greatly lower training costs. As it is now, a new group of men must be taught their jobs every two years, and this is expensive. Money saved could be used to pay higher salaries, so that more able men would want to make the army their career. Also, if men stay in the service for more than two years they can learn how to do a better job.

A volunteer system would affirm the principles that free men should not be forced into involuntary servitude in violation of the thirteenth amendment. If a man wants to be a soldier he can do so, and if not, he does not have to be.

The new system would greatly help college boys. Many have to drop out of college to go into the army, and they frequently do not return to college.

The volunteer army would be mainly composed of men with character and determination. Only the men who want to keep our country free would join. Our protection would not be in the hands of those idiots who burn their draft cards. Most of those who would volunteer would have greater intelligence and more will power. Tests have shown that those who volunteer graduate from training more quickly than those who are drafted.

Our national defense would improve with a volunteer army. The only two countries who do not draft men, Canada and Britain, have high effectiveness, low turnover, and contented officers. The United States Navy, Air Force, and Marines do not draft men, and their volunteer system has worked well, making these the prestige services.

Many feel that a volunteer army would help the Negroes to overthrow our government. They think the Negroes would all join the army and use it to give them power. This is far from true. The higher pay would encourage both black and white. It would actually level off the number of black and white in the army.

I think everybody would benefit from the volunteer army system. Our army would be better organized with more capable men. These men would want to do their jobs without being forced. This type of army would help ease racial tensions and stop draft card burners. Above all, a volunteer army would give a man a free choice which is supposed to be guaranteed him by the Constitution.

DAVID WORRELL.

NEW YORK CITY COUNCILMEN INTRODUCE RESOLUTION OPPOSING ABM DEPLOYMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the prospect of the deployment of President Nixon's Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system has elicited considerable response from cities and communities across the country. Contrary to the opinion expressed recently by a White House assistant that the opposition has already spent itself, opposition is increasing in intensity.

A resolution opposing deployment of the Safeguard system has recently been introduced in the City Council of New York under the primary sponsorship of Councilmen Donald R. Manes and Theodore Weiss. Since it was introduced on March 25, 1969, the resolution has attracted the cosponsorship of 17 addi-

tional councilmen, giving it the support of a majority of the council.

I am happy to provide a copy of this important resolution, and a list of its supporters, for the RECORD:

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK CALLING UPON THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REFRAIN FROM APPROPRIATING THE FUNDS NECESSARY FOR THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE SAFEGUARD MISSILE SYSTEM AND URGING THAT THE MONEYS SAVED BY SUCH ACTION BE SPENT TOWARD THE PROMOTION OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND SOCIAL HARMONY WITHIN OUR NATION'S CITIES

Whereas the cost of the recent presidential decision to deploy the Sentinel Anti-Missile system is conservatively estimated at six to seven billion dollars and

Whereas the system has provoked considerable disagreement as to both its technical feasibility and political desirability and

Whereas the Defense Department has exhibited a history of spending billions of dollars on weapon systems that become obsolete before they are completed and

Whereas it is universally accepted that millions of Americans are daily faced with a multitude of problems that severely limit their present and future well being and

Whereas an enlightened government has the responsibility to endeavor to provide equal opportunity for all its citizens and

Whereas the greatest danger facing the United States is the slow disintegration and polarization of our Nation's social framework, and

Whereas needed economic and social programs within our Cities are not properly funded or are non-existent and

Whereas this intended deployment will only further siphon off funds badly needed for our Cities and

Whereas it will be more practical as well as morally correct for our national government to make the commitment needed to eliminate social imperfections before our nation's flaws become its permanent failures and

Whereas the deployment of these systems may abrogate a portion of the newly ratified treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the City Council of the City of New York does respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to refrain from appropriating the funds necessary for the deployment of the Sentinel Missile System and be it further

Resolved, that the City Council urges that money saved on this action be spent towards the promotion of equal opportunity and social harmony within the Cities of our nation.

SPONSORS AND COSPONSORS OF A RESOLUTION INTRODUCED IN THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK OPPOSING DEPLOYMENT OF THE SAFEGUARD ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Councilmen Manes, Weiss, Bernstein, Cohen, Friedland, Greitzer, Katzman, Knigin, Lazar, Lebrun, Low, Maze, Merola, Moscovitz, Rios, Sadowski, Sharison, Skolnick, and Thompson.

PROF. JOHN E. ULLMANN'S STATEMENT ON THE ABM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, I participated in a congressional hearing sponsored by the New York Council for a Sane Nuclear Policy on the subject of

the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system. This hearing was held at the Ethical Culture Society. I believe that hearing was an important contribution to the national debate now taking place on the question of the ABM. Testimony was presented by academicians and scientists concerned with the implications of the ABM, its relationship to disarmament talks and the arms race, and its effect on the economy. Concerned community citizens also testified about its impact upon our society.

Prof. John E. Ullmann, who is chairman of the department of management and business statistics at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y., made a presentation at that hearing which I believe gives an exceptionally well-reasoned analysis of the economic implications of the proposed ABM programs. I am today inserting Professor Ullmann's statement in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE ABM SYSTEMS: BANKRUPTCY WITHOUT SECURITY

(By John E. Ullmann)

My name is John E. Ullmann. I am Chairman of the Department of Management, Marketing and Business Statistics of Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York. I am also a national director of SANE and co-chairman of the New Democratic Coalition of Nassau County. I am a civil, mechanical and industrial engineer by training and have specialized for many years in engineering economics and in industrial and urban planning.

My purpose today is to discuss some of the economic implications of the proposed ABM programs. I would like to make it clear at the outset, however, that in commenting on some of the cost estimates announced by the Pentagon, my views are essentially that the proposed systems are not worth \$50 billion, nor \$5 billion, nor five cents. To be an effective defense, an ABM system could not even permit a single nuclear armed missile to reach its target. For if just one did, all would be lost anyway, and the city together with most of its population would be destroyed. Merely to set the requirements of the system in this way indicates the utter futility of trying to develop one. It would certainly have to perform enormously better than anything we now have in the defense against aircraft.

It is perfectly clear from the American experience in Vietnam and from military operations elsewhere that today, just as in World War II, the bombers, or at least most of them, will get through. The North Vietnamese have, we are told, been equipped with some of the most sophisticated Russian ground-to-air missiles but these appear to have been largely useless against our attacking aircraft. Even against armed helicopters, defense measures have proved to be quite difficult.

Are we then to take seriously any claims by the military and by their industrial suppliers that there exists now or there is in prospect any system that can provide the kind of protection which I specified earlier? I think that the very suggestion is an utter absurdity. Clearly, the advantage lies with the attacker and with the development of multiple warheads and better penetration devices, this system would not help defend anybody against anything.

This does not mean, however, that we should therefore install more offensive weapons. What with 4200 megaton warheads ready to go at no more than 136 Russian towns with over 100,000 inhabitants, we have plenty of overkill already. The Russians, in turn, can kill us 20 times over. Enough is enough for both sides; "parity" and "su-

periority" are slogans that have no meaning in this contest—unless we can figure out how to kill somebody more than once.

Other speakers today have concerned themselves with further technical, strategic and political objections to the ABM. It is extremely gratifying that a growing number of members of Congress is beginning to agree with our objections. To be asked to pay vast sums for something which is worth nothing is, in a commercial situation, known as attempted fraud. And we in this city would not tolerate it for one minute if we were buying hamburger. Why then should we tolerate it if the protection of our lives is to be entrusted to such quack remedies?

What are we to make of the argument that the ABM is a useful bargaining counter in the strategic arms limitation talks with the Russians? Obviously, the Russians must respond to the same physical and technical constraints as we. Whatever so-called system they have built, therefore, they cannot defend themselves against us either. We must look for something better to come out of the talks than trading one load of expensive nothing for another. Besides, why should we still let the Russians decide for us how we should act? Is it because, as Robert M. Hutchins once said, "unless we are getting ahead of, or falling behind the Russians, how would we know where we are going?" Let it be stated categorically: To refrain from wasteful futility is not unilateral disarmament; nor is the installation of a non-functioning defense system a step toward tension reduction, as Mr. Kosygin and the Hudson Institute seem to think.

Competent military planners first identify a threat and then try to counter it. For the reasons stated, an effective defense against nuclear armed ballistic missiles is impossible. Faced with this fact, the ABM designers have turned this planning process upside down: They define their ABM system and then invent an attack scenario to suit which, of course, the enemy would and could avoid. It is as if a knight of old had sallied forth into battle with armor only on his left kneecap—it's a great defense system if you are sure that the enemy won't aim at any other part of your anatomy. We are told that the Sentinel, sometimes referred to as "thin," is alleged to cost \$5 billion. But, fat as this number is—at least to me—, is it only a downpayment? Does that \$5 billion depend on the Chinese for once really being as stupid as some of our more arrogant military planners evidently expect them to be? I believe that the \$5 billion would inescapably become a starter set for a thick system alleged to cost \$40 billion.

Recent weapon systems (e.g., the F-111) have overrun their costs by a factor of about 3.2 and we could expect at least that with the ABM. The reason is that such a system would monopolize our technical talent even more than military industries do now and so barrel-scraping, with corresponding loss of efficiency, is inevitable. Moreover, as the design proceeds we would have to keep going "back to the old drawing board" as the uselessness of the system becomes clear; truly we have here a technical labor of Sisyphus. And when all is done, the system still won't function properly. Congressman Ryan has drawn out attention to this decline in quality in a recent highly perceptive article (*The American Engineer*, January 1968, p. 19). The only remedy for this condition is redundancy.

And here I must once again point out that long before such a system could be put in place, its design, which must necessarily be frozen at an early stage would render it obsolete.

This kind of thing has so often happened to us in the past, and with so many weapon systems, that I find it incredible that anyone should have the slightest doubt that this would occur again in the course of producing as difficult a system as an ABM.

We have, therefore, reached a working

total of \$200 billion for hardware. This is a truly enormous amount, and would far exceed the combined total of all military procurement of the past five years. It would be eight times the current total output of the military electronics industry. It exceeds by about 40 per cent the total now collected by all forms of taxation in the United States. It is in fact about the size of the total Federal expenditures from all sources at present. All of this would be disastrous enough, but there is worse to come.

An indispensable ingredient of an ABM system would undoubtedly have to be a civil defense program and shelter system if for no reason other than to protect us from misfires, malfunctions and overhead explosions. Over the years there have been many so-called estimates of blast shelter costs deriving from a multitude of so-called engineering studies prepared at taxpayer expense. This is no occasion for dealing with them in detail. Suffice it to say that they all seem to have been derived by a most irresponsible cutting of corners and by other invalid design assumptions, some of them bordering on fantasies. My own estimate prepared in 1962 and contained in Seymour Melman (ed.) *No Place to Hide* (Grove Press, 1962, p. 150-156), is that the cost would have to be no less than \$1,500-\$2,200 per shelter place. This implies a national cost of not less than \$250 billion. To this we would have to apply at the very least an inflation factor, leading to a revised estimate of some \$350 billion.

In short, what we are really talking about here is a downpayment on something that will ultimately cost \$550 billion. This is an amount equal to twice the Gross National Product of the Soviet Union. It is half as big again as our national debt. It is over three years' worth of all taxes at present levels. It is already, to my mind, bad enough that our present defense budget should exceed the Gross National Product of Italy by some 25 per cent but this would be seven times as high.

With the kind of spending to which the ABM proposals would inexorably lead, however, even we would be overstraining our spending capacity. The reason is, of course, that a project of such magnitude would have to be put in hand fairly rapidly for it to have any military value and in order to provide at least an illusion of protection before it is too obviously obsolete. Such a task, of course, is physically impossible of accomplishment unless we are willing to conscript all of our labor and all of our resources in the service of this preposterous exercise in what I can only describe as "necropolitan planning." The kinds of controls that this would involve would, of course, end our freedoms very rapidly. If their care and protection is what defense is all about—and I think that it is—then a set of proposals which would inexorably lead to their willful destruction obviously brands our weapons planners as professional incompetents and blunderers.

This view may seem harsh but I suggest that the alternative would be even worse. It is that the ABM is being promoted in order to find permanent work for those in the military and their suppliers unwilling to contemplate a reduced level of activity and money-wasting after Vietnam. Recent statements by military suppliers to the effect that they do not expect to have to do much conversion lend point to this argument. Congress should make it crystal clear to these people that the nation owes them a fair chance at something else to do—something the country really needs—but not more jobs and more profits at the expense of our liberties and with the result of our bankruptcy.

Finally, Members of Congress are often impatient with the "thin-end-of-the-wedge" argument, preferring to point out that at each stage of escalating expenses, Congress could say no and would do so if things got too bad. This time, however, let there be no mistake: You have been warned by all the "building

block," "pilot system," "thin screen" arguments of the military of what lies ahead and you know how difficult it is in fact to say no to a military spokesman who promises glittering results for just a few more billions of dollars—and, indeed, for a few more thousand lives.

Thus I submit that the time to say no is now: Now, when there is a chance of getting a real peace dividend for our long suffering society; now when even a respected business journal like *Fortune* can put the necessary therapeutic expenditures for our neglected country at \$57 billion a year. Today I am here to suggest ways in which not to waste untold billions which we need elsewhere. I hope you will all be back soon for a discussion of constructive alternatives.

ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the present system for electing the President of the United States needs to be reformed. This issue will be one of the most important to be considered by the Congress. Interest and concern about how the system should be reformed is widespread. When the Judiciary Committee held hearings on this matter, AFL-CIO President George Meany made a strong case for election of the President of the United States by direct popular vote, for universal suffrage for all persons 18 years of age or older, and other reforms. Mr. Meany's testimony should, I believe, have the widest possible circulation. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 179 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 181, AND RELATED BILLS PERTAINING TO ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM, MARCH 6, 1969

Mr. Chairman, my name is George Meany. I am President of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and I appear here on behalf of that organization.

I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before this Committee, Mr. Chairman, to present our views on various proposals now before the Congress for reform of the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. Obviously, the measures which you are sponsoring, H.J. Res. 179 and H.J. Res. 181, are of particular importance, and I shall have more to say about these proposals later in my statement. There are, of course, other measures to which the Committee will, I feel sure, also wish to give their attention.

At the very outset I would like to indicate the kind of electoral college reform that we believe to be required at this time. In 1955 the merger convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations adopted a resolution, which was subsequently reiterated by our Third Constitutional Convention in 1959, that stated:

"The President and Vice President of the United States should be elected by direct popular vote. The electoral college system has outlived its usefulness, and should be abolished."

Last month, the AFL-CIO Executive Council reaffirmed that policy. So our position is very clear. We want to see the electoral col-

lege system of electing the President and Vice President abolished and a system of direct popular election of these officials substituted in its place.

We are not, of course, alone in taking this position. On November 23, 1968, the *New York Times* reported the results of a survey conducted by the Gallup Poll which showed that 81 percent of adults who had been interviewed between November 8 and November 16, 1968, favored amendment of the Constitution to "do away with the Electoral College and base the election of a President on the total vote cast throughout the nation". And a recent Harris Poll showed similar results: 78 percent of the people polled favored a constitutional amendment providing for direct election of the President and Vice President instead of the present electoral college system.

Many organizations have also indicated their support of such a system of direct popular election of the President and Vice President. Among these organizations are the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Federation of Independent Business—none of which are particularly noted for their radical views.

Many members of Congress, including you, Mr. Chairman, and Congressman McCulloch and other members of this Committee, have introduced proposed constitutional amendments that would provide for a system of direct popular election of the President and Vice President in place of the electoral college system. Thirty of the approximately 60 proposals for reform of the electoral college system that have been introduced in the House of Representatives thus far in the present session of Congress call for such a system, and the sponsors of these proposals total some 75 Congressmen in all. None of the other proposals has any comparably broad support among the public or the members of Congress.

The reasons for this strong support for fundamental, rather than patchwork, reform of the present electoral college system need only be briefly summarized. First, of course, the present system permits one candidate for President to be elected with fewer popular votes than his principal opponent, and this has happened three times in our history. Presidents John Quincy Adams in 1824, Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876, and Benjamin Harrison in 1888 all actually trailed their opponents in the popular vote. It is worth recalling, too, that in 1960 President John F. Kennedy led his opponent, Richard M. Nixon, by only 49.71 percent to 49.55 percent of the vote, and that in 1968 President Richard Nixon, received only 43.16 percent of the vote while his opponent, Hubert H. Humphrey, received 42.73 percent of the vote.

Perhaps the most important objection to the present electoral college system arises from the provisions which call for election by the House when none of the candidates for President has an electoral vote majority. While it is true that this has actually happened only twice in our history, the possibility has been an every-present threat to stable transfers of power from one administration to another, as in the Hayes-Tilden contest in 1876.

In this connection, it should not be forgotten that it was the settlement of that contest, achieved through a compromise designed to avoid having the choice between those two contestants go to the House of Representatives when neither appeared to have an electoral vote majority, that paved the way for the deprivation and postponement of equal voting and civil rights for Negroes and other minorities for a period of nearly 90 years. Indeed, the spectre of that dark history was ever-present even in our latest Presidential election in 1968, when George Wallace of Alabama dreamed of the possibilities of another deal like that of 1876.

But it is not only the political consequences that flow from the provision calling for deci-

sion by the House of Representatives when neither party has an electoral vote majority that is the most objectionable feature of this procedure. When this happens, the members of the House of Representatives do not vote as individual Congressmen. Each state has a single vote and that vote is determined by the votes of Congressmen who make up the delegation from that state. If the Congressmen from a particular state, be it New York or New Mexico, divide their votes evenly among the candidates, that state gets no vote at all in the selection of the President. Yet a majority of all the states, or 26 votes, is necessary for election. It is hard to imagine how a more archaic and totally unrepresentative system could have been derived. I do not believe anything good can be said about it.

There is another objection to the present Electoral College System of electing the President and Vice President which need only be briefly summarized—the fact that there is no legal way to force an elector to vote for the candidate to whom he pledged himself. It is significant that when Congress endeavored to deal with such an elector—Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of South Carolina—in last fall's Presidential election it found itself completely unable to require the elector to cast his vote in the manner contemplated in his party pledge.

There are arguments, of course, in support of the present Electoral College System, not the least of which is that it has survived virtually unchanged since the Constitution was written in 1787. By and large, however, the arguments in behalf of this system are negative in character and the fact remains that the hazards which it presents continue to hang like a cloud over every Presidential election. This is intolerable under present-day conditions when smooth transfers from the administration of one President to another are essential.

I should like to turn now to a discussion of the recommendations of President Nixon, the two proposed constitutional amendments which Chairman Celler has introduced, and other principal proposals for reform of the present electoral college system.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council noted that, while we are fully in agreement with President Nixon that the present Presidential selection procedures require major overhaul, "we see no point to replacing the present complicated and erratic mechanism with one even more complicated and erratic." We do agree with both President Nixon and President Johnson that, whatever else is done, the individual electors should be abolished. They serve no useful purpose and, in fact, perpetuate an "anachronism whereby occasional faithless individual electors are legally free to betray their trust."

We do not agree, however, with President Nixon's plan, which he says he is proposing because of doubt that his "personal preference" for direct popular election can be adopted. That plan would (1) allocate the electoral vote of each state on a proportional, instead of the present unit vote basis; (2) make a 40 percent electoral vote plurality sufficient to choose a President; and (3) provide for a runoff election by popular vote if no candidate receives 40 percent of the electoral vote. The AFL-CIO Executive Council observed:

"Except for the third step, this plan would not improve but would worsen the present mechanism. Proportionate allocation of electoral votes could have the same unfortunate consequences as the existing system—it could elect a President receiving a smaller popular vote than his opponent. Thus the particular proportional allocation plan which President Nixon has sometimes supported would have elected him instead of President Kennedy, in 1960. Moreover, proportional allocation, unlike the present system, would favor the development of splinter parties and undercut the two-party system. In sum,

the President's proposal is worse, not better than, the present system."

We feel furthermore that if direct popular election is feasible in a runoff, as President Nixon has proposed, it is feasible in the first place.

But basically we do not agree with the President's doubts as to whether a direct election amendment can be adopted. Certainly, the President could have gone far to resolve such doubts had he announced his unequivocal support, instead of merely a "personal preference," for direct popular election of the President and Vice President. As I have already pointed out, this proposal has already received far wider support in Congress than any other proposed amendment and is, according to the polls, favored by the vast majority of the American people. It is our belief, in contrast to President Nixon's doubts, that if the proposal for direct popular election cannot be adopted, there is little reason to believe that any other plan can.

I should like to turn now to a discussion of some of the specific proposals that are presently before Congress to remedy or to replace the present electoral college system. One proposal, which may be described as the "unit vote" proposal, would write into the Constitution the present practice of awarding all of a state's electoral votes to the candidate winning the greatest number of popular votes in the state. Such a proposal is contained in H.J. Res. 181, one of the proposed constitutional amendments which you, Mr. Chairman, have introduced.

This proposal would preclude the type of situation which arose in the 1968 election in connection with the so-called "faithless elector," Dr. Bailey. The mere fact, however, that H.J. Res. 181 would remedy this type of situation is hardly sufficient justification for its passage in view of the far greater drawbacks of the present system which it would leave intact.

H.J. Res. 181 does correct one other deficiency of the present system when an election is thrown into the House. Under this proposed amendment the members of the House and Senate sitting in joint session would choose the President by ballot from among the three candidates having the highest number of electoral votes. The vote of each Congressman and Senator would be publicly announced and recorded, and the person receiving the greatest number of votes would be chosen. A quorum for the purpose of such a joint session of the House and Senate would consist of three-fourths of all the Congressmen and Senators.

This feature of H.J. Res. 181 would undoubtedly be an improvement over the present procedure which is called into operation when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes. It would not, however, eliminate the basic objection to the electoral college system which is that it permits the election of candidates who have not received the greatest number of popular votes, such as has happened in three of our presidential elections. Nor would it prevent such compromises contrary to the public interest as have characterized at least one effort to avoid submission of the choice to Congress, as happened in the Hayes-Tilden contest in 1876.

While H.J. Res. 181 has some constructive aspects, we are not able, Mr. Chairman, to give it our endorsement since it still would permit the popular will as demonstrated by the votes of the people to be disregarded. At the present time, and under present-day political, economic and social conditions, we do not believe this is any longer tolerable.

Another proposal would divide each state into electoral districts comparable to Congressional districts. In some versions existing Congressional districts would in fact be used. Under this "district vote" proposal, the winner of the popular vote within a district would receive the district's electoral vote. Most versions of this proposal would also al-

locate two additional electoral votes to the winner of the popular vote in the state. H.J. Res. 401, introduced by Congressman McCulloch, and resolutions introduced by twelve other Congressmen are examples of proposals along this line. Although there are variations between them in respect to use of Congressional districts or specially created electoral districts, all of them would continue to provide that electors similar to those currently provided for would cast the ultimate votes for President and Vice President.

This proposal, like the proportional proposal, would leave unresolved the problem that arises if none of the candidates receives a majority of the electoral votes. When this happens under these proposals the question of the choice of the President is thrown into the House of Representatives. Had this proposal been in effect in 1960, Mr. Nixon would have been elected over President Kennedy by an electoral vote of 278 to 245, despite the fact that his popular vote total was lower.

Finally, there is the proposal which has the overwhelming support of most members of Congress who have introduced measures to effectuate reform of the present electoral college system. This is the direct popular vote system, which you have introduced, Mr. Chairman, in H.J. Res. 179, and which Congressman McCulloch has introduced in H.J. Res. 402. We support your proposals along this line, and urge that this Committee report such an amendment.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that any amendment which is adopted by Congress should provide for election of the President and Vice President by direct nationwide popular vote. It would be desirable, we think, to provide, as your proposed constitutional amendment does provide, that a candidate must obtain at least 40 percent of the popular vote in order to be elected, and that there should be a national run-off popular vote between the two top candidates in the event no candidate receives at least 40 percent of the popular vote. We also approve of the provisions of your proposed constitutional amendment which would require the President and Vice President to be voted for jointly.

However, we respectfully suggest that the amendment does not go far enough in providing for Federal control of eligibility to vote for president and as to the places and manner of holding presidential elections and the inclusion of names of candidates on the ballot.

We think the constitutional amendment should itself provide for universal suffrage in presidential elections, that is that all persons 18 or above shall be qualified to vote in presidential elections. Further, we think that the amendment should provide that the places and manner of holding presidential elections and the inclusions of names of the candidates on ballots shall be prescribed by the Congress.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize the importance of the requirement that Congress be authorized to adopt uniform age and residency requirements for voting. These matters received extended and urgent attention by the recent meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Council. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that a copy of these statements be included at this point in the record of these hearings as part of my statement.

Probably the main objection that has been raised against the direct popular vote system of electing the President and Vice President is that it would represent a basic departure from the federal principles upon which the Government of the United States is based. We have given long and careful consideration to this contention and have concluded that it is not well-founded.

The electoral college system was from the outset a compromise that proved from the first Presidential election on to be wholly unworkable and was the subject of one of the

earliest amendments (Amendment No. XII) to the Constitution. Conceivably the electoral college system seemed to the drafters of the Constitution to make sense when the country was young and because of difficulties of transportation and communication it was hardly possible for people in one part of the country to be acquainted with public figures in other parts of the country so as to enable them to make an informed judgment as to their qualifications for election to the Presidency or Vice Presidency.

The Presidency is a national office, and the question of who fills it is a matter of first importance to people throughout the United States. Candidates for the office of President and Vice President today are generally well-known public figures who have the means and the ability through modern systems of transportation and communication to make their qualifications known to the people in all parts of the country.

In practical fact, the federal principle today finds its strongest institutions, not in the electoral college, but in the state governments, the Senate of the United States and, above all, the substantive provisions of the Constitution itself. We are convinced that direct election of the President and Vice President will do no violence to the federal principle but will strengthen and make far more workable our constitutional system of government.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, when I recently appeared before the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in support of S. 860 which calls for the creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs, I stated:

Without full, vigorous, and coordinated enforcement, consumer protection laws benefit only the printers and bookbinders of the United States Code.

For it is evident that with 33 Federal departments and agencies carrying on approximately 260 consumer activities, protection of the consumer remains haphazard and ineffective.

The editorial entitled "Consumer Protection" which appeared in the Long Island Press on March 24, 1969, calls for a Federal consumer protection apparatus which will provide an overview of consumer programs and more central control. This message will be heard and read more often in the future as we see that the consumer legislation enacted in the past is only a partial solution to the problem. The editorial follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Is the consumer—too often on the short end in the marketplace—also getting shortchanged in federal protection?

No, insists President Nixon, citing consumer protection programs scattered through 33 different federal agencies.

Yes, insists Betty Furness, President Johnson's former consumer aide, who told a Senate committee last week: "Given the opportunity to protect commerce or the consumer, but not both at the same time, who do you think the Department of Commerce will protect? Given the same opportunity with the farmer or the consumer, who will the Department of Agriculture protect?"

Not since the muckraking movement before World War I has there been such a thrust toward greater protection for the consumer as we are seeing today. Those early champions of the consumer like Upton Sinclair, Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens and Charles Edward Russell, among others, wrote powerful exposés of abuses in meat packing, housing, labor, insurance and other enterprises, resulting in a host of landmark reforms such as the Pure Food and Drug Act, child labor laws and others.

Congress is now taking a hard new look at this difficult three-way relationship involving consumers, business and government. The Senate committee Miss Furness addressed held hearings all last week on proposals to set up a cabinet office for a Department of Consumer Affairs as a means of better protecting consumer interests. A similar proposal has for years been vigorously pushed in the House by Rep. Benjamin Roesenthal, the Elmhurst Democrat, who testified at the Senate hearing about the inadequacy of present federal machinery. Not only is there fragmentation and inefficiency, he said, but the new administration is dragging its feet about naming a chairman of the President's Consumer Affairs Committee, the post held by Miss Furness.

This gets close to the heart of the matter. While it is the mission of Congress to fight the uphill battle to enact new laws, it is up to the Executive to see that they are adequately enforced.

There are good laws on the books, but many more will be needed as times and technology change. The auto safety fight is a good example. And President Nixon is correct in pointing to how many agencies are now responsible for consumer protection. But a pressing need—that can be met immediately—is to make these agencies, so richly endowed with power, more responsive to consumer needs than they have been. A cabinet post, as a central focus of responsibility, would, of course, facilitate this. But whether we have a cabinet post or only the existing apparatus, the real key to consumer protection ultimately lies with the President to set the properly vigorous pro-consumer pace. Moreover, cooperation, instead of opposition, from business would be in the best interest of all.

STRENGTHENING PRESCHOOL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the administration has finalized its proposals for establishing an Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and for transferring to the new agency the Headstart program.

The President is directing that the new Office of Child Development put great emphasis on the role of parents in the administration of the program, that the program continue to focus on the poor, and that the comprehensive nature of the program, including health, nutrition, education, social services, and parental involvement be maintained. The office will encourage additional experimentation with program content and techniques in order to find better teaching methods which will increase the effectiveness of Headstart.

The essential purpose of this move is to place emphasis on investing available

resources to improve the capabilities of the educational system rather than continuing to build parallel and competing systems. The new cross-disciplinary approach to early childhood services represents a significant step toward bringing all relevant and helpful services together. The establishment of a new bureau not bound by tradition or previous commitments provides a workable mechanism for making significant improvements in preschool child development programs.

I insert the President's announcement of the establishment of the Office of Child Development, together with statements of Secretary Finch in the Record, as indicative of the commitment of the administration to improving preschool programs for the Nation's children.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

In my message to the Congress of February 19th on the Economic Opportunity Act, I called for a "national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life . . ." I again pledge myself to that commitment.

No such commitment has ever before been asked in our nation: No such pledge has ever been given.

Two fundamental developments bring it about.

The first is one of the most characteristic developments of the modern age: new knowledge, new facts. We know today—and with each day our knowledge grows more detailed—that the process of human development is in certain fundamental ways different from what it has been thought to be. Or perhaps it is the case that mothers have always understood, but that only men have failed to take notice.

We have learned, first of all, that the process of learning how to learn begins very, very early in the life of the infant child. Children begin this process in the very earliest months of life, long before they are anywhere near a first grade class, or even kindergarten, or play school group. We have also learned that for the children of the poor this ability to learn can begin to deteriorate very early in life, so that the youth begins school well behind his contemporaries and seemingly rarely catches up. He is handicapped as surely as a child crippled by polio is handicapped; and he bears the burden of that handicap through all his life. It is elemental that, even as in the case of polio, the effects of prevention are far better than the effects of cure.

Increasingly we know something about how this can be done. With each passing year—almost with each passing month, such is the pace of new developments in this field of knowledge—research workers in the United States and elsewhere in the world are learning more about the way in which an impoverished environment can develop a "learned helplessness" in children. When there is little stimulus for the mind, and especially when there is little interaction between parent and child, the child suffers lasting disabilities, particularly with respect to the development of a sense of control of his environment. None of this follows from the simple fact of being poor, but it is now fully established that an environment that does not stimulate learning is closely associated in the real world with poverty in its traditional forms. As much as any one thing it is this factor that leads to the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next. It is no longer possible to deny that the process is all too evidently at work in the slums of America's cities, and that is a most ominous aspect of the urban crisis.

It is just as certain that we shall have to invent new social institutions to respond to this new knowledge.

Elementary school, kindergarten, even Head Start appear to come too late for many of those children who most need help. This is no ground for despair, but, to the contrary, a clear challenge to our creativity as a great urban, democratic society. Ways of reaching and helping the very young and their mothers—when they need such help—must be found. There must be ways that protect the privacy of that relationship, and the sacred right of parents to rear their children according to their own values and own understandings. But they also bear a solemn responsibility to insure that the full potential of those children is enabled to come forth. Finding a balance between these imperatives will test our moral wisdom as much as our scientific knowledge. But it can be done, and it must.

The delegation of Head Start to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was the first step in fulfilling my commitment to the first five years of life. In HEW, this program can be supported and supplemented by other Federal programs dealing with children in the early years.

The second step, which I announce today, is the creation of an Office of Child Development, reporting directly to Secretary Finch's office. This office must take a comprehensive approach to the development of young children, combining programs which deal with the physical, social and intellectual.

Preliminary evaluations of this program indicate that Head Start must begin earlier in life, and last longer, to achieve lasting benefits. Toward this end, Secretary Finch has decided to expand the Parent and Child Center and Follow Through programs, while reducing summer programs.

We must remember that we are only beginning to learn what works, and what does not, in this field. We are on the verge of exciting breakthroughs, but much more must be learned before we can prepare a successful nation-wide preschool program.

There are any number of urban problems that can be dealt with promptly—and should be. Others can be approached in terms that admit of clear results in two, three, and four years. But some matters take longer. Above all, the process of a child's maturing is one of slow and steady growth that will not be speeded up for all our scientific knowledge.

America must learn to approach its problems in terms of the time-span those problems require. All problems are pressing; all cry out for instant solutions; but not all can be instantly solved. We must submit to the discipline of time with respect to those issues which provide no alternative.

The process of child development is such a matter.

Our commitment to the first five years of life will not show its full results during my Administration, nor in that of my successor. But if we plant the seeds and if we respond to the knowledge we have, then a stronger and greater America will surely one day come of it.

STATEMENT OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert H. Finch said today he will operate Project Head Start through a new Office of Child Development which will be located in his immediate office and report directly to him.

Delegation of Head Start to HEW is expected to take place on or before July 1.

The Secretary said the new Office would be designed to carry out President Nixon's expressed commitment to the needs of children from birth to five years of age. He said that "the delegation of Head Start to HEW offers

the occasion for a new and overdue national commitment to child and parent development."

"This new Office will have direct access to me," Secretary Finch said, "and will serve as a focal point for new initiatives in child development." In addition to Head Start, the Office will be responsible for the day care program, and over time, other early childhood programs now handled by the Children's Bureau.

Secretary Finch also announced he will form an ongoing Advisory Committee on Child Development which will be made up of experts in the field, parents of children participating in the programs, and local program officials.

As soon as it takes shape, the Office of Child Development will take action to strengthen Head Start. In this connection, the Secretary intends to:

Encourage communities to try out some of the new program models which are being developed through HEW-supported research.

Encourage replacement of many summer programs with full year programs.

Double the present number of 36 Parent and Child Centers, programs for families with children under three years of age.

Seek greater use of Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds for the Follow Through program for Head Start graduates.

Experiment with a scholarship or voucher system to put Head Start purchasing power directly in the hands of parents, and encourage greater private participation by funding joint projects with industry and unions for day care or Head Start associated with places of employment.

The Office of Child Development will coordinate its activities with existing educational, health, and social service programs. Secretary Finch said he will encourage joint projects whereby school systems using education funds can collaborate with community groups using Head Start funds to provide a more comprehensive child development program.

"I am encouraged by the increasingly greater use of ESEA funds for programs comparable to Head Start. This is only one of the signs of the changes which are taking place in the schools," he said.

Secretary Finch expressed his gratitude to an advisory committee headed by former Director of the Bureau of the Budget Charles Schultze which met at HEW March 7 and 8 to consider the placement of Head Start.

In establishing the Office of Child Development, the Secretary said he was following the recommendation of the advisory committee.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT H. FINCH, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

In his February 19 message to the Congress, President Nixon announced that he intended to delegate the operation of the Head Start program to the Department, effective on or before July 1, 1969. In the days since the President's announcement, I have been conducting an intensive review to determine where Head Start might best be placed within HEW and how new resources and strength can be brought to it.

As part of that review process, I convened an Advisory Committee which was ably chaired by Mr. Charles Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Schultze's Report to me on the Committee's recommendations has played a major role in shaping my own decision. Copies of his Report are available.

In arriving at the following decisions about Head Start, I was guided by two basic principles which emerged from our review: (1) the delegation of Head Start to HEW offers the occasion for a new and overdue national commitment to child and parent develop-

ment, and (2) we still do not know what child development techniques are most effective, and our future efforts must more carefully test and evaluate different approaches.

With regard to the need for greater emphasis on child development, we know that there are four times as many young people as aged in the U.S., yet:

Federal benefits and services of all kinds in 1970, including the social insurance programs, will average about \$1,750 per aged person, and only \$190 per young person; and

The relative imbalance has been expanding with the increase over the last 10 years for the aged standing at nearly \$22 billion, compared to \$11.5 for the young.

We do not begrudge our expenditures on the aged; they are a group which needs special help. But the relative lack of emphasis on investment in children seems shortsighted in light of the high social and economic payoffs which such investment can have in terms of helping to produce fully effective members of society.

Our purpose now is to strengthen and improve Head Start through this delegation, rather than in any way to weaken it. It is my intention that the basic policies governing the program be continued, including parent participation, comprehensive services, development of career opportunities for nonprofessionals, use of volunteers, and the opportunity for a wide variety of types of organizations to operate the program.

Within these guidelines, there are a number of steps which I propose to take to improve the program:

1. The Head Start experience needs to be reinforced through greater program length and continuity. To that end, I am preparing to take the following three steps:

a. We must encourage communities to convert summer programs, which are of limited effectiveness, into experimental or regular full-year programs. Preliminary surveys indicate some \$45 million would be transferred in this manner into full-year efforts.

b. I plan to double, to \$12 million, the size of the Parent and Child Center program which serves children under three years of age and their families.

c. I will seek a substantial expansion of the Follow Through program which is budgeted to reach only 6 percent of Head Start graduates in Fiscal Year 1970, by encouraging greater use of existing Title I funds for this purpose.

2. Technical assistance and evaluation efforts need to be increased. Accordingly, I will implement the suggestion made in the evaluation report of a consulting company that program development and review teams be sent out to work with grantees about six months in advance of their submissions for refunding. We will also expand efforts of personnel training and dissemination of research results through a new visitation and personnel exchange effort between experimental and operating programs.

3. We need to experiment with new program models and ways of bringing the full resources of HEW to bear in support of the program. In this connection we will require the larger Head Start grantees to devote 5 percent of their approved slots for experimental curricula and programs as a means of keeping them alive to new ideas. Among the promising new approaches we plan to test are (1) lower-cost "mini" programs conducted in the child's home or neighborhood through tutors or sub-centers, (2) day care programs funded jointly with industry and labor and related to particular places of employment, (3) experimental early childhood centers linking preschool and school programs for children up to eight years, and (4) programs providing Head Start scholarships or vouchers directly to parents so that they can purchase Head Start services on a competitive basis from certified providers.

I have also decided that Head Start should be administered by a separate Office of Child Development within the Department which would report directly to my office and which would not be subordinated to any existing organizational unit. This was the central recommendation of my Advisory Committee, and I believe it will offer the best possible way of responding to the President's charge to us that we make an expanded commitment to the first five years of life.

The new Office will have direct access to me and because of its high prestige and visibility can become the focal point for a new initiative in child development.

In this connection, I plan to upgrade and transfer the day care, and over time, other early childhood programs operated by the Children's Bureau to this new Office. We are undertaking further studies as to how this can best be accomplished.

I also plan to create an ongoing Advisory Committee on Child Development to include persons skilled in the early childhood field, parents of children participating in the program, and officials responsible for operation of programs at the local level.

Over the next few weeks we will also develop a coordinating mechanism which will seek to provide an overview of early childhood programs throughout the Department, so that research experience and program models can be most widely used. In this regard, I am asking each of the senior officials of the Department to work closely with the new Office and to carefully explore the ways he can be of assistance to it. In particular, we want to make the body of research knowledge now available through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute of Mental Health an integral part of the program effort.

The new Office of Child Development will seek to coordinate its activities with related activities at the local level in our existing education, health and social service programs. For example, we will encourage school systems using education funds and community groups using Head Start funds to collaborate in order to provide a more thorough program of child development. Similar uses may be made of funds under the Social Security Act. Such collaboration would represent, not only a "Head Start," but a sustained start for youngsters.

Today, our nation's schools and child care programs are in the process of changing toward a more comprehensive approach to the physical, social and intellectual development of children and their families. The work and the program of this new Office, with all of the added resources which it will bring to bear, will help our schools and our child care programs to make that change more rapidly.

I am encouraged by the increasingly greater use being made of Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds for local school system programs which are comparable to Head Start. Similarly, I am aware that many school systems have made use of such funds for their own Follow Through programs, and that Social Security Act funds which are administered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service can and are being used to complement education funds and Head Start funds. Therefore, it is critically important that the cooperation between the Office of Child Development, the Office of Education and the Social and Rehabilitation Service be strong and continuing. Both Dr. James Allen, Assistant Secretary for Education designate and Miss Mary E. Switzer, Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service have indicated to me their intention to substantially strengthen the commitments of their programs to focus more sharply on areas of early childhood relevant to their agencies.

ATTACK AGAINST POLICE RENEWED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose peace of mind through law and order and are irresponsible to society continue devious plans to hamstring and thwart local law enforcement protection.

Strangely, the continued attacks on police officers are well-organized and well-financed.

Can any thinking American conceive of offering a cloak of respectability to any movement to make it impossible for our cities to have trained, experienced police officers on the beat?

I feel that many of our colleagues are well aware of the war on our streets—the damage and mayhem from the outside interference with our police—will be interested in the newest attack, reported as "Community Control of Police" by Arthur I. Waskow. I ask that the report follow:

COMMUNITY CONTROL OF THE POLICE

(By Arthur I. Waskow; report of a discussion conference cosponsored by the Institute for Policy Studies and the Center for the Study of Law and Society of the University of California (Berkeley))

Participants: John P. Spiegel, Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence; Frank Mesiah, Quaker Project on Community Conflict; Newton Garver, Quaker Project on Community Conflict; Alton T. Lemon, North City Congress, Police-Community Relations; John Vincent, Institute of Criminal Law & Procedure; Calvin Hicks, New York; Paul Jacobs, Center for the Study of Law and Society; Annette Gottfried, Institute for Policy Studies; Arthur I. Waskow, Institute for Policy Studies.

Three major models for establishing community control over the police were discussed:

1. Neighborhood political control over on-the-beat policemen through elections, etc., of neighborhood commissions with full or considerable power over the police, or the creation of new neighborhood-based police.

2. Creation of counter-police organizations (in effect, "unions" of those policed) with a political base and an ability to hear grievances and force change.

3. Transformation of the police "profession" and role so as to end isolation of the police from the rest of the community, and thus to establish *de facto* community control by informal, rather than formal, means.

1. *Neighborhood control over the police.* Two strands of history were kept in mind: the tradition of popular election of the sheriff in many rural or small-town constituencies, and the recent emergency deputizing of "white hats" in racial-violence situations like Tampa—i.e., withdrawal of white police from black communities and the semi-authorization of black youths (or clergy, or teachers, etc.) to act as police within the black communities. So long as the "white hats" remain an emergency-only resort and also remain under the control of the white authorities (for pay, legitimacy, etc.), they cannot effectively base their authority on consent from the black communities. But it is possible to imagine the institutionalization of neighborhood control: e.g., the election of a neighborhood police commission authorized to hire, fire (or force transfer of),

promote, and discipline officers on the beat in a given neighborhood (up to the precinct captain). In such circumstances, some units of the police would probably stay under metropolitan control (e.g. fingerprint files); but those officers in daily, constant contact with the public in a given neighborhood would be responsive to neighborhood desires on police conduct, rigidity of enforcement of particular laws, etc. It was pointed out that essentially this is the situation already in many small middleclass suburban towns, as well as in farm areas. In the great cities, however, many neighborhoods now have no direct political control over the metropolitan police, and a system of needs and desires different enough from that of the controlling groups that even if there is no deliberate harassment on racist or similar grounds, the effect is of utter disjunction from neighborhood wishes.

Some difficulties were identified with the notion of neighborhood control:

A. Protection of property in neighborhoods where few of the residents own property. Would this traditional function of the police be carried out, if the constituency were opposed or uninterested? Possible solutions: (1) Agreement by the society to pay for property stolen or damaged (essentially, public or private insurance) and to avoid endangering the physical health of those who stole or damaged property; (2) Transformation of the property relations at about the same time as transfer of the police function, so that the neighborhood would own the property (perhaps collectively through co-ops) and would therefore have an interest in protecting it from individual marauders. (The latter might suggest putting energy into demands for social change much broader than the demand for community control of the police.) (3) Abandonment of the property function and substitution of a new function especially oriented to serving the propertyless: "advocacy of change," in which the policeman becomes something like a community organizer/attorney. E.g., the "policeman" leads challenges to illegal housing practices in tenements owned by outside slumlords. (Presumably the neighborhood policeman would keep and probably greatly strengthen his role as mediator or peacekeeper, which is now strongest where the police do live under community control and weakest where they are an occupying army.)

B. Density of population in big cities, leading to greater "boundary" difficulties than in rural America. The difficulty is that the shift from one kind of neighborhood to another comes much more quickly; the likelihood of people moving around from one kind of neighborhood to another during their daily lives is therefore much greater; therefore the possibility of major differences in the kind of law enforcement one person would encounter from geographic unit to unit is much greater, if each such unit controls its own police.

C. Arms. A series of dilemmas were suggested: If neighborhood-controlled police keep their guns, they are much more likely to play conventional police roles. But if black-controlled police in the black neighborhoods are disarmed while white policemen in white neighborhoods keep their guns, there may be important strains because the arms are crucial, symbolically as well as physically. Further: white America may be unwilling to let black-controlled police carry guns if the police are angry young men and true ghetto residents, while permitting black clergy and other "respectable" types to do so. Yet on the other hand, would black "respectable" police act appreciably different from or be seen as more legitimate than the present Metropolitan Police?

D. The Courts. Would neighborhood control of at least the small-crimes and small-claims courts be necessary, in order to up-

hold the meaning and usefulness of neighborhood control of the police? Perhaps in part, the logic would move in this direction; but note that neighborhood control of the police is not utterly meaningless without similar control of the courts: the police are themselves the court of first resort. If they do not arrest, there is no trial; if they arrest and punish, there has been conviction and punishment without trial.

2. *Counter-police organizations.* The possibility of control of the police through counter-vailing power was based on two recent models: the emergence of the Community Action Patrols in Watts and elsewhere as checks on the police, and the Community Review Board created by the Mexican-American community in Denver. Both are vastly different from the conventional proposals for a neutral Civilian Review Board, in that they are explicitly based not on a quasi-judicial model but on the necessity of having independent political power to confront that of the police forces. Both tend to assume that the police are either an independent political force or an arm of a powerful establishment, not a neutral peacekeeping body.

Thus both approaches seek some external political support for pressing grievances against the police. In the Denver case, *chicano* organizations investigate charges of illegitimate or unjust police behavior and where they regard the charges as well-founded, demand punishment of the officers and back up their demands with political pressure (publicity, threatened loss of votes, threatened disorder, etc.). As for the CAP arrangements, they used the endemic anger of young black men against the behavior of the police in the black community to energize youth patrols, accompanying the police on their rounds to take detailed notes and photographs of their behavior. Where the patrols felt the police acted badly, they filed complaints and sometimes tried to turn on some political heat to achieve redress. The Watts CAP tried, notably, to combine the insurgent political energy of the black community with the outside political (i.e. financial support of the Federal government, and thus to box in the police force. But what the Watts CAP hoped to gain from the Federal tie in political ability to resist enormous hostility from the police, was lost in the weakening of ties with the black community itself. The CAP's legitimacy within Watts declined; and then, when the Los Angeles Police Department brought its political power to bear, the Federal government backed off.

The major lessons to be learned from previous experience with the CAPs is that they must be financially and politically responsible to the aggrieved constituency, and that some institutionalization of this responsibility is essential so that the community can remove any CAP men that have stopped being the community's representatives.

3. *Transformation of the policeman's role and career.* The formal command structure, as a result of which metropolitan police forces are ultimately responsible to the power structure of the metropolitan area, is not the only process by which the neighborhoods are denied control over the police. The isolation of the police into an angry and frequently frightened subculture is another. Enforced as it now usually is by tight political organization (based on associations of policemen or their wives), this separation is a major factor in the ability of the police to insulate themselves from the demands of the black or Spanish-speaking or campus communities. The ending of this isolation might therefore be a major element in permitting community control. The analogy mentioned in the discussion was the traditional democratic hostility to a professional

military, for fear that they would slip loose of civilian control.

One proposed medicine for this disease was the radical de-careerization of the on-the-beat police force. It was argued that the role of peacekeeper was not a highly technical or specialized one, but dependent rather on a rather widespread and certainly non-professional skill in conciliatory human relations. The "false professionalization" of the role was ascribed in part to an effort by policemen to defend their jobs and careers, and in part to the attempt of middle-class liberals to "upgrade" and "retrain" working class policemen, on the theory that "the uneducated cop" was typically brutal or racist. It was agreed that some policeman-ship—such as detective work—required more technical and professional training, but it was argued that clear distinctions should be made between such roles and that of the policeman on the beat.

On the basis of these arguments, it was suggested that police might be recruited for a term of not more than three years from a broad cross-section of the public—especially, and deliberately, from among women as well as men and from a wide age range, so as to emphasize the peacekeeping rather than the force-dispensing function. It was thought that the short term might prevent the rigidification of a police culture and police political power. The danger of large "veterans" organizations was mentioned, but it was agreed that the chief danger of military veterans groups comes from their origins in and ties to an officer cadre which would not be present in a de-professionalized on-the-beat police force. (If it is true, as has frequently been claimed, that those who volunteer for police duty are specially self-selected for tendencies to sadism, etc., then even a short-term volunteer process might not change the police enough, and one might have to think about selection of police by lottery from the whole population, etc. But most of the discussants felt that recruitment for the police proceeds on so many different appeals that if sadism is widespread, that is because it is learned on the job from other officers. If that is so, reducing the "career" line to three years would greatly weaken the informal social pressures from older policemen.)

Any of these approaches would require great energy and political support to create, almost certainly against the wishes of police departments. Two approaches to creating this support seem possible: urging decentralization and community control as valuable to all American communities for the sake of their own direct relations with the police; and urging community control in black neighborhoods, either on the ground that black communities, as a result of the emergence of a black "people," are morally and politically entitled to that control or on the ground that achieving it will be the only way to protect the peace and order of the whole city.

Some participants argued that one reason to emphasize the second approach is that much of the available energy for change in the police originates from young black men who are psychologically and physically, as well as politically, outraged by present police behavior. Moreover, starting from this standpoint of the black neighborhoods may, even before community control is achieved, affect police behavior by strengthening the concept of the existence of a black community of people. Present urban policemen lack any idea of how to treat the black community because they do not "see" it: they deal with individual blacks as if they lived in a vacuum, not a community. The very demand for black control of black police in the black neighborhoods (and of course much more strongly the achievement of that demand)

would encourage or force policemen to develop and accept the concept of a complex (not homogeneous) black community in which they can legitimately deal with idiosyncratic interpersonal difficulties, as well as deal with conflicts between black and white society.

There was also some discussion of the question whether such basic reconstruction of the police forces as described above were politically feasible at all, as compared to the slow reform of police practice. Most of those present felt that attempts at reform had consistently failed: civilian review boards and similar devices had neither become meaningful to black communities nor become legitimate in the eyes of the police, thus getting the worst of both worlds, and had as a result frequently started to act as protective covers for the police rather than checks upon them; community-relations training programs had made little dent on practice encouraged by the informal police reference groups; momentary changes achieved by orders from vigorous liberal police chiefs of commissioners had quickly washed away. Some participants expressed hope that deeper forms of training (such as role-playing) might effect permanent changes, but most of those present were skeptical. On the other hand, all recognized that basic reconstructions would not be easy to achieve or make legitimate.

An important problem noted by many of the participants was the difficulty they and other scholars had encountered in getting full access to police files and records, for research purposes. This—a special case of the separation of the police into a special and rather fearful subculture—was making adequate research difficult. The police also, reported some of the participants, brought to bear political pressure upon teachers and scholars in institutions (such as police academies) who were critical of traditional police roles. The participants agreed that efforts should be made to assert the principle of open research in questions and archives pertaining to the police.

EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT WITH- IN THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN COM- MUNITY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to receive a quality education rates as perhaps the greatest path to success for millions of Americans who belong to minority groups. Indeed, for those minority citizens whose native tongue is not English, the importance of education within a bilingual atmosphere is paramount.

Education always has been an area of special significance for the Mexican-American community—particularly in my home district of East Los Angeles. Recently, Mr. Armando Rodriguez, chief of the Mexican-American Affairs Unit of the Office of Education, sent to my attention a series of articles on educational trends in Mexican-American affairs. I find these articles quite stimulating; certainly they should be viewed as a strong argument for increasing Federal commitments to such programs as the bilingual Education Act.

Under unanimous consent I submit the articles for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Education, November 1968]

INTRODUCTION: MEXICAN-AMERICAN EDUCATION: THE SEARCH FOR IDENTITY

About 4.7 million Mexican-Americans live in the United States today, more than 90 percent of them in the five Southwestern States and more than 80 percent in an urban environment. Most of them have an inadequate education.

A 1964 survey revealed that 39 percent of Mexican-Americans in one State had less than a fifth grade education. In a border city that same year, only five to six percent of the Mexican-American children entering first grade knew enough English to go forward with the other children. And many Mexican-American youngsters never get to the first grade.

The recent high school student demonstrations in several cities clearly show that the Mexican-American youngster is very much aware of the failure of the urban school to educate him. When acknowledged student loss rates among schools with a predominantly Mexican-American student body are in excess of 50 percent—and some high schools are graduating only 59 percent of those who started in tenth grade—the evidence of failure is very apparent. The rise in cultural militancy among young Chicanos is directly related to the school's appalling ignorance about the Mexican-American and his role in the American democracy.

We need to dig deep for the ingredient in the curriculum that will enable the Mexican-American to serve himself and his society effectively. Such a program will be committed to these principles:

(1) The Mexican-American child can learn. His Spanish language should not be an obstacle to his success in school, but an effective tool for learning. To destroy it is to destroy his identity and self-esteem.

(2) Mexican-American children and parents have the same high aspirations and expectations as Anglos and Negroes.

(3) Training programs can be established which will enable the teacher and administrator to have confidence that they can be successful with the bilingual child.

(4) The parents and the community must be involved in the decisions that direct the education of their children, and the Mexican-American wants to be a part of this process.

Without a real partnership between the school and the community no basic solutions to the educational problems of the Mexican-American can be found. This partnership must center upon the child, the parent, and the teacher. The rest of the school organization must serve them. Although the community school board concept has had some trying moments, it is a sound idea that needs only more time and patience to work out problems and make it effective.

Community action groups must be mobilized to bring a new vision into the American scene—a vision of cultural diversity in which the school serves as the instrument for the creation of a society which truly accepts each man for himself. The Mexican-American sees the urban school as the prime means to produce a fundamental change in the attitude of our society—but only if it is a school where the hopes and individuality of each child are raised and praised, not diminished and destroyed.

The one issue which unites all Mexican-American activists is education. The Mexican-American is late getting into this battle. But he realizes that unless he gets in quickly and forcefully he will spend another half-century fighting for survival from a position of linguistic and cultural isolation. I was once told: "Black militants will not look out for the Mexican-American; he has his own bag to fight for."

The struggle in urban education as well

as in rural education can be narrowed to a single goal. For the Mexican-American it is taking the schools out of the hands of those who use them to shape a monolinked, monocultural society. The Mexico-American is saying that cultural superiority must be eliminated or cultural militancy will continue to rise. Cultural diversity must be the key ingredient in this new educational environment.

The Mexican-American will not remain a poor third behind the Anglo and the Negro because his school cannot teach him. Nor will he allow society to destroy his linguistic and cultural heritage. He is moving directly into the arena where his future will be decided—the school. As he moves, he calls to all who believe in the richness of differences, in a pluralistic society, in the great strength of diversity to join him.

I invite you to join me and the millions of Chicanos who are embarked on this revolution in our schools. It will be peaceful, and it will be successful! Viva la Causa, Viva la Raza!

ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ,
Chief, Mexican-American Affairs Unit.

UPRISING IN THE BARRIOS

(By Charles A. Erickson¹)

In California's cities the natives are restless. The ethnic kin to the Cabrillos and Seras, to Joaquin Murrieta and Jose de la Guerra are confronting the power structure with demands for educational change. They want it now. They tell you that they don't intend to be stalled or sidetracked or bought off with a job or a raise, a new title or a fingerful of *atole*.

They are activist Mexican-Americans. Their awareness of what the American educational system has done to the bilingual, bicultural Mexican-American is acute. They know that in California he lags nearly four years behind the Anglo, two behind the Negro, in scholastic achievement. They know that the worst schools in cities like Los Angeles—measured by dropout statistics—are the de facto segregated Mexican-American schools.

The day when a lazy "educator" with a glib tongue dazzles them with doubletalk about "language problems" and "responsibilities of parents" is past. They know better. They've done their homework. And while they don't claim to have all the answers, they do know that solutions don't lie with the status quo.

Instant change is the only hope, or many thousands more brown children of the United States will be destroyed by the system, California's activist Mexican-Americans tell you.

Who are these activists?

They are Sal Castro, schoolteacher; Miguel Montes, dentist; Manuel Guerra, college professor; Esther Hernandez, housewife; Moctezuma Esparza, student. The list in Los Angeles alone could fill a book and encompass every trade and profession from newspaper boy to electrical engineer.

The commitment of each varies, of course. In part it is proportionate to the time each has left over from his obligation to job and family, or in the case of some who exploited or downgraded their own race, *raza*, to "make it," proportionate to their personal guilt. Or maybe it is in direct ratio to how much they have been Americanized and made aware of their individual rights.

Some send in a dollar. Some work at it 24 hours a day and go to jail for *la causa*.

The growth of Mexican-American militancy in California has been rapid. Its focus is education. Dominated by youth, it moves in spurts.

¹ Mr. Erickson, whose wife is a native of Mexico, has been closely involved in efforts to help California's Mexican-Americans and their children.

Last March several hundred Mexican-American students participated in a series of peaceful but widely publicized walkouts from their high schools in East Los Angeles. Their orderly protests brought praise from some members of the Los Angeles board of education and called the community's attention to urgently needed educational programs after adult discussion had failed to do so.

Underground newspapers, with Mexican-American reporters in their teens and twenties, are sprouting in cities up and down the length of California. They take on the police, the alleged *Tio Tomases* of their communities, the growers, the selective service system. But the main meat they feed on is the educational system. In East Los Angeles there are two such newspapers: *La Raza* and *Inside Eastside*. They have been instrumental in exciting youth's passion for change.

In the past regular community newspapers circulating in the Eastside and other Mexican-American *barrios* throughout the Greater Los Angeles area studiously avoided social controversy. Today they have changed. They report controversial matters, column upon column, because the community demands it. It wants to know what's going on.

In Los Angeles a few years ago the first significant organization of Mexican-American teachers was founded: the statewide Association of Mexican-American Educators. It flourishes today, and its leaders speak out frequently and boldly. Most of its teacher members are in their twenties and thirties.

Soon after the teachers organized, the students did, too. Today the college and high school students from Los Angeles' Mexican-American community have several organizations to choose from. Most prominent among them: the United Mexican-American Students, Mexican-American Student Association, and the Brown Berets.

When the Los Angeles district attorney's office charged 13 Mexican-American activists with conspiring to cause the East Los Angeles high school walkouts (to walk out is a misdemeanor; to conspire to walk out is a felony), United Mexican-American Students and Brown Beret members were among those arrested, as was a member of the Association of Mexican-American Educators.

The action brought an immediate response from the Mexican-American community and its leadership. Miguel Montes, a member of the California State Board of Education, termed the arrests "an imprudent attempt to keep students and teachers in line . . . unjust and highly partial application of the law."

Francisco Bravo, prominent medical doctor and president of the Pan-American bank, reacted to the arrests with an open letter to the district attorney: "I wish to take hard issue with you in this matter. . . ." he began. Referring to "the continuing mental maiming of our children which has been in existence these many decades in our local educational system," Bravo explained, "While we wish to be responsible citizens, yet we must also ask . . . that our government be responsible and responsive to the needs and to the problems of our people. . . ."

On the issue of education, California's Mexican-Americans speak with an unflinching, united voice. Yet five years ago only a few dared to speak out, and they, with rare exception, were quickly discredited.

Why the sudden shift to militancy?

"The success of the Negro civil rights movement in America unquestionably had a lot to do with it," explains attorney Herman Sillas, a member of the California State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

But Sillas sees other causes: "Today's activist in the Mexican-American community is the one who is most Anglo in his attitudes. He's more aware than his neighbors of his rights as an American and more sophisticated in his knowledge of the machinery of our

democracy. In other words, he knows what happens to the squeaky wheel."

Sillas and other committee members spent two days in the heart of the East Los Angeles *barrio* last year, listening to the testimony of intense young Mexican-Americans about civil rights problems in their community. Typical was the commentary by Rosalinda Mendez, a graduate of an East Los Angeles high school:

"From the time we first begin attending school, we hear about how great and wonderful our United States is, about our democratic American heritage, but little about our splendid and magnificent Mexican heritage and culture. What little we do learn about Mexicans is how they mercilessly slaughtered the brave Texans at the Alamo, but we never hear about the child heroes of Mexico who courageously threw themselves from the heights of Chapultepec rather than allow themselves and their flag to be captured by the attacking Americans.

"We look for others like ourselves in these history books, for something to be proud of for being a Mexican, and all we see in books, magazines, films, and TV shows are stereotypes of a dark, dirty, smelly man with a tequila bottle in one hand, a dripping taco in the other, a sarape wrapped around him, and a big sombrero.

"But we are not the dirty, stinking winos that the Anglo world would like to point out as Mexican. We begin to think that maybe the Anglo teacher is right, that maybe we are inferior, that we do not belong in this world, that—as some teachers actually tell students to their faces—we should go back to Mexico and quit causing problems for America."

According to Armando Rodriguez, chief of the U.S. Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit, young people like Rosalinda, who organize and vocalize their bitterness, are our educational system's best friends.

"What is an activist anyway?" he asks. "Our 'conventional' activists are the ones who become involved in the PTA, who get wrapped up in community projects or walk the precincts for one political party or another. Maybe they'll form a housewives' picket line around City Hall to get a street light on a dark block, or maybe they'll bake cakes to raise money for a new church building.

"Whoever they are, whatever they do, they're working to bring about change. They possess special knowledge and have a special point of view. They introduce an idea to the community, and they campaign for it. This is a basic process of democracy.

"Mexican-American activists are no different than any other American activists. The issue of education is one that affects them most intimately. They themselves were most likely victims of our schools. They've seen the hopes and dreams of their brothers and sisters, their friend, their own children, diminished or destroyed by a system which for years has been indifferent to their needs.

"They want a light in their block too."

Rodriguez contends that these people are vital—just as a PTA is vital—if Mexican-Americans are to get their full share of the American educational system.

"Remember," he says, "the Mexican-American is not talking about destroying the system. He wants to improve it."

The Federal Government's awareness of the special needs for the bicultural student is also reflected in comments made by U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II to delegates attending last April's National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans in Austin, Tex. Howe cited the need to help every youngster—whatever his home background, language, or ability—to reach his full potential; "Such a goal is a lofty one, and it is doubtful that the schools will ever achieve perfectly," he stated. "What must concern us is the degree to which many schools fail to come within a country mile of that goal.

"If Mexican-American children have a higher dropout rate than any other comparable group in the Nation—and they do—the schools cannot explain away their failure by belaboring the 'Mexican-American problem.' The problem, simply is that the schools have failed with these children."

Howe pointed out that Federal funds flow through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into many school districts in which Mexican-American children go to school. "You and your fellow citizens with a particular concern for Mexican-American children should bring every possible pressure to bear to ensure that title I funds provide education which allows Mexican-American children to have pride in their heritage while learning the way to take part in the opportunities this country has to offer. Title I funds are not appropriated by the Congress to promote 'business as usual' in the schools. They are appropriated, instead, to help the educationally deprived get a fair chance.

"The Office of Education," Howe promised, "will join with you to help see that this fair chance is made a reality."

The California State Board of Education requires all school districts to set up advisory committees for title I funds, which assist in assuring effective programs for the disadvantaged.

"The funds enabled us, for the first time, to focus on the needs of the disadvantaged Mexican-American child—to zero in on some of his problems," says Wilson Riles, California's State director of compensatory education. "Students in our title I programs have averaged about a year's gain for each year of instruction. Before title I, they averaged about seven-tenths of a year's progress in a year."

The problem, Riles states, is in having insufficient funds to reach all of the eligible children with a saturated program. "We require districts to concentrate their programs. We try to reach the most severely deprived areas. Spread the money too thin, and you see no results."

Federal monies for migrant education projects also flow through Riles' office. Ramiro Reyes, who coordinates California's plan for the education of migrant children, says, "We're helping 50,000 children, and 85 percent of them are Mexican-American."

Through special migrant education projects some school districts are discovering that they can structure a regular summer school program capable of attracting significant numbers of migrant children. Reyes cited the community of Mendota, in fertile Fresno County, as an example of this:

"They had never had summer schools there before. They started when our program came in, and the youngsters turned out in droves. Many children of migrants from Texas were able to be absorbed into the program."

Another federally funded title I program of importance to California's two million Mexican-Americans is English as a Second Language (ESL). Manuel Ceja, consultant in program development in the State's office of compensatory education, sees ESL as the first step which districts take in recognizing that there is a problem and that other subjects should be taught bilingually too.

"Many of today's ESL programs are steppingstones to true bilingual programs," he says.

In September, Santa Monica started using some title I funds for a 10th-grade bilingual class in reading, math, and English for recent immigrants as well as native-born Mexican-Americans.

"Were watching Santa Monica closely," says Ceja. "Were looking to the day when we have Anglos in these bilingual classes too."

Riles points out that there is a strong indirect benefit from the many federally funded innovative programs in use in California. "Through these special programs," he

says, "we are continually finding new educational techniques and strategies that are useful and adaptable in the broader system."

Armando Rodriguez cites one of these: "The English as a Second Language demonstration center in San Diego has been very successful in bringing the people into a more effective role in helping determine programs for their districts. Now San Diego's ESL program is moving in the direction of bilingual education."

Rodriguez points out that the Federal Government has made a national legal and moral commitment to bilingual education.

"The commitment must be taken up by the States and implemented, regardless of how many dollars will be forthcoming through the new bilingual legislation, or when they will become available," he says. "There are sufficient monies available now through a variety of other Federal programs. It's up to local school districts to re-examine their priorities as to which are the most effective programs and to initiate bilingual teaching."

California's Miguel Montes of the California school board agrees that true bilingual programs must be given top priority. He sees them as intertwined with priorities for expanded preschool programs and projects to prepare teachers for the cultural differences of the Mexican-American child.

"The entire history of discrimination is based on the prejudice that because someone else is different, he is somehow worse," says Commissioner Howe. "If we could teach all of our children—black, white, brown, yellow, and all the American shades in between—that diversity is not to be feared or suspected, but enjoyed and valued, we would be well on our way toward achieving the equality we have always proclaimed as a national characteristic."

Armando Rodriguez sees this as the challenge. "The more completely we develop this bicultural resource—the Mexican-American—the better he will serve our Nation. That's the goal: to educate the total Mexican-American, not just parts of him."

When this happens California's Mexican-American activist will stay home and bake a cake.

[From the American Education, November 1968]

MAMA GOES TO NURSERY SCHOOL

Parents are usually welcome in school one at a time for a "conference," or all together once a year on Parents' Night. But Frank Serrano, a pre-school teacher at the Malabar Street School in East Los Angeles, shatters the pattern. "It would be nice to have one parent for every child each day," he says.

"From the first day of school to the close of the semester, Mr. Serrano had from four to 14 mothers working with him daily in his class of 18 preschool children," says Constance E. Amsden, principal investigator for Reading Project for Mexican-American Children, of which Malabar is an integral part.

Many mothers could not speak English, but Serrano would go to their homes and tell them, "You're the only one who can bring the security and affection of your home into the classroom, and this will help your child tremendously."

So, cautiously they came. Quietly they sat in the back of the classroom, like cardboard figures. But Serrano was patient and encouraging. Before long everyone was merged into the happy hum of class activity.

Serrano's preoccupation with parent involvement strikes from his deep desire to help disadvantaged Mexican-American children break out of their cycle of educational underachievement. "Why," he asks, "with all the good things in the Mexican-American culture, are the results so poor in education?"

Statistically, it's a proper question. Children from areas like Malabar Street enter kindergarten a year or two behind those

from middle-class Anglo neighborhoods. Six months of preschool alone are not enough to span the gap. The difference, Serrano believes, can be made by the parents.

But first there are walls to break down. Mexicans in the lower economic levels have a high, almost reverent regard for education. The teacher is really on a pedestal. Serrano knew he had to go to the parents to scale the wall that had been built between the home and school.

"Most parents were proud that I came to their house. One mother told me that my visit gave her the feeling that I meant business and was working beyond what I was getting paid for," says Serrano. "And this receptiveness helped the children. It gave them assurance that school was going to be a nice, warm place where they'd enjoy being."

Serrano made two visits to each home: the first to break the ice and the second, just before school opened, to erase any tension that may have built during the interim. "It was important to reach the parents on the first visit," says Serrano. "I told them everything I knew about the preschool, what we were trying to do and what benefits they could expect. They were made to understand that the child was not going to play for play's sake. I'd explain, generally, what happens to the child, and some of the problems. Then I'd switch and ask specifically, 'What problems do you think your child will have?' and 'How can you help him?' As we talked, the parents realized that they were an essential part of the program, and their reserve and timidity began to crumble."

Once the mothers overcame their own shyness, they helped the children learn where things were in the classroom and showed them how to get to the bathroom and other rooms in the building. The mothers sculpted with clay, painted, and participated in all the projects the children were working on. Some children painted their first strokes only after a parent was painting next to them. And, oddly enough, these children selected their own subjects and colors, and were not aware of the picture the parent was painting.

One mother tells of a conversation with a friend whose daughter is in a preschool in another city. The friend implied that by taking part in the program the mother was doing something she shouldn't be doing. But the Malabar mother replied, "Your child was timid when she started preschool and after six months she's still timid." Then she pointed out that at Malabar all the children had improved and the only ones who did not improve dramatically were those whose parents did not participate regularly.

That reply applies to another plus in the Malabar program. One might think that a mother would coddle and favor her own child. This is not the case, however. Parents are proud of the growth in all the children and Serrano has "never seen a bit of jealousy on the part of any of them." A mother will work just as hard and be just as attentive with someone else's child as she will with her own.

One mother was a bit miffed when her little girl came home with her shoes on the wrong feet. Serrano apologized and, sensing the trouble, asked, "Aren't you telling me that you want the other parents to give Rosita the same love and care . . ." "Yes, yes, that I give the other children," the mother interrupted.

"This emphasized what I felt everyone was looking for," says Serrano. "Actually, Rosita is very much loved by the other parents, but she is also independent. She wanted to put her own shoes on, and in the turmoil of helping the other children, we forgot to check her shoes. This can happen sometimes!"

Although the mothers are undoubtedly the mainstay of the parental effort in the preschool, some fathers manage to sandwich

in a few minutes from their workday. For those who can't make it, Serrano furnishes slides showing schoolroom activities, and a projector. Several fathers, upon seeing the slides, insisted that their wives "forget the housework and take care of that job at school."

After a year with the program, which is now funded by title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act after a successful debut with support solely by the Los Angeles city school system, Serrano is convinced that parents can make the difference.

"Parent participation in the school makes education important to the child. This means that he will probably continue in school as far as he can. Knowledge is the sure way out of poverty."

[From the American Education, May 1968]
SPEAK UP, CHICANO—THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN
FIGHTS FOR EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY

(By Armando M. Rodriguez¹)

I sat quietly and listened as 15 Mexican-American citizens who had gathered in a crumbling adobe community center in San Antonio's oldest slum talked about their schools. As director of the U.S. Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit, I was there to learn what the local citizens and school people felt were their most pressing educational needs.

"We ought to be consulted more about what goes on in our schools," the president of the Mexican-American Community Club said heatedly. "Our high school needs a Mexican-American on the counseling staff. But the school people say they can't find a qualified one to hire. Over 60 percent of the kids are Mexican-Americans and most of them have trouble speaking English. Yet we have only five Spanish-speaking teachers and not a single person in the school office speaks Spanish. Is it any wonder the kids drop out like flies? The hell with the requirements. Let's take care of these kids' needs, and one of the first is to get somebody who can talk to them."

"Now wait just a minute," interrupted the school district's assistant superintendent. "We have to follow State regulations, you know. You can't put just anybody in the counseling office. You tell us where to find a qualified Mexican-American teacher or counselor and we'll be delighted to hire him."

"At least you could have Mexican-Americans in the school as aides, couldn't you?" asked a neighborhood representative on the community action program board. "But you folks downtown made the requirements so high that none of our people could get a job. Why?"

"We have to have qualified people to work with the youngsters," answered the director of instruction.

"Qualified?" the president broke in. "What could be better qualifications than speaking the language and understanding the kids?"

"Well, we haven't seen much show of interest from the parents," countered a schoolman. "We can't get them out to PTA meetings, can't even get many of them to come to parents' night. We hired a Mexican-American school-community coordinator for some of our schools, but she's finding it an uphill battle getting the parents to take an interest in school matters."

And so it went at meeting after meeting that I attended with Lupe Angulano and Dean Bistline, my coworkers in the Mexican-American Affairs Unit. We visited 17 communities on our three-week tour of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Both Mexican-American community

¹ Mr. Rodriguez, formerly chief of the Bureau of Intergroup Relations of the California State Department of Education, is chief of the Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit.

leaders and school people—some 1,700 altogether—poured out their frustrations, and we learned a great deal about what the people want and need and in what priority.

In those five States alone, there are more than 5.5 million people of Spanish surname. Eight out of 10 live in California or Texas. Their numbers are constantly reinforced by a stream of immigrants from Mexico. Add the 1.5 million other Spanish-speaking people—Cuban, Puerto Rican, Central and South American, and Spanish—who live in Florida and the Northeast and Midwestern industrial cities, and it becomes apparent that the United States has a substantial second minority group. They are a minority whose historical, cultural, and linguistic characteristics set them apart from the Anglo community as dramatically as the Negro's skin sets him apart. Few people outside of the Southwest realize the degree of discrimination this difference has brought about.

For me the introduction to discrimination began 37 years ago when my father brought the family to California from Durango, Mexico. I was nine years old when we settled in San Diego in an extremely poor but well integrated community of Mexican-Americans, Negroes, and poor Anglos. The trouble was in school. I knew only a dozen words of English, so I just sat around the first few weeks not understanding a thing. I was not allowed to speak Spanish in class. But after school each day I played with neighborhood kids, so I soon picked up enough English to hold my own on the playground. Then I made this smattering of English do in class.

It didn't occur to me or my family to protest. In those days people didn't talk much about ethnic differences or civil rights. The chicanos (our favorite nickname for fellow Mexican-Americans) pretty much stayed "in their place," working as domestics and laborers in the cities or as wetback stoop laborers in the fields and orchards. Only a few became professionals or businessmen.

I remember being advised by my high school counselor to forget my dreams of going to college and becoming a teacher. "They don't hire Mexican-Americans," he said. Then World War II came along, and when I got out of the Army in 1944 the G.I. Bill of Rights saw me through San Diego College. I got a teaching job and eventually became a junior high school principal in San Diego. But my experience was a rare one for the times.

Since then conditions have changed a good deal. There is spirit in the Mexican-American community now. On my recent trip I saw a pride in the young people that was not so evident when I was growing up. The chicano today is proud of his role as an American. Many parents, even those who are illiterate, as were mine, are determined that their children will not be like them. And they see education as the means. But along with their determination has come a new impatience. Gone is the meek, long-suffering separateness of the chicanos. They are beginning to stand up and make their voices heard.

"Head Start is great," said a parent-businessman at one of our meetings. "But it isn't enough. Some of the programs are only for the summer and our kids need a whole year if they are to have a chance to start out even with the Anglo kids."

"Many of our kids go to school hungry," another complained. "Why can't the schools use more of their Government money for food and health services?"

As we listened to their grievances, I realized that our most valuable role at these meetings was as a bouncing board for their ideas. With us present, both school and community leaders found themselves saying things to each other they had heretofore

said only within their own group. Inevitably, though, they looked to us, the spokesmen for the Government, to "do something." Of course, that was not our role. We were there to help them establish lines of communication and to explain to them the ways in which the U.S. Office of Education can support their efforts. But we had to make clear that it is they, the State and local school people and the community, who must design the programs and carry them out.

Nationally there is a growing amount of concern about Mexican-American affairs that has generated much real help. In evidence is the recent series of conferences at Tucson, Pueblo, and El Paso sponsored by the National Education Association. Also, the Federal Government created three new agencies with specific responsibilities to the Mexican-American. The Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs assists in development of services that cover the wide range of Government activities. The United States-Mexico Commission on Border Development and Friendship is charged with creating programs to improve cooperation on both sides of the border. And the U.S. Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit seeks to bring some expertise to bear on the education of the bilingual-bicultural citizen and to develop a focus on the effort. This unit is now supported by a newly created Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education. Still another evidence of concern and help is the passage by Congress last December of the Bilingual Education Act (title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act). It authorizes funds and support for schools to develop programs in which both English and the native language of the student can be used as teaching tools until a mastery of English has been achieved.

These are a healthy start, as is the rising involvement of the Mexican-American community itself in directing attention to educational issues. Still, some major obstacles remain in the way of the Mexican-American's progress toward educational equality. Of prime consideration is the shortage of teachers qualified to cope with the Mexican-American's particular situation. There are only 2,000 bilingual teachers in the elementary and secondary schools today. Equally distressing is the lack of teachers who are even aware of the chicanos' cultural background and recognize his language as an asset. It is a striking contradiction that we spend millions of dollars to encourage schoolchildren to learn a foreign language and, at the same time, frown upon Mexican-American children speaking Spanish in school. The impression they receive is that there must be something inherently bad about their language. This, of course, leads to self-deprecation. To make the situation even more ridiculous, they are often asked to take Spanish as a foreign language later in school.

Only bilingual teachers can correct this situation—teachers who can treat the chicanos' Spanish as an asset while the student is learning English. And that will require a tremendous effort in teacher education. As a starter, the Teacher Corps, cooperating with the Mexican-American Affairs Unit, has set up a high intensity language training component for a group of interns teaching in schools with a number of Spanish-speaking students. This program lasts six weeks and gives considerable attention to cross cultural values as well as to language instruction.

A second obstacle to a comprehensive education for the chicanos is the lack of well-integrated curriculums. As I toured the Southwest, I saw good programs here and there for preschool youngsters, some good adult basic education going on in one place, a good program to educate the whole migrant

family in another. But in no single place did I see a school district whose curriculum and instructional program correlated with the needs of the Mexican-Americans from kindergarten through high school. There were glimpses of hope, though.

In San Antonio, Tex., I was impressed with a program developed by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory of Austin that used linguistic techniques to improve the fluency of Mexican-American youngsters in oral language as a foundation for reading. Intensive instruction is given in English as a second language, and an identical program of instruction is given in Spanish. The program was started two years ago in nine schools and is in formal operation in the first two grades in San Antonio with plans for continuation in grades three and four. The first group of youngsters in the program are now equaling national norms in reading and some are even achieving the fifth-grade level. Traditionally Mexican-American boys and girls in southern Texas have lagged at least a year behind the national norms.

San Diego, Calif., has developed a demonstration center for English as a second language to help school districts create specialized educational programs for students who initially learned a language other than English. One of its bright features has been the large number of parents who worked with the professional staff in designing these programs for non-English-speaking parents and youngsters alike.

The Foreign Language Innovative Curricula Studies at Ann Arbor, Mich., used funds from title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to develop a bilingual curriculum program with materials for language arts instruction. The program has been aimed at the Spanish-speaking youngster—both migrant and permanent resident—whose linguistic handicaps severely limit his educational achievement. It is for the primary grades and stresses the development of materials which are exciting to all youngsters and are suitable for use by teachers with a minimum of specialized training.

By sharing their experiences in these innovative programs, school districts can help one another. And a wealth of good ideas are emerging from conferences such as the one sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education and the Mexican-American Affairs Unit in Austin, Tex., last month. Here at the Office of Education we have a special task force that works closely with the eight bureaus in considering funding proposals for projects aimed at improving educational opportunities for the Mexican-American.

A third obstacle to the young chicanos' educational success is a lack of models—"heroes," if you will. The school needs to put before him successful Mexican-Americans whom he can emulate as he sets his educational goals. A teacher, a counselor, a principal who is Mexican-American can do the trick. Discrimination in past generations has, unfortunately, limited the number of such persons. In many heavily Mexican-American schools, there is not a single Mexican-American teacher, let alone a counselor or administrator. Now, however, with the chicanos' education improving and discrimination diminishing, I am hopeful that more and more of today's children will have the career models before them that they need.

If my impression of all this activity and promise is correct, the Mexican-American is about to see the dawning of a new era. He will become a far more productive member of society. His cultural and linguistic heritage will be turned to good use.

Although the chicanos has suffered and lost much in the last 100 years, he now intends to do what is necessary to win his fight for educational equality. And he will do it today. Mañana is too late.

TODAY'S CHALLENGES TO YOUNG AMERICANS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a group of 12 young men and young women from Erie County, N.Y., were guests in the Nation's Capital over the Easter holiday, in recognition of their success in an Americanism essay contest.

Each year for the past 40 years, students in my home county have competed in the contest conducted by the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News and the Erie County American Legion and Auxiliary.

The topic for this year's contest was: "Today's Challenges to Young Americans."

Winners were selected from the thousands of student entrants in the sixth through the 12th grades in some 300 public and private schools.

Their prize was an air trip to the Nation's Capital where a special bus and veteran guide took them on a well-planned 6-day visit to places of both historic and scenic interest.

Accompanying the winners were Mr. and Mrs. Russell F. Tripi, of Williamsville—Mr. Tripi is chairman of the county Legion's Americanism committee—and Mr. David E. Peugeot, promotion editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

Following are the texts of the winning essays:

TODAY'S CHALLENGES TO YOUNG AMERICANS FIRST WINNING ESSAY

(By Mary Lou Pankow, 12, 87 Kingston Place, Buffalo, N.Y., sixth-grade pupil at School 70, winner of the Girls Division of the Buffalo Public Elementary School Classification, Margaret A. Songin, teacher)

The challenges to young Americans are countless. However, these challenges, though many, are not very different from the ones the youth of the world faced throughout the ages. With great respect for the past, a strong faith in the future and inspiration in the present, any challenge can be met and dealt with successfully in the world of today.

Inspiration. What a challenge! We look to others for inspiration. How about ourselves?

Do we inspire others to become better students, patriotic Americans and finer human beings in the family of the world by what we say and do?

We shouldn't be ashamed of the lump in our throat when the Star Spangled Banner is sung or the gleam of pride in our eye when the flag is unfurled.

Then, our "hidden-in-the-heart" love is revealed to inspire others. The challenge of inspiration is only half completed by us. The other half is completed by those whom we inspire.

History repeats itself and young Americans should welcome the challenge of showing respect for the past. Read about it. Learn it. And profit from it. Progress is based on the ideas and deeds of the past.

Faith in the future is a challenge most young Americans forget about. Too often they become discouraged. A good American will have faith in the future and encourage this faith in others, make your faith strong, knowing the best is yet to come.

If we live up to these challenges we can bring about a Golden Age in America as the Greeks did when Pericles ruled. Show the world and the next generation that by ac-

cepting the challenges of today, we, the youth of America, will make it a better world of tomorrow.

SECOND WINNING ESSAY

(By Charles Ihrig III, 12, 1 Treehaven Road, Buffalo, N.Y., a seventh-grade pupil at School 80, winner of the Boys Division of the Buffalo Public Elementary School Classification. Mary A. Lynch, teacher)

Today, the youth of America are faced with the challenge of building tomorrow's America so it will once more regain world respect. This is our challenge and we must accept it.

Tomorrow's America will rely on people of ability and training to improve America. Therefore, youth must acquire an education to comprehend tomorrow's new ideas and to make use of them.

In education we need competent teachers to instruct tomorrow's leaders. As we begin to think about our careers, we must realize that a teaching career will greatly shape tomorrow's America.

Another challenge now confronts us. It is the widespread presence of dissenters. These young adults shout "Peace!" but do nothing to achieve peace. We, as young Americans must rebuild the United States tarnished image.

Some might say it seems an insurmountable task, but if each young person would become a builder, our country would be praised, not downgraded for its youth.

There are many ways by which we can do this. At our present age, we can set a good example to others, respect law and order, participate in community youth work, study hard in school and enjoy a compatible relationship with adults and peers.

Another challenge is to help overcome the prejudices that exist. America was built on the principle that all men are created equal. Yet today, people are discriminated against. Young Americans should move forward to stop oppression. This is the land of the free, and it must remain that way.

These challenges are but a few of those facing us. As young Americans we must carry the emblem of peace and the torch of freedom onward.

If we do, America will once more be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

THIRD WINNING ESSAY

(By Barbara J. Meyer, 17, 102 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y., Lafayette High School senior, winner of Girls Division of the Buffalo Public High School Classification, Lola Marie DiPaolo, teacher)

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." This advice was given many generations ago to the entire world, but it is especially applicable to the present youth of America.

Acceptance of this simple advice poses two major challenges. The first challenge is to decide which ideals in life are good, and the second is to seek them.

As the future leaders and citizens of America, it is important that we form ideals that will guide us in maintaining this nation as a country which offers freedom and liberty to all.

We must learn not to accept blindly all the ideals that have been set before us by past generations. On the other hand, however, we must be careful not to reject, in a spirit of rebellion, everything which is suggested by those who came before us.

It is essential for us to scrutinize each situation that confronts us, to seriously mediate upon each idea which is presented to us, and to view all things objectively and without selfishness in order to prove what is good.

The second challenge is to seek those ideals which have been proven to be good and to firmly incorporate them into our lives. Often, we know what is right, but, be-

cause of social pressure and human frailty, we fail to remain steadfast in our quest of it.

The knowledge of good is useless unless that good is pursued. We must overcome any pressure placed upon us by society and support that which we know to be good. Only if we firmly uphold these worthwhile ideals can we preserve the strength of our country.

This challenge should not be taken lightly by any American, young or old. But it is more important for the young Americans to realize the significance of it because it is they who will determine the future of the United States.

Only if we "prove all things and hold fast that which is good" can we insure the strength and justice which have been characteristic of our nation from the beginning.

FOURTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Timothy Groeger, 17, 581 Highgate Ave., Buffalo, N.Y., Kensington High School senior, winner of Boys Division of the Buffalo Public High School Classification, Ruth C. Culliton, teacher)

The world has changed since our parents and grandparents were young. Its pace today is swifter, its problems more complex.

Young men die in the jungles of Vietnam, fighting for democratic ideals, while others burn their draft cards to protest the war.

Upper-class suburbanites relax in the shade by the backyard pools, while tenement poor swelter in the heat of the inner city.

Small children struggle to read and write in one-room schools in Appalachia, while student rebels riot on campus at Berkeley, Columbia, and San Francisco State.

We look around and see poverty, ignorance, hypocrisy, injustice, and inequality. As the leaders and citizens of tomorrow, today's youth will be faced with the great challenge of solving these problems which confront our nation.

Ours will be the task of keeping America great and free. But we need not wait until we are middle-aged to accept our responsibilities as Americans. There are challenges now which are sufficient to test our strength and ability.

We must begin by bettering ourselves. We must strive to obtain a good education, develop sound values, and use our abilities to their fullest potential. We must become all that we can be, for a better world begins with better men.

In an age marked by disorder and rebellion, youth faces the challenge to respect and obey the laws. Instead of taking LSD or smoking marijuana to escape reality, we can join the Peace Corps or VISTA and work to brighten reality. Rather than fighting to resist the draft, we can accept the challenge of serving our nation with courage and honor.

Unfortunately, there is a "generation gap" which prevents many adults and young people from understanding each other's problems and viewpoints. Similarly, there is racial tension, which alienates many from their fellow Americans.

We must learn to live and work with others and through understanding, tear down the barriers which separate man from man. Together, we will be strong.

The challenges which face the youth of today are unlimited. For young Americans, no challenge is too great.

FIFTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Pamela Zammito, 12, 94 Fairview Drive, Depew, N.Y., eighth-grade pupil at Lancaster Junior High School, winner of the Girls Division of the Erie County Public Junior High School Public Junior High School Classification, Jeanette M. George, teacher)

Today's world is very complicated. Some young people feel they are facing problems that cannot be solved, such as racial in-

equality, poverty, pressures of higher education, and competition for better jobs, just to mention a few.

Some of today's youth have attempted to solve these problems with violence and others by "dropping out." They don't stop to think about what they may be leaving those of us who will be the next generation.

I believe this is the biggest challenge facing us today—how to keep from making the same mistakes of not the older generation, but today's. No society can exist without respect for law and order. We must learn of law and get the very best education we can, so when we become unhappy with the way life is, we can change it legally and orderly.

We have to strengthen our faith in God and uphold his commandments. No one can force a man to love his neighbor, but with common sense and common courtesy we can learn to live together in peace and harmony. Both sides must learn to listen to the other side and be fair-minded.

We can try to see life as it really is and learn to realize there will always be problems, but the way to solve them is with our heads and hearts, not force.

We young people could set an example for the older generation by love and respect for one another, regardless of race, creed, or color, and by studying and doing the best we can now so when we enter college we will be properly prepared.

So you see, our greatest challenge is the future and what we do with it when it's our turn.

SIXTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Cathleen Summers, 16, 33 Bellinger Street, Tonawanda, N.Y., Tonawanda Senior High junior, winner of the Girls Division of the Erie County Public High School Classification, Mary Elizabeth Neill, teacher)

Look around you, past those four surrounding walls, outside your secure group, around the borders of this protective, care-free society.

What do you see? If you truly wish to see, your eyes will meet the loneliness of an old woman, the hunger of a starving child, the hatred of a colored youth, and the unconcern of thousands. Many of today's Americans live in a shell, shut off from the problems of a changing world.

And yet today's youth is awakening and becoming aware of these problems. We can no longer sit back and say, "It doesn't concern me," but rather, "it could have been me."

We confront the afflictions and anguish of others in the newspaper, in magazines, on television and on movie screens; and we feel the increasing tension around us. We look to the future with hope, while others look to the future with fear. Can we turn our back on our brother? We can't unless we are willing to be untrue to ourselves. For everyone needs to love, just as everyone needs to be loved.

Not only should we be aware, but now we must become involved and entangled. We must fight for what we believe, as our forefathers did years ago, and as our men in Vietnam are doing today. For to be willing to sacrifice one's life is the greatest example of integrity and sincerity.

Therefore, let our aim be to alleviate the desperation of others, and let courage be our inspiration. If we set this goal for ourselves and struggle toward it with determination, one day we will reach it.

SEVENTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Kevin Grippie, 13, 41 Ellsworth Drive, Cheektowaga, N.Y., eighth-grade pupil at Maryvale Junior High School, Cheektowaga, winner of the Boys Division Erie County Public Junior High School Classification; Helen M. Stellrecht, teacher)

Most of today's challenges fall under one broad heading—living up to our heritage, a

heritage based on the metamorphosis of thirteen struggling colonies into the most powerful country on earth. Our nation's founders fought valiantly to establish this heritage, and today's youth—tomorrow's statesmen—must fight equally hard to retain it.

As Americans, we must accept our privileges with humility, and our responsibilities with foresight. Plans for underwater cities that will solve our present population dilemma are already in the making.

Ways to desalt massive amounts of water economically must be discovered if the human race is to survive. Farming the ocean is now in its embryonic stage and must be made more commercially feasible if we are to have food for future generations.

Colonization of the moon and exploration of the solar system are within our grasp. We are on the threshold of many accomplishments, and it is up to America's youth to turn these ideas into reality.

Such attainments cannot be perfected by a nation divided over race, color or creed. A society absorbed in violence and lawlessness cannot endure.

We must be willing to develop, through education, to our fullest potential. We must be a generation which reaffirms the basic principles of democracy—equality, justice, and the betterment of mankind.

The responsibility of protecting the rights of the entire free world will fall heavily upon the shoulders of young Americans. We must be willing to fight in any corner of the world where freedom is threatened, eternally seeking an honorable settlement and our true goal, peace.

Today's youth must continue to follow America's policy of trying to avoid war, but never fearing it.

EIGHTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Michael Krupp, 16, 193 Walter Street, Tonawanda, N.Y., Tonawanda Senior High junior, winner of the Boys Division of the Erie County Public High School Classification. Virginia L. Holcombe, teacher)

The challenges of today's life in America are so vast and numerous that they have brought a varied reaction from all. I would like to define this challenge as a call for service that we might have to offer.

With the vast technological society we have today, one might think only the intelligent person is the object of this call. This is an unfortunate misconception many of our young people have today.

The challenge is present for all; it is a call for all to develop a sincere understanding for others. Many feel life is meaningless, but this is only because they have shunned the call.

Before we can attack the problems which threaten our way of life we must understand what they are, why they have come about and the people involved in them.

Our understanding of the marvels of the universe are nothing if we can't foster understanding here on earth. The opening of the mind should be the frontier that we should concentrate on. If we can achieve this, we could solve our race problem and start solving a multitude of others.

To effectively meet this challenge we have to rearrange our personal priorities. The way of self must be abandoned and a new breed of selfless Americans must evolve. These people, young and old, will no longer find it hard to realize why the ghetto dweller hates society.

This challenge requires no campus revolution; but forces us to undergo a self-revolution. We must beat down our own foolish desires and search for a meaningful way to solve the problems of the society around us.

If our professors, college administrators and students could understand each other's goals, I am confident the disastrous disorders on campuses would abate.

The person who accepts this challenge realizes this is a fulltime job. He doesn't quit when one job is met, but continues on until all problems are vanquished. The challenge for young Americans is the same all are faced with. If we can accept it and make understanding our "thing," then we all will live in a much better place.

NINTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Mary Jo Orzech, 13, 7 Palm Street, Lackawanna, N.Y., Eighth-grade pupil of Our Lady of Victory School, Lackawanna, winner of the Girls' Division of the Private and Parochial Elementary School Classification. Sister Rita Kane, teacher)

To become instruments in the improvement of the world, searchers for enduring values in changing times and then leaders of peace and freedom, are our challenges as young Americans; in short, to become sons and daughters of whom America can be proud. Our challenge is to contribute to the good of society, realizing that like other nations, ours may need alterations and updating but not complete rebuilding; medication and even transplants but not mourning and death.

As living hopeful members of the world, we have our lives before us to fulfill our special roles. Medicine, science, space travel and racial discord, to name a few, are loaded with more than a spark of the challenges which face us. To choose the best lessons of history, to learn the solid values of what is right, is what we are challenged to learn; then, to live them so as to be visible evidence of our self determination.

When it is difficult to be strong under the pressures of today's pace, it is wise to study how yesterday's youth resolved their differences during merciless wars, depressions and troubled times. Their sacrifices and actions can give us the strength and inspiration to confront and master our challenges, for these are not insurmountable difficulties.

Our challenges are physical, mental and moral. They are self discipline, study and work to create an intelligent and orderly mosaic of life instead of an ever changing kaleidoscope of strains and stresses, uprisings and riots, crimes and disorder.

No one guaranteed America's greatness forever. History tells us empires as great as ours have fallen. My challenge is to appreciate, preserve and promote America's greatness; to enjoy my rights and privileges simultaneously respecting those of others. Finally, America should not look after us, we should look after our America.

TENTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Gloria A. Rossi, 16, 93 Clarence Street, Buffalo, N.Y., Bishop O'Hern High School, junior, winner of the Private and Parochial High School Classification. Mina Callis, teacher)

Challenges today hit youth hard. Because we are young, the mystery of existence has not yet cleared: we are still in the haze of discovery. Uncertainties about ourselves and about life surface in our minds. We want to prove ourselves as adults while we are still children. Our first challenge was to survive; now it is to survive peacefully, to make the world a better place for ourselves while tripping upon mistake after mistake.

The challenge to find ourselves and to fit into the adult world is hard; we have not quite fit into the adolescent world. Intelligent thinking replaces childhood acceptance as we begin to find God and attempt to settle questions of right and wrong for ourselves as individuals. Youth is challenged to find the pattern for its lifetime in a few short years of too little experience.

We know we must bargain and compromise with childhood thoughts a bit in youth. To meet youth's challenges a new form of thought emerges: realism and anticipation force us into the future. To meet life's chal-

lenges a bit of the extraordinary is required: clearness and sureness, uncommon to youth. A realistic outlook toward the future along with a willingness to meet challenges aid us greatly when we are thrown against life's winds and expected to survive on our courage alone.

Young Americans have claim to the best and most promising future possible. Are we worthy of it? Past and present Americans seem to be rich in the same secret of American life and happiness: belief in the people as a nation. We must claim our place in this nation and hold it if we are to grow old in dignity and in Americanism. We must prove we are as worthy as our predecessors. We must be able to match and surpass their discoveries and miracles by living our lives not repetitiously but creatively.

ELEVENTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Paul Kunkemoeller, 12, 172 Dickens Road, Town of Hamburg, N.Y., Seventh-grade pupil of Our Lady of Sacred Heart School, Town of Hamburg, winner of the Boys' Division of the Private and Parochial Elementary School Classification. Sister Catherine Mary, teacher)

Young Americans today are growing up in a rapidly changing world. Speed, action and constant change are the characters of their present environment.

Today's youth have been affected by these characteristics and feel a certain impatience with any concept hinting of moderation or complacency. This impatience, itself is not harmful. It must be channelled properly to find methods to deal with the basic problems confronting the world. Working to solve these problems is the biggest challenge to young Americans today.

The most pressing problem facing the world today is the achievement of an honorable peace throughout the world.

Once world peace is a reality, attention must be given to helping the disadvantaged people at home and in other nations.

While attacking these problems, ever-present gaps between generations, races, and nations must be corrected.

Upon the resolutions of these problems, many remaining difficulties will disappear.

The real summons to American youth is to speak out to help find avenues to peace. However, destruction and riotous behavior are not the answers. Evidence proves that draft-dodging, car burning, and other unlawful acts are not solutions. Only honorable, concrete, proposals can lead to the eventual successful establishment of peace.

Then, youth could turn its boundless energy to the unfinished task of working with, educating, and otherwise aiding the millions of disadvantaged in the world to fulfill the basic desire for self-achievement. Lobbying done by youth for needed legislation could greatly reduce the problems of the less fortunate.

The aforementioned gaps which exist are basically those of communication. A dialogue must be established with each party trying to understand the other's position. Youth must understand that the older generation listens when meaningful, workable suggestions are presented.

To meet these challenges, youth must apply the foregoing principles now.

TWELFTH WINNING ESSAY

(By David Carlson, 14, 8430 Wehrle Drive, Williamsville, N.Y., St. Joseph Collegiate Institute, Kenmore, freshman, winner of the Private and Parochial High School Classification. Mr. John M. Busch, teacher)

The late Robert Kennedy once said "our future may lie beyond our vision, but it is not completely beyond our control."¹

¹ Robert Kennedy quote from "A Tribute to Senator Robert F. Kennedy" by Senator Edward Kennedy.

Listing the challenges is useless; working to meet the most important challenge is vital. This does not necessarily mean the most talked about or most extensive. Before we take large steps, we must take small steps; before we take small steps we must take the first step. This is the most important. America today is on a road leading to the realization of the goals of the Constitution and hopes of America's future. The challenge to young Americans today is to work and help America with the first steps of this journey.

The first area of challenges to young Americans is within the realms of the family. We must work to eliminate the generation-communication gap and nurture good family relationships. We then must meet the challenges of the neighborhood, school and local government.

The second area of challenges is that which young Americans present to themselves. We must work to rid our age group of the bad name society has given us. It is the result of irresponsible actions on the part of a few who are immature. We are taking on more active roles as American citizens. This entails any challenges from voting to fighting in the Armed Forces. Presently, our challenges are school and the many freedoms and responsibilities society gives us. There are also the challenges with which we are all familiar; civil rights, draft dissension, student violence, and other form of civil disobedience.

These challenges can be summed up in one basic challenge: To take the idealism, so dominant in America's youth, to work, to make it realism today and in America's future. When these challenges are met, one by one, step by step, America will be moving along that road at a fast pace. The late Martin Luther King once said "And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall march ahead. We cannot turn back."²

ENDING THE WAR STILL IS MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, behind all the fancy talk over the proposed ABM system; behind the furor over inflation and taxes; behind the Nation's attention on problems of hunger and poverty, there remains the key issue of our day—that the tragic war in Vietnam goes on and on without any real sign of peace from any front.

America's commitment to maintaining adventurism in Southeast Asia the past 5 years has resulted in perhaps the most useless, costly sacrifice of resources—human, physical, and moral—in our history.

The Nixon administration has picked up where the Johnson administration left off. We should not be fooled; substituting South Vietnamese troops for Americans is not a move toward peace.

Two recent series of newspaper articles offer some valuable perspective on the direction that we should be undertaking in our policies toward Southeast Asia. I insert the articles—from *Newsday* and from the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*—in the *RECORD* at this point:

² Martin Luther quote from "I Have a Dream" by Martin Luther King.

[From *Newsday*, Mar. 25, 1969]

VIETNAM I: WHAT IS OUR CHOICE?

(NOTE.—*Newsday* recently published a letter from a reader raising several basic questions about the future of the Vietnam War. Because of the significance of these questions, *Newsday* is reprinting the letter and responding in a two-part editorial, appearing today and tomorrow.)

"SMITHTOWN.

"To the Editor:

"In the editorial 'How Long Must We Wait' (March 3), *Newsday* called for the rapid termination of the Vietnam war but did not make clear how that goal could be reached.

"It may be attained by one of two means: We can either withdraw all American troops and aid from South Vietnam and surrender that country to the Communists or we can destroy the North Vietnamese capability for waging aggressive war. Looking at it another way, the choice is between subjecting 17,000,000 people to a life of atheistic totalitarianism, or giving them the chance to develop a rewarding society such as can be found in South Korea and Nationalist China.

"I argue that 'We need a policy now to end the fighting.' That policy must be either a surrender to aggression or defeat of aggression.

"GEORGE J. TREUTLEIN."

Mr. Treutlein is not alone in his opinion. The Gallup Poll reported this weekend that the views of Americans on Vietnam are rapidly polarizing between those who want to "go all-out" and those who want to "get out." Distressed by the rising toll of dead and wounded and exasperated by the stalemate which makes the suffering seem all the more pointless, people are beginning to draw the issue in the simplest of extremes: "We can either withdraw all American troops and aid from South Vietnam and surrender that country to the Communists, or we can destroy the North Vietnamese capability for waging aggressive war."

Unfortunately, the issue is not that simple. Whether or not we were right to do so, we assured several million Vietnamese who opposed the Communists that they would be safe on "our" side. Do we suddenly pull out and leave them to an adversary who is sure to be all the more vengeful because the U.S. made the price of their victory so high?

And what do we say to those other nations to whom we have repeatedly stressed that our presence in South Vietnam is proof of our belief in collective security? Is any one of them likely to place much faith in our saying now, "Well, we are out of South Vietnam, but you can count on us in—"? Critics will say this is an irrelevant question because the U.S. can no longer be the world's policeman, but they will be missing the point. If we pull out of Vietnam in a hasty and ill-contrived way, the Communists may be tempted to do what otherwise they might not have done if we had not gone into Vietnam in the first place: step up their pressure at other points in Southeast Asia.

For the supreme irony of Vietnam is that we invested the Domino Theory with a validity it may never have had until we translated a local conflict into an international confrontation. By introducing half a million men and massive amounts of materiel into South Vietnam, we made certain that the vacuum created by a precipitate withdrawal of those forces would be greater than the original vacuum we sought to fill. The consequences of a Communist victory on the heels of a quick flight by the U.S. are almost guaranteed to be more serious than they would have been if we had never intervened. Having intervened in another nation's affairs to maintain the balance of power in Southeast Asia, we would alter the balance drastically by suddenly withdrawing.

"Next to the assumption of power," Disraeli

said, "was the responsibility of relinquishing it." In other words, getting out of a mess is harder than getting into it. The urge to "get out" no matter what the cost is a perfectly understandable emotion on the part of people weary of war and sickened by its costs. But our impatience and sorrow must not permit us to replace one wrong policy with another which only multiplies the costs.

THE MILITARY OPTION

What of the other choice—the "go all-out" option that would have us "destroy the North Vietnamese capability for waging aggressive war"? This presumes the war can be won in the North, a proposition hardly justified by past experience.

We have already dumped on the North Vietnamese more tons of explosives than we did on all of Europe in all of World War II, and to what end? With only marginal dislocation, they have gone on pouring enough manpower and materiel into the South to sustain the war and to mount two Tet offensives. The fact is that the primitive North Vietnamese economy does not lend itself to destruction by modern machines of war—it can be and is so widely dispersed as to be almost immune from air strikes. When American warplanes went after the large petroleum storage tanks in 1966, the North Vietnamese effectively relocated their oil supplies in thousands of smaller underground tanks scattered throughout the countryside. Leveling Hanoi and destroying the port at Haiphong would reduce their capacity only slightly, and even then not for long. The supply lines to China are short and the North Vietnamese ability to move goods on peasant backs and bicycles remains impressive.

This leaves only an invasion of North Vietnam to consider, but does anyone really believe it is either morally or militarily possible? For one thing, it would almost certainly force China and the Soviet Union to forget their own quarrels in the interest of helping a sister socialist republic under attack by a capitalist nation. For another, it would flaunt whatever measure of self-respect Americans have left to watch our forces invade a country with which we are not legally at war and which has not threatened us. Finally, it wouldn't succeed. If more than a million allied troops have been unable to defeat an outnumbered army of Viet Cong guerrillas and North Vietnamese regulars operating in South Vietnam, is it reasonable to expect there would be any greater advantage in doubling the size of the battlefield and carrying the fight to the enemy's homeland, where the terrain is even more familiar to him and the people more friendly? And who believes that the President could order such an invasion and command the resources at home to support it without splitting this country right down the middle?

NO END IN SIGHT

Is our option, then, to escalate the war in the South? Hardly. To continue to apply massive firepower to the countryside of South Vietnam is to reinforce the old dictum that some military victories make political defeat inevitable. It is quite possible that the South Vietnamese people, as over and against the Saigon government, are growing weary of being defended at such an excessively high cost. The longer the war continues, the higher the price they pay. And this says nothing of the grim cadence at which our own casualties continue to rise: 400 dead one week, 300 the next, more than 32,376 in all, and still no end of the violence in sight.

These, then, are three of the options: "To get out," "To go all-out," and "More of the same." None is acceptable. The first compounds the consequences of our original intervention, the second escalates the possibility of a far wider war, and the third continues the same dreary cycle of death and destruction.

But these are not the only options. Mr. Treutlein has correctly asked that we make clear how the U.S. can reach the goal of ending the fighting. Tomorrow we will discuss more fully what is to us the most compelling choice of all: disengagement.

[From Newsday, Mar. 26, 1969]

VIETNAM II: FACING THE FACTS

The immediate goal of the U.S. in Vietnam should be to reduce its own role in the fighting to square with these realities:

We have achieved the main purpose for which we escalated the war four years ago—to prevent a tottering government in Saigon from falling to Communist armed forces.

Certain other objectives, no matter how sound in principle, cannot be achieved by U.S. military forces. Creating a sense of nationhood among the people of South Vietnam, guaranteeing their right of self-determination, and distributing power among the various groups in the country are goals which only the Vietnamese can secure for themselves through political action.

The costs of continuing the conflict have grown out of proportion to any benefit we can reasonably hope to gain beyond our original purpose. The fallout from U.S. involvement—the moral alienation of our young people, the diversion of money and talent from programs needed to solve our social ills at home, the stirring of isolationist sentiments, and the annual impact on our economy of \$30 billion in war costs—cannot be tolerated much longer without the gravest consequences.

The Communists in Vietnam want to keep the finger at an intense level, and have the means to do so indefinitely, in the hope that destruction of the countryside will turn the Vietnamese people away from us and that high American casualties will undermine U.S. public support for our aims there.

No matter how long the fighting continues, neither side can win a clear military victory. We cannot kill enough Communists to force them to stop fighting and they cannot defeat half a million Americans. The result can only be a Vietnam version of the Battle of the Somme: costly but inconclusive offensives on each side leading to more conflict, death, and stalemate.

The best resolution we can hope for is a settlement in which neither side gets what it has been fighting for but which permits each side to believe it has a reasonable chance to achieve its aim by political rather than military means.

These are the realities upon which the U.S. must act. President Nixon is more free to act upon them now than he will ever be. The longer he waits, the more entwined he will become in the inherited policies of the Johnson administration and in the inexorable momentum of the machinery of war. He should begin immediately to reduce the level of violence and to make the American role less conspicuous.

Three tactical decisions are possible:

First, stop the "Search and Destroy" and "Clear and Hold" operations or turn them over to South Vietnamese forces. These have been operations of dubious value anyway, requiring too many forces to fight in exposed positions with precarious lines of supplies, and requiring indiscriminate bombing and shelling of the countryside. We cannot convince neutral villagers that they are safe on "our" side when willingly or unwillingly the allies destroy their homes and dispossess their families.

WITHDRAWING TROOPS

Second, withdraw between 50,000 and 100,000 troops in the next few months. (White House advisers are already saying privately that most U.S. combat forces could be withdrawn by the summer of 1970.) An immediate withdrawal of some troops would have the effect of convincing the South Viet-

name that we mean business when we insist they bear more of the load. They have often treated our demands as bluffs, believing that Washington would not dare push too hard on a Saigon government so weak that it might fall altogether. As a result, they met only those demands which they found convenient and ignored the others.

Third, concentrate U.S. troops on the mobile defense of the cities and as advisers to South Vietnamese units responsible for guarding the heavily populated rural areas of the country. South Vietnamese troops could be deployed from time to time to knock off balance Communist units poised for attack, but missions into remote terrain would be replaced by a joint allied strategy of protecting the coastal strip and the southern third of South Vietnam where most of the people live.

These steps will not end the fighting in Vietnam overnight. But they will begin to change the nature of what has become an Americanized war, one which, ironically, no American army can win. They will lower the visibility of the American war machine and demonstrate our desire to disengage from the vain and endless quest for a military triumph. Hopefully, they will accelerate the political process through which the war will ultimately be ended.

POLITICAL COMPROMISE

For this is the quintessential point. Even these steps will be useless if they are not the basis for moving toward a genuine political compromise. The keystone of such a compromise must be an election in which all of the people who live in South Vietnam choose a new government through universal suffrage and the secret ballot. There can be no honest settlement which avoids the fact that many of the people we have been fighting have been deeply rooted in the South Vietnamese countryside since 1954. They are determined to participate with all other groups in the political life of the country.

We and our adversaries in Hanoi and Moscow have all talked of such elections. Now let the primary purposes of the talks in Paris and any secret negotiations be to agree to move explicitly toward those elections.

Hanoi should realize that all of our troops will finally be withdrawn only in return for free elections, but Saigon must realize that only in the give-and-take of political action can the future of South Vietnam actually be decided. This may be an unpalatable risk, but it is also an unavoidable one. All of the cards are simply not in our hand. The only other practical option is to go on backing the present government ad infinitum, a decision that would drag the war far into the future.

The critical moment has arrived. If Washington chooses to press in Paris and elsewhere for an honest compromise and a true political settlement, there is hope. But if Washington believes that a decisive and ultimate victory on the battlefield still is possible and holds out for a political settlement which ignores the realities, nothing can save us from another round of death in Vietnam and division at home.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Dec. 15, 1968]

VIETNAM, 1968 IS TIME FOR ANGER

(By Michael D. Roberts)

SAIGON.—It is difficult to feel sadness on leaving Vietnam. All the sadness you could muster has long been expended—uselessly you might add.

The thing you can do is lament the dead and those who are going to die in this place of confused torment.

The feeling most prevalent, though, is anger—not an anger derived from a political philosophy or a fervid moral movement, but an anger based on realism.

This anger is directed at the Vietnamese

and American governments and those who represent each in their particular endeavors in the orchestrated mess called the Vietnam war.

And the others—the Vietnamese people and the American soldiers—well, they really have no control over what happens to them, and need an element of luck to duck at the right moment. You can sympathize with them, admire them and wish them luck. After they are dead you may lament them.

A new President will now confront the cursed ways of this war, and if he is not deceived perhaps he can help bring peace to the countryside and joy to the people.

But to do this he must be tough and wise and stop playing "let's pretend" with the South Vietnamese Government (GVN) and recognize what it is and what it has not done.

In many ways the GVN, masked behind its democratic drapery, is as much of a hindrance as the Viet Cong when it comes to joy and freedom for the people.

It is neither responsive to the people it represents nor viable enough to stand on its own. Directed largely by military personalities, the GVN goes its own way and in a carefully masked drama gives us the impression of being democratic. It is a hollow impression.

Most knowledgeable Vietnamese who care enough to be interested will tell you about the great election we forced the GVN to hold in the fall of 1967.

"The election was the biggest fraud," said one student. "It is common knowledge among the people that many soldiers voted twice. That many people long dead had cast ballots is quite amusing to many of us."

But since the election and the writing of a constitution Americans here have looked upon the evolution of democracy in almost a reverent manner.

"Why, I'm not worried about a coup," said an American adviser in Vung Tau. "They have a constitution now. After the election why should there be a coup? It is a practicing, living democracy now."

The fact that the GVN is a thinly disguised tyranny that closes newspapers with flimsy explanations, harasses those who would dare to speak out in public, and takes from the people in the form of corruption is usually overlooked.

Outwardly, the GVN appears to be laboring to develop a war-torn nation, but inwardly its officials, products of a system that has become part of this nation's blood, continue to grow wealthy from the ways of war, corruption and the American dollar.

Given peace tomorrow, the GVN would only have to face another armed group preparing to rid the land of oppression.

The oppression comes first, rebellion follows and the Communists fill the vacuum and provide an added spirit, eventually taking the leadership of the entire movement and making it theirs. This is a possible pattern of insurrection.

As long as the GVN continues to treat the people in the present manner communism will always have a point from which to commence.

Legions of naive, ambitious and plainly stupid Americans have unwittingly aided the GVN. Our government attempted a revolution here which was of such magnitude that it became an impossibility from the start because of the character of the people and the nature of the GVN.

Our government, under the impression that American money and men could eventually transform this land into a democratic society, gave the GVN its head. Because of the United States, the GVN had power and we really had no control over this power, which, of course, was ours from the beginning.

Never before has our government fought such a war. In response, it has sent Ameri-

can civilians and leaders of such naive quality that one's teeth grate in frustration.

U.S. AID employes, people who are asked to function in important jobs—jobs that require immense skill and understanding—arrive daily to collect substantial salaries and live in air-conditioned comfort. They arrive without skill or understanding.

Some go to the district and provincial capitals to serve in various advisory roles. Many who are sent to advise are recent college graduates who previously never held jobs and are avoiding military service. Others are former military men, usually retired, who were passed over on the promotion lists.

This is not to say that the civilians who serve as advisers are all inadequate, for there are some outstanding people here, but even they are stymied by the atmosphere and events that take place around them.

One adviser, a young man who is capable and knowledgeable, blames the military for many ills and refuses to mingle with the rest of the men on the advisory team who are all military.

His attitude is one of disgust toward the Army—disgust because the Army seems indifferent toward the Vietnamese people.

"I have as little as possible to do with the military," this adviser explained.

Whether he knows it or not, this adviser is dulling the effectiveness of his particular team. True enough, the military does not exhibit the same zeal as the young adviser, but he refuses to see reality and try to make the team work.

On the other hand, the military often manifests contempt for the civilians, who are sometimes viewed as "do-gooders" with an business to be cluttering up a war zone.

Since the job of fighting this type of struggle is complex, the experience and knowledge of those who have mastered a small part of it is invaluable. But by and large, many of these people give up in disgust at the leadership, which tends to give in to the Vietnamese pressures at nearly every turn.

The matter of corruption alone is of such staggering magnitude that the mind reels when it confronts only a small part of it.

And the Vietnamese people laugh—oh, how they laugh!—at the Americans who are innocent of the corruption that surrounds them. The Vietnamese people know all and see all. They are the last to be fooled by the stories of improvement and progress that we praise the GVN for making. Obviously, we are the first to be fooled.

We have done so much for the Vietnamese that they have simply stopped functioning. We advise on everything. We finance most things and we do the heaviest fighting. The Vietnamese government spends its time talking about how it is not going to talk to the National Liberation Front, a confrontation that will have to take place if there is to be peace.

While South Vietnam's large and questionable army moves about the countryside deploying in maneuvers of eluding and engaging, our military is expected to do more than fight.

The truth is that the military has been asked to do too much in Vietnam. Soldiers are expected to be politicians, good humor men, development specialists, doctors, psychologists and just about everything short of the good fairy.

If you have ever had anything to do with an infantry unit that has seen combat day in and day out, you can understand the ridiculousness of this. Men tense and tired from combat are apt to look upon any Vietnamese with suspicion and ill feeling.

However, the military in Vietnam cannot go uncriticized. Gen. William C. Westmoreland with his vocal optimism, his search-and-destroy methods and his massive use of firepower left the military effort open to the attacks of skeptics.

But in many ways the military has done its primary job in Vietnam. It has killed Viet

Cong and North Vietnamese soldiers. It is even getting better at the job. What else does a military do?

The longer you are here, however, and the more closely you examine the enemy and the politics, it becomes increasingly evident that the military operations are superfluous because the "other war" is being fought like a delay-and-withdraw action. Because of the ineptness of the GVN, Viet Cong are manufactured daily.

Our participation in the "other war" has been less than brilliant.

Men were assigned to Vietnam as leaders in this program and came to build personal empires of such bureaucratic magnitude that it took elaborate charts to find out who was responsible for what.

Robert W. Komer, now U.S. ambassador to Turkey and a former Central Intelligence Agency man, came to head up our efforts in this area.

On paper, the way Komer likes things, he had great qualifications. He had good schools behind him, good experience and was generally considered a good administrator. Fine.

But Komer did not listen to his people in the field, many of whom he classified as malcontents when they complained of failures. He would urge them to "get on the team."

A cheery, ebullient sort, Komer told his people to listen to the GVN and do it their way. After all, it was their country.

Komer was fair game for the press which constantly attempted to put him on the defensive at his news briefings. These were almost always concerned with his evaluation system for pacification, a computerized system that analyzed security in the countryside.

"It is the only measurement," he would say in defense. Yes, it was the only measurement that could be worked out on the computer, but there was always the feeling that advisers' reports never quite made it to the final input. Things may not be so good out in the districts, yet by the time Saigon produced the final reports they looked good on paper.

And what about the U.S. advisory system, which has worked so long and so hard with the Vietnamese military and civilian forces?

Despite all the cheering and applause from many American advisers, who must rely upon good efficiency reports for promotion, progress among the Vietnamese armed forces is largely hope and a supply of better American arms.

Since almost all advisers, be they civilian or military, have rather limited tours of duty in specific assignments, their Vietnamese counterparts have gone through a dozen or so.

In many instances the adviser does not advise at all. He sometimes asks, sometimes begs, sometimes cons and most times functions as a line of supply or a communications clerk.

Many Vietnamese commanders, district chiefs and province chiefs have served in the environment of war for so long that it seems impossible that an American officer with no command of the language or, in many cases, no previous combat experience is really going to advise them.

Advisers do not even have the power to control American goods and materials that are sent to help the war-stricken people.

The advisory effort in name has dwindled to the static stage. Vietnamese counterparts have learned to rely too much on U.S. support as provided by an adviser who thinks that he is doing his job by making the aid available. Vietnamese leadership, as bad as it generally is, needs to regain personal initiative.

No one fools the Vietnamese people. When they are helped they know where the help comes from, and our help does not make them view their government with any more respect.

The advisory program needs re-evaluation. It would be the first step in making the Vietnamese realize that the "other war" must be fought by themselves for it is a war in which we are altogether too ineffective.

The problem of the South Vietnamese military is one that will tax the minds of our leadership for some time. The Vietnamese soldier sees how the American fights. He sees the artillery, air strikes and massive helicopter support. He is not interested in fighting without these and where, after we withdraw, is he going to get them?

Westmoreland tried to make the war as easy as possible on the GI. He always said let machines do the job to save men's lives, which was admirable enough. But the South Vietnamese are men, too. Where does their future lie?

The naive Americans are perhaps the most dangerous. They truly believe because they cannot see. The adviser in one seacoast town was oblivious of the fact that the yearly budget was being held back and lent out at a high rate of interest and then, suddenly, spent at a terrific pace at the end of the fiscal year.

"I don't know why they've spent only 20% of the budget in 10 months," he explained to a reporter. "I think it's because they have been having a difficult time getting the books straightened out."

His assistant, younger and more alert, explained later: "It is being lent out at as much as 50% interest on a loan that has to be paid back in 10 months."

"Why didn't you tell your boss?"

"I've told him a couple of times and he refuses to believe me. He says we have to listen to the Vietnamese."

A Saigon official laughed over the lending incident. "At least they are not stealing it," he said.

Americans are naive in other ways.

In a province west of Saigon, an area heavily infested with Viet Cong, the American advisers are quick to extol the virtues of the province chief, who is better than most but still is not beyond applying the con.

Several nights a month, the province chief, buttoned up in his armored car, travels with a musical band to a hamlet where the people are brought together to listen to entertainment and a speech from their leader.

The American leadership views this as quite wholesome. It is just the kind of thing Bob Komer would have in his backyard. The province chief gains prestige through this action because the Americans like it and in turn the GVN is impressed because the United States is much easier to deal with in this particular province.

So on the face of it the rice paddy variety shows are very good. The province chief displays his contempt for the VC by spending the night in the village. On paper it is a brave and bold gesture.

Since most Americans cannot speak Vietnamese, however, they do not realize one thing. The people in that particular hamlet are terrified.

Even though the province chief, who appears to be quite unconcerned about the VC, has set up night ambushes and defensive positions around the hamlet with nearly a battalion, the people fear that his foolishness is simply inviting a Viet Cong attack.

"I have talked with some people from one hamlet," a Vietnamese friend said. "The mothers fear for their babies when the musical show comes. All the people are cold with fright. They wish the colonel would stop trying to impress the Americans."

If you are sitting in Saigon reading reports and evaluating this activity, all would appear quite progressive. The province chief is attempting to pacify his province; he is out showing the flag and he is working. His counterpart seems to be doing well, too.

No one evaluates the people's feelings. Did you ever have a good time while waiting for a mortar attack? This never occurs to the Saigon officials, whose secretaries often enjoy salaries and benefits equal to those of a company commander.

The game goes on.

Most Americans in Vietnam see our effort for what it is, most recognize the GVN as despotic. To discuss this with them in Saigon is old hat; you give an example and they can give you two back.

Westmoreland could never understand the press in Vietnam. He tried to be friends, tried to use public relations to win their understanding.

Westmoreland did not lie. But what he faced in the press corps was an independent agency that could go anywhere in the country and see anything it wanted to and talk to anyone who cared to comment.

The difference between the press and the government was that the press listened to what everyone had to say. It was not that U.S. officials did not tell the truth. It was just that they did not know any differently themselves so they took the word of the GVN or of whoever could identify progress.

But when these same people who had talked to the press tried to talk with the government, people like Bob Komer did not always have time to listen. Ambassador Komer wanted to listen only to those things that told of progress. To speak otherwise meant that you were not doing your job.

Barry Zorthian, the former leader of the Joint U.S. Press Mission, another bureaucratic empire of questionable worth, returned home after a long tour in Vietnam and criticized the irresponsibility of the press.

To a degree Zorthian was right. Some poor reporting is coming out of Vietnam. But the U.S. Government accredits as a journalist just about anyone who would like to attend a war.

These persons flock in without any previous journalistic experience. They are accredited as free-lancers.

"Oh, this is my first writing effort," a young man said the other day. "I'm just here to make some money and see a little war."

A beautiful school operator came over to film a documentary, Red Cross girls return to become journalists and even a matronly woman with nothing other to do was accredited. She asked meekly:

"Please can you tell me when the tour is going out to the war?"

And strangely enough, when the free-lancers find out, as most eventually do, that a war does not necessarily make you an Ernest Hemingway and that it takes money to live even in Saigon they can get an assignment from our government that will pay them a few hundred dollars.

They are paid well to write insipid feature stories that neither will see print nor represent good propaganda. Our conception of propaganda is air-dropped leaflets that the Vietnamese use for toilet paper or peanut wrappers.

Yes, Barry Zorthian is right. There is a problem with the press, largely because the government was too timid to keep Vietnam from being a playground for would-be writers.

A lot of good is to be found in Vietnam, mostly good people. Outstanding Americans and equally outstanding Vietnamese labor daily together, endure the hardships and dangers and build binding friendships and mutual respect through their toils.

The men who extend for more duty deserve credit for they discount the odds that are made by the Viet Cong and the politicians. Not enough can ever be said about these people.

Often it is best not to mention the good Vietnamese for their government does not like to hear what they have to say. But they are the victims of politics and the times and they are the ones who suffer the most.

Both governments, reigned over by the single-mindedness of their leaderships, struggle on. The Americans look for progress during their tour so they can come home to a promotion while the GVN leaders immerse themselves in the joys of new-found power, unwilling to face reality.

That the writer has been unfair in his portrayal is acknowledged. He is unfair because he does not have the answers to these agonies, but apparently neither does any of those in power.

But first we have to acknowledge our mistakes before we can correct them. The question is whether our leadership is ready to do so.

That is why anger overcomes sadness in Vietnam.

THE ARMS RACE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in an article published in the April 1969, issue of *Scientific American*, Dr. George W. Rathjens, currently a visiting professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, examines the possible effects of a decision to deploy the ABM and the MIRV systems on the spiraling arms race. Dr. Rathjens argues that none of the commonly cited purposes of the ABM system, that is, first, to defend the American population and industry against a possible Chinese attack; second, to provide at least some protection for population and industry against a possible Russian attack; third, to defend Minuteman missile sites against a possible Russian attack; and, fourth, to serve as a bargaining counter in strategic-arms-limitation talks with the U.S.S.R.—the first three being of a damage-limitation nature—would be accomplished by deployment.

Dr. Rathjens points to the inconsistency of trying to limit the damage of a possible nuclear war, while trying at the same time to lessen that possibility. If one follows a policy of damage-limitation, the advantages of a first strike are increased severalfold. In the article he concludes:

To the extent that one accepts the action-reaction view of the arms race, one is forced to conclude that virtually anything we might attempt in order to reduce damage to ourselves in the event of war is likely to provoke an escalation in the arms race. Moreover, many of the choices we might make with damage limitation in mind are likely to make preemptive attack more attractive and war therefore more probable. The concurrent development of the MIRV's and the ABM system is a particularly good example of this.

Dr. Rathjens qualifies as an expert on the issue, having held the following positions: former member staff weapons systems evaluation team, Department of Defense, 1953-58; former Special Assistant to the President for science and technology, 1959-60; former chief scientist, Advanced Projects Agency, Department of Defense, 1961; former Deputy Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 1962-64; and former Director of Weapons Systems Evaluation Division, Institute for Defense Analysis, 1965-68. He is also the author of a recent book entitled "The Future of the Strategic Arms Race: Options of the 1970's."

The Government should give close attention to the opinions of experts like

Dr. Rathjens on crucial issues such as the ABM. I strongly urge my colleagues to read the following article:

[From the *Scientific American*, April 1969]

THE DYNAMICS OF THE ARMS RACE

(by George W. Rathjens)

(NOTE.—Recent decisions by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. threaten to upset the stability of the present strategic military balance. The net result may be simply to decrease the security of both countries.)

The world stands at a critical juncture in the history of the strategic arms race. Within the past two years both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. have decided to deploy new generations of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons systems. These developments, stimulated in part by the emergence of China as a nuclear power, threaten to upset the qualitatively stable "balance of terror" that has prevailed between the two superpowers during most of the 1960's. The new weapons programs portend for the 1970's a decade of greatly increased military budgets, with all the concomitant social and political costs these entail for both countries. Moreover, it appears virtually certain that at the end of all this effort and all this spending neither nation will have significantly advanced its own security. On the contrary, it seems likely that another upward spiral in the arms race would simply make a nuclear exchange more probable, more damaging or both.

As an alternative to this prospect, the expectation of serious arms-limitation talks between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. holds forth the possibility of at least preventing an acceleration of the arms race. In the circumstances it seems worthwhile to inquire into the nature of the forces that impel an arms race. In doing so we may determine how best to damp this newest cycle of military competition, either by mutual agreement or by unilateral restraint, before it is beyond control.

There are a number of new weapons systems under development in both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., but the possibilities that are likely to be at the center of discussion not only in the forthcoming negotiations but also in the current Congressional debate are the anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) concept and the multiple - independently - targeted-reentry-vehicle (MIRV) concept. These systems, one defensive and the other offensive, can usefully be discussed together because of the way they interact. In fact, the intrinsic dynamics of the arms race can be effectively illustrated by concentrating on these two developments.

It is now 18 months since former Secretary of Defense McNamara announced the decision of the Johnson Administration to proceed with the deployment of the Sentinel system: a "thin" ABM system originally described as being intended to cope with a hypothetical Chinese missile attack during the 1970's. The technology of the Sentinel system and some of the means a determined adversary might employ to defeat it were discussed in some detail a year ago in this magazine [see "Anti-Ballistic-Missile Systems," by Richard L. Garwin and Hans A. Bethe; *SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN*, March, 1968]. At this point I should like to review some of the background of the ABM problem.

Before the Sentinel decision most of the interest in a ballistic-missile defense for the U.S. was focused on the Nike-X program. This concept involved the use of two kinds of interceptor to protect the population and industry of the country against a hypothetical Russian missile attack. Interception would first be attempted outside the earth's atmosphere with Spartans, long-range missiles with nuclear warheads in the megaton range. The effectiveness of the defense, however, would depend primarily on the use of Sprints, short-range missiles with kiloton-yield warheads designed to intercept incom-

ing missiles after they have reentered the atmosphere. The system also envisaged suitable radars and computers to control the engagement.

The Spartans could in principle defend large areas; indeed, about a dozen sites could defend the entire country. A defense based solely on them could be rendered ineffective, however, by fairly simple countermeasures, in particular by large numbers of lightweight decoys (which would be indistinguishable to a radar from an actual reentry vehicle containing a warhead) by measures that would make the radar ineffective, for example the use of nuclear explosions, electronic jammers or light, widely dispersed metal "chaff."

The effectiveness of a Sprint defense would be less degraded by such countermeasures. Light decoys could be distinguished from actual reentry vehicles because they would be disproportionately slowed by the atmosphere and possibly because their wake in the atmosphere would be different. Radar blackout would also be much less of a problem. Because of their short range, however, Sprints could defend only those targets in their immediate vicinity. Thus an adversary could choose to attack some cities with enough weapons to overwhelm the defense while leaving others untargeted. Heavy radioactive fallout could also be produced over large parts of the country by an adversary's delivering large-yield weapons outside the areas covered by Sprint defenses. A nationwide defense of the Sprint type would therefore require a nationwide fallout-shelter program.

Although combining Sprints and Spartans in a single system, as was proposed for the Nike-X system, would complicate an adversary's penetration problem, in a competition with a determined and resourceful adversary the advantage in an offense-defense duel would still lie with the offense. As a result, in spite of strong advocacy by the Army and support from the other branches of the military and from members of Congress, the decision to deploy the Nike-X system was never made.

At the heart of the debate about whether or not to deploy the Nike-X system was the question of what the Russian reaction to such a decision would be. It was generally conceded that the system might well save large numbers of lives in the event of war, if the U.S.S.R. were simply to employ the forces projected in the available intelligence estimates. On that basis proponents argued in favor of deployment in spite of the high costs, variously estimated as being from \$13 billion to \$50 billion. Such deployment was opposed, particularly by Secretary McNamara, because of the belief that the U.S.S.R. could and would improve its offensive capabilities in order to negate whatever effectiveness the system might have had. Indeed, because the deployment of a U.S. ABM system would introduce large uncertainties into the calculus of the strategic balance, there were occasional expressions of concern that the U.S.S.R. might overreact. Hence the damage inflicted on us in the event of war might even be greater than it would be if the Nike-X system were not deployed.

The Sentinel system announced in 1967 would have far less capability than the Nike-X system. It would include some Sprint missiles to defend key radars (five or six perimeter acquisition radars, or PAR's to be deployed across the northern part of the country), but the main defense would be provided by Spartan missiles located to provide a "thin" or "light" defense for the entire country (see illustration on opposite page). Spokesmen for the Johnson Administration argued that such a deployment would be almost completely effective in dealing with a possible Chinese missile attack during the 1970's, but that it would be so ineffective against a possible Russian attack that the U.S.S.R. would not feel obliged to improve its strategic offensive forces as a response to

the decision. Both arguments were seriously questioned.

Garwin and Bethe, for example, contended that even the first-generation Chinese missiles might well be equipped with penetration aids that would defeat the Sentinel system. Other experts pointed out that the system, like the Nike-X system, could never be tested adequately short of actual war, and that in view of its complexity there would be a high probability of a catastrophic failure.

The contention that the U.S.S.R. would not react to the Sentinel decision seemed at least as questionable as the assertions of great effectiveness against the Chinese. Whatever the initial capability of the Sentinel system, it seemed clear that the Sentinel decision would at least shorten the lead time for the deployment of a system of the Nike-X type. Moreover, the fact that Sentinel was strongly and publicly supported as a first step toward an "anti-Soviet" system could hardly escape the attention of Russian decision-makers.

Since the announcement of the Sentinel decision, and particularly since the change in the Administration, the arguments in favor of the decision have become confused. It has been variously suggested by Administration spokesmen that the primary purpose would be (1) to defend the American population and industry against a possible Chinese attack, (2) to provide at least some protection for population and industry against a possible Russian attack, (3) to defend Minuteman missile sites against a possible Russian attack and (4) to serve as a bargaining counter in strategic-arms-limitation talks with the U.S.S.R. It might be noted that no one in recent months has seriously suggested that a Russian reaction to the decision is unlikely. In fact, all but the first of the arguments cited above imply the likelihood of a Russian response.

President Nixon's reaffirmation, albeit with some modification, of the Sentinel decision was presumably made on the basis of his judgment that the first and third of the aforementioned arguments justify the costs of such a system, not only the direct dollar cost but also the cost in terms of the impact on Russian decision-making and any other costs that may be imputed to the system. Whether or not his decision is correct depends strongly on how serious the possibility of a Russian reaction is. Before dealing further with that question it will be useful to bring MIRV's into the picture.

The problem of simulating an actual warhead reentry vehicle is a comparatively easy one, provided that the attacker need not be concerned with differences in the interaction of decoys and warheads with the atmosphere during reentry. If one wishes to build decoys and warheads that will be indistinguishable down to low altitudes, however, the problem is a formidable one, particularly if one demands high confidence in the indistinguishability of the two types of object. Improved radar resolution and increased traffic-handling and data-processing capability make the problem of effective decoy design increasingly difficult. The development of interceptors capable of high acceleration will also complicate the offense's problem. With such interceptors the decision to engage reentering objects can be deferred until they are well down into the atmosphere; the longer the defense can wait, the more stringent are the demands of decoy simulation on the offense.

As the problem becomes more difficult, the ratio of decoy weight to warhead weight increases. There comes a point at which, if one wants really high confidence of penetration, one might just as well use several warheads on each missile rather than a single warhead and several decoys, each of which may be as heavy, or nearly as heavy, as a warhead. Hence multiple warheads are in a sense the ultimate in high-confidence penetration aids (assuming that one relies on exhaustion

or saturation of defense capabilities as the preferred tactic for defeating the defense). To be effective, however, multiple warheads must be sufficiently separated so that a single interceptor burst will not destroy more than one incoming warhead. Moreover, the utility of multiple warheads for destroying targets, particularly small ones that would not justify attack by more than one or two small warheads, will be greatly enhanced if they can be individually guided.

In principle each reentry vehicle could have its own "post-boost" guidance and propulsion system. That, however, is not the concept of the MIRV's in our Poseidon and Minuteman III missile systems, which are now under development. Rather, a single guidance and propulsion system will control the orientation and velocity of a "bus" from which reentry vehicles will be released sequentially. After each release there will be a further adjustment in the velocity and direction of the bus. Thus each reentry vehicle can be directed to a separate target. The targets can be rather widely separated, the actual separation depending on how much energy (and, therefore, weight) one is willing to expend in the post-boost maneuvers of the bus. It is an ingenious—and demanding—concept.

Two rationales have been advanced for the decision to proceed with the U.S. MIRV programs. One is that with MIRV's the U.S. can have a high confidence of being able to penetrate an adversary's ABM defenses. The apparent deployment of a limited Russian ABM system in the vicinity of Moscow and U.S. concern about a possibly more widespread Russian ABM-system deployment have been important considerations in the decision to go ahead with the U.S. MIRV programs.

The second rationale is that a MIRV system enables one to strike more targets with a given number of boosters than would be the case if one were using one warhead per missile. This rationale has been important for two reasons.

First, it enabled spokesmen for the Johnson Administration to argue against expanding the size of our strategic missile force during a period when Russian forces were growing rapidly. They were able to contend in the face of political opposition on both flanks that, whereas we did not contemplate expanding the number of our offensive missiles, the number of warheads we could deliver would increase rapidly.

Second, it raised the prospect of a missile force that could be used as a very effective "counterforce" weapon. This means that with MIRV's a limited number of missiles might be capable of destroying a larger intercontinental-ballistic-missile (ICBM) force in a preemptive attack. To achieve this performance, however, particularly against hardened offensive missile sites, would require a substantial improvement in accuracy and a high post-boost reliability—no mean feats with a device as complicated as the MIRV bus.

What bearing will the deployment of the ABM and the MIRV systems have on the future of the arms race? In attempting to answer this difficult question it is instructive to consider the extent to which the choices of each of the superpowers regarding strategic weapons have been influenced by the other's decisions.

The actual role of this action-reaction phenomenon is a matter of considerable debate in American defense circles. Indeed, the differences in views on this question account for most of the dispute of the past few years regarding the objectives to be served by strategic forces and their desired size and qualities. Thus whether the U.S. should be content with an adequate retaliatory, or "assured destruction," capability or go further and try to build a capability that would permit us to reduce damage to ourselves in the event of war must clearly depend on a judgment on whether Russian defense decisions

could be influenced significantly by our decisions. Those who have felt that Russian defense planning would be responsive to our actions have held that for the most part any attempt by us to develop such "damage-limiting" capabilities with respect to the U.S.S.R. would be an effort doomed to failure. The U.S.S.R. would simply improve its offensive capabilities to offset the effects of any measures we might take. This was the basis for the rejection by the American leadership of the requests by the Army for large-scale ABM-system deployment and for the rejection of requests by the Air Force for much larger ICBM forces.

Although there is considerable evidence to support the claim that the action-reaction phenomenon does apply to defense decision-making, to explain all the major decisions of the superpowers in terms of an action-reaction hypothesis is an obvious oversimplification. The American MIRV deployment has been rationalized as a logical response to a possible Russian ABM-system deployment, but there were also other motivations that were important: the desire to keep our total missile force constant while increasing the number of warheads we could deploy, the long-term possibility of MIRV's giving us an effective counterforce capability, and finally the simple desire to bring to fruition an interesting and elegant technological concept.

Nevertheless, the action-reaction phenomenon, with the reaction often premature and/or exaggerated, has clearly been a major stimulant of the strategic arms race. Examples from the past can be cited to support this point: (1) the American reaction, indeed overreaction, to uncertainty at the time of the "missile gap," which played a central role in the 1960 Presidential election but was soon afterward shown by improved intelligence to be, if anything, in favor of the U.S.; (2) the Russian decision to deploy the "Tallinn" air-defense system, possibly made in the mistaken expectation that the U.S. would go ahead with the deployment of B-70 bombers or SR-71 strike-reconnaissance aircraft; (3) the U.S. response to the Tallinn system (which until recently was thought to be an ABM system) and to the possible extension of the Moscow ABM system into a countrywide system. It was in order to have high assurance of its ability to get through these possible Russian ABM defenses that the U.S. embarked on the development of various penetration aids and even of new missiles: Minuteman III and Poseidon.

Those examples have in common the fact that if doubt exists about the capabilities or intentions of an adversary, prudence normally requires that one respond not on the basis of what one expects but on a considerably more pessimistic projection. The U.S. generally bases its plans—and makes much of the fact—on what has become known as the "greater-than-expected threat." In so doing the Americans (and presumably the Russians) have often overreacted. The extent of the overreaction is directly dependent on the degree of uncertainty about any adversary's intentions and capabilities.

The problem is compounded by leadtime requirements for response. According to the Johnson Administration, the decisions to go ahead with Minuteman III, Poseidon and Sentinel had to be made when they were because of the possibility that in the mid-1970's the Russians might have a reasonably effective ABM system and the Chinese an ICBM capability. The Russians had to make a decision to develop the Tallinn system (if the decision was made because of the B-70 program) long before we ourselves knew whether or not we would deploy an operational B-70 force.

Once the decisions to respond to ambiguous indications of adversary activity were made it often proved impossible to modify the response, even when new intelligence became available. For example, between the

time the Sentinel decision was announced and the first Congressional debate on the appropriation took place during the summer of 1968, evidence became available that the Chinese threat was not developing as rapidly as had been feared. Yet in spite of this information those in Congress who attempted at that time to defer the appropriation for Sentinel failed. Similarly, at this writing, as the Poseidon and Minuteman III programs begin to gain momentum, it seems much less likely than it did at the time of their conception that the U.S.S.R. will deploy the kind of ABM system that was the Johnson Administration's main rationale for these programs. On the Russian side, the Tallinn deployment continued long after it became clear that no operational B-70 force would ever be built.

Of the kinds of weapons development that can stimulate overresponse on the part of one's adversary, it is hard to imagine one more troublesome than ABM defenses. In addition to uncertainty about adversary intentions and the need (because of lead-time requirements) for early response to what the adversary might do, there is the added fact that the uncertainties about how well an ABM system might perform are far larger than they are for strategic offensive systems. The conservative defense planner will design his ABM system on the assumption that it may not work as well as he hopes, that is, he will overdesign it to take into account as fully as he can all imaginable modes of failure and enemy offensive threats. The offensive planner, on the other hand, will assume that the defense might perform much better than he expects and will overdesign his response. Thus there is overreaction on both sides. These uncertainties result in a divergent process: an arms race with no apparent limits other than economic ones, each round being more expensive than the last. Moreover, because of overreaction on the part of the offense there may be an increase in the ability of each side to inflict damage on the other.

All one needs to make this possibility a reality is a triggering mechanism. The Russian ABM program, by stimulating the Minuteman III and Poseidon programs, may have served that purpose. The Chinese nuclear program may also have triggered an action-reaction chain, of which the Sentinel response is the second link.

It can be assumed that there will be considerable pressure and effort to make Sentinel highly effective against a "greater than expected" Chinese threat. Such a system will undoubtedly have some capability against Russian ICBM's. Russian decision-makers, who must assume the Sentinel might perform better than they expect, will at least have to consider this possibility as they plan their offensive capabilities. More important, they will have to respond on the assumption that the Sentinel decision may foreshadow a decision to build an anti-Russian ABM system. Hence it is probably not a question of whether the U.S.S.R. will respond to Sentinel but rather of whether the U.S.S.R. will limit its response to one that does not require a U.S. counterresponse, and of whether it is too late to stop the Sentinel deployment.

It is apparent that reduction in uncertainty about adversary intentions and capabilities is a *sine qua non* to curtailing the strategic arms race. There are a number of ways to accomplish this (in addition to the gathering of intelligence, which obviously makes a great contribution).

First, there is unilateral disclosure. In the case of the U.S. there has been a conscious effort to inform both the American public and the Russian leadership of the rationale for many American decisions regarding strategic systems and, to the extent consistent with security, of U.S. capabilities. This has been done particularly through the release by the Secretary of Defense of an an-

nual "posture" statement, a practice that, it is hoped, will be continued by the U.S. and will be emulated someday by the U.S.S.R. This would be in the interest of both countries. Because there has been no corresponding effort by the Russians the U.S. probably overreacts to Russian decisions more than the U.S.S.R. does to American decisions. (At least it is easier to trace a causal relationship between Russian decisions and U.S. reactions than it is between U.S. decisions and Russian reactions.)

Second, negotiations to curtail the arms race (even if abortive) or any other dialogue may be very useful if such efforts result in a reduction of uncertainty about the policies, capabilities or intentions of the parties.

Third, some weapons systems may be less productive of uncertainty than others that might be chosen instead. For example, it is likely to be less difficult to measure the size of a force of submarine-launched or fixed missiles than it is to measure the size of a mobile land force. Similarly, it would be easier to persuade an adversary that a small missile carried only a single warhead than would be the case with a large vehicle. Such considerations must be borne in mind in evaluating alternative weapons systems.

In short, although uncertainty about adversary capabilities and intentions may not always be bad (in some instances the existence of uncertainty has contributed to deterrence), the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. would seem well advised to make great efforts to avoid giving each other cause for overreacting to decisions because of inadequate understanding of their meaning.

The importance of somehow breaking the action-reaction chains that seem to drive the arms race is obvious when one considers the enormous resources involved that could otherwise be used to meet pressing social needs. In addition, there is particular importance in doing so at present because the concurrent deployment of MIRV's and ABM systems is likely to have drastic destabilizing consequences. It is conceivable that one of the superpowers with an ABM system might develop MIRV's to the point where it could use them to destroy the bulk of its adversary's ICBM force in a preemptive attack. Its air and ABM defenses would then have to deal with a much degraded retaliatory blow, consisting of the sea-launched forces and any ICBM's and aircraft that might have survived the preemptive attack. The problems of defense in such a contingency would remain formidable. They would be significantly less difficult, however, than if the adversary's ICBM force had not been seriously depleted. In fact, the defense problem would be relatively simple if a large fraction of the adversary's retaliatory capability were, as is true for the U.S. and to a far greater degree for the U.S.S.R., in its land-based ICBM's, most of which would presumably have been destroyed.

It may seem unlikely that either superpower would initiate such a preemptive attack, in view of the great uncertainties in effectiveness (particularly with respect to defenses) and the disastrous consequences if even a comparatively small fraction of the adversary's retaliatory force should get through. With both MIRV's and an ABM system, however, such a preemptive attack would not seem as unlikely as it does now. It might not appear irrational to some, for example, if an uncontrollable nuclear exchange seemed almost certain, and if by striking first one could limit damage to a significantly lower level than if the adversary were to strike the first blow. In short, if one or both of the two superpowers had such capabilities, the world would be a much more unstable place than it is now.

Obviously neither superpower would permit its adversary to develop such capabilities without responding, if it could, by strengthening its retaliatory forces. The response

problem becomes more difficult, however, if the adversary develops both MIRV's and an ABM system than if only one is developed.

Against a MIRV threat alone there are such obvious responses as defense of ICBM sites or greater reliance on sea-launched or other mobile systems. Such responses are likely to be acceptable because, whereas the costs of highly invulnerable systems are large (perhaps several times larger than the costs of simple undefended ICBM's), only relatively small numbers of such secure retaliatory weapons would be required to provide an adequate "assured destruction" capability. Indeed, a force the size of the present Polaris submarine fleet would seem to be more than adequate. The response to an ABM system alone might also be kept within acceptable limits because the expenditures required to offset the effects of defense are likely to be small compared with the costs of the defense.

If it is necessary to acquire retaliatory capabilities that are comparatively invulnerable to MIRV attack in numbers sufficient to saturate or exhaust ABM defenses, however, the total cost could be very great. In fact, if one continued to rely heavily on exhaustion of defenses as the preferred technique for penetration, the offense might no longer have a significant cost-effectiveness advantage over the defense. Thus the concurrent development of MIRV's and ABM systems raises the specter of a more precarious balance of terror a few years hence, a rapidly escalating arms race in the attempt to prevent the instabilities from getting out of hand, or quite possibly both.

With this background about the roles of uncertainty and the action-reaction phenomenon in stimulating the arms race, one can draw some general conclusions about the functions and qualities of future strategic forces. We must first recognize that two kinds of instability must be considered: crisis instability (the possibility that when war seems imminent, one side or the other will be motivated to attack preemptively in the hope of limiting damage to itself) and arms-race instability (the possibility that the development or deployment decisions of one country, or even the possibility of such decisions, may trigger new development or deployment decisions by another country).

The first kind of instability is illustrated in the chart on the opposite page, which is based on former Secretary McNamara's posture statement for fiscal 1967. This shows that—assuming two possible expanded Russian threats, various damage-limiting efforts by the U.S. and failure of the U.S.S.R. to react to extensive U.S. damage-limiting efforts by improving its retaliatory capability—American fatalities in 1975 would be only about a third as great in the event of a U.S. first strike as they would be in the case of a Russian first strike. (In the present situation the advantage of the attacker is negligible.) Obviously if war seemed imminent, with the strategic balances assumed in this example, there would be tremendous pressure on the U.S. to strike first. There would be corresponding pressure on the U.S.S.R. to do likewise if a Russian first strike could result not only in a much higher level of damage to the U.S. but also in a diminution in damage to the U.S.S.R. The incentives would be mutually reinforcing.

To minimize the chance of a failure of deterrence in a time of crisis, it seems important for both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to develop strategic postures such that preemptive attack would have as small an effect as possible on the anticipated outcome of a thermonuclear exchange. Actually, of course, it is extremely unlikely that the Russians would passively watch the U.S. develop the extensive damage-limiting postures assumed in the foregoing example. Instead they would probably react by

modifying their posture so that the advantage to the U.S. of attacking preemptively would be less than is indicated in the chart. Thus the example can also be used to illustrate the second kind of instability.

To the extent that one accepts the action-reaction view of the arms race, one is forced to conclude that virtually anything we might attempt in order to reduce damage to ourselves in the event of war is likely to provoke an escalation in the race. Moreover, many of the choices we might make with damage-limitation in mind are likely to make preemptive attack more attractive and war therefore more probable. The concurrent development of MIRV's and ABM systems is a particularly good example of this.

One is struck by the fact that there is an inherent inconsonance in the objectives spelled out in our basic military policy, namely "to deter aggression at any level and, should deterrence fail, to terminate hostilities in concert with our allies under conditions of relative advantage while limiting damage to the U.S. and allied interests." Hard choices must be made between attempting to minimize the chance of war's occurring in a time of crisis and attempting to minimize the consequences if it does occur.

The decisions made by U.S. planners in recent years with respect to new weapons development and deployment reflect a somewhat inconsistent philosophy on this point. The U.S. has generally avoided actions whose primary rationale was to limit damage that the U.S.S.R. might inflict on it, actions to which the Russians would probably respond. Accordingly the U.S. has not deployed an anti-Russian ABM system and has given air defense a low priority.

On the other hand, where there were reasons other than a desire to improve American damage-limiting capability with respect to the U.S.S.R., the U.S. has proceeded with programs in spite of their probably escalating effect on the arms race or their effect on first-strike incentives. This was true in the case of the MIRV's and Sentinel.

The U.S. will face more such decisions. For example, it may appear necessary to change the U.S. strategic offensive posture in order to make American forces less vulnerable to possible Russian MIRV attack. The nature of these decisions will depend on the importance attached to the action-reaction phenomenon and to the effect of improved counterforce capabilities on the probability of war. Emphasis on these two factors implies discounting options that would increase U.S. counterforce capability against Russian strategic forces, which in turn might provoke an expansion of Russian offensive forces. Options requiring long lead times would also be discounted, since decisions regarding them might have to be made while there was still uncertainty about whether the U.S.S.R. was developing MIRV's.

Should more weight be given in the future to developing damage-limiting capabilities? Or should more weight be given to minimizing the probability of a thermonuclear exchange and curtailing the strategic arms race? It is hard to see how one can have it both ways.

In spite of some changes in technology, there is little to indicate that the U.S. could get very far with damage-limiting efforts, considering the determination of the Russians and the options available to them for denying the attainment of such U.S. capabilities. The emergence of new nuclear powers, the rapid pace of technological advance and the other important demands on American resources suggest that a clear first priority should be assigned to moderating the action-reaction cycle. Moving toward greater emphasis on damage-limitation would seem justified only if the U.S. can persuade itself that the Russians will not react to American moves as the U.S. would to theirs, and if

means can be chosen that will not increase the probability of war.

No treatment of the dynamics of the strategic arms race would be complete without some discussion of the possibility of ending it, or at least curtailing it, through negotiations. Both the urgency and the opportunity are great, but the latter may be waning. This opportunity is in part a consequence of the present military balance, as well as of somewhat changed views in both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. about strategic capabilities and objectives.

With the rapid growth in its strategic offensive forces during the past few years, the U.S.S.R. can at long last enter negotiations without conceding inferiority or (which is worse from the Russian point of view) exposing itself to the possibility of being frozen in such a position. Moreover, the U.S.S.R. may at long last be prepared to accept the prevailing American view about the action-reaction phenomenon, and about the intrinsic advantage of the offense and the futility of defense. The apparent decision of the Russians not to proceed with a nationwide ABM system at present, and their professed willingness to enter into negotiations to control both offensive and defensive systems, may be evidence of this convergence of viewpoints.

On the American side there is at long last a quite general, if not yet universal, acceptance of the concept of nuclear "sufficiency": the idea that beyond a certain point increased nuclear force cannot be translated into useful political power. Acceptance of this concept is an almost necessary condition to termination of the arms race.

In considering negotiations with the U.S.S.R. on the strategic arms problem, the first factor to be kept in mind is the objectives to be sought. It would be a mistake to expect too much or to aspire to too little. One obvious aim is to reduce strategic armaments in order to lessen significantly the damage that would be sustained by the U.S. (and the U.S.S.R.) in the event of a nuclear exchange. Regrettably this goal is not likely to be realized in the near future. In the first place, any initial understandings will probably not involve reductions in strategic forces. Even if they did, the reductions would be limited. One cannot expect potential damage levels to be lowered by more than a few percent, even with fairly substantial cuts in strategic forces, because the capabilities of the superpowers are already so great.

Other objectives have been considered: reducing the incentives to strike preemptively in time of crisis, reducing the probability of accident or miscalculation, and increasing the time available for decision-making in the hope that the increased opportunity for communication might prevent a nuclear exchange from running its full course. Last but not least, one might also hope to change the international political climate so as to lessen tension, to reduce the incentive for powers that currently do not have nuclear weapons to acquire them and to increase the possibility for agreement by the superpowers on other meaningful arms-control measures.

It is reasonable to expect that successful negotiations might to some degree achieve all these objectives except the first: the reduction of potential damage. To focus on any one objective, or combination of objectives, however, is to obscure the immediate problem. In spite of the restraint of the U.S. in its choices regarding strategic weapons development and deployment during the first two-thirds of this decade, it now appears that in the absence of some understanding between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. the action-reaction sequence that impels the arms race will not be broken. Therefore, the immediate objective of any negotiations must be simply to bring that sequence to a halt, or to moderate its pace so that there will be a better chance

of ending the arms race than is offered by continuing the policies of the past two decades.

In retrospect, controlling or reversing the growth of strategic capabilities could have been accomplished more easily a few years ago, when the possibility of ABM-system deployment seemed to be the main factor that would trigger another round in the arms race. Now the prospect of ABM systems is more troublesome because of technological advances. In addition, there are the two other stimuli already discussed: the possibility of effective counterforce capabilities as a result of the development of MIRV's, and the possibility that the Chinese nuclear capability may serve as a catalyst to the Russian-American action-reaction phenomenon.

Obviously, short of destroying China by nuclear attack, there is little the U.S. can do about Chinese capabilities except to make sure that it does not give them more weight in its thinking than they deserve. This leaves the option of trying to break the ABM-MIRV chain by focusing on the control of MIRV's or ABM defenses.

Whereas one might hope to limit both, if a choice must be made the focus should clearly be on the control of ABM defenses. Verification of compliance would be relatively simple and could probably be accomplished without intrusive inspection. In addition, the incentive to acquire MIRV's for penetrating defenses would be eliminated, although the incentive to acquire them for counterforce purposes would remain.

The problems of verifying compliance with an agreement to control MIRV's would be much more difficult. Moreover, if an ABM system were deployed, there would be great pressure to abrogate or violate any agreement prohibiting MIRV deployment because MIRV's offer high assurance for penetrating defenses. Although reversing the MIRV decision would be difficult, reversing the Sentinel one would present less of a problem.

To be attractive to the U.S.S.R. any proposal to limit defenses would almost certainly have to be coupled with an agreement to limit, if not reduce, inventories of deployed strategic offensive forces. In principle this should not be difficult, since it need not involve serious verification problems.

Complicating any attempt to reach an understanding with the U.S.S.R. on the strategic balance, however, is the fact that the American and Russian positions are not symmetrical. The U.S. has allies and bases around the periphery of the U.S.S.R., whereas the latter has neither near the U.S., unless one counts Cuba. It is clear that a Pandora's box of complications could be opened by any attempt in the context of negotiations on the strategic balance to deal with the threat to America's allies posed by short-range Russian delivery systems, and with the potential threat to the U.S.S.R. of systems in Europe that could reach the U.S.S.R. even though they are primarily tactical in nature. One may hope that initial understandings will not have to include specific agreements on such thorny issues as foreign bases and dual-purpose systems.

Virtually all the above is based on the premise that for the foreseeable future each side will probably insist on maintaining substantial deterrent capabilities. For some time to come there will unfortunately be little basis for expecting negotiations with the U.S.S.R. to result in a strategic balance with each side relying on a few dozen weapons as a deterrent. The difficulties and importance of verification of compliance at such low levels, the problem of China, the existence of large numbers of tactical nuclear weapons on both sides and the general political climate all militate against this. At the other extreme, negotiations would almost necessarily fail if either party based its negotiating position on the expectation that it might achieve a significant damage-limiting capability with respect to the other.

Thus the range of possible agreement is quite narrow. There is a basis for hope, if both sides can accept the fact that for some time the most they can expect to achieve is a strategic balance at quite high, but less rapidly escalating, force levels, and if both recognize that breaking the action-reaction cycle should be given first priority in any negotiations, and also in unilateral decisions.

There will be risks in negotiating arms limitation. These must be weighed not against the risks that might characterize the peaceful world in which everyone would like to live, or even against the risks of the present. Rather, the risks implicit in any agreement must be weighed against the risks and costs that in the absence of agreement one will probably have to confront in the 1970's.

Whether the superpowers strive to curtail the strategic arms race through mutual agreement or through a combination of unilateral restraint and improved dialogue, they should not do so in the mistaken belief that the bases for the Russian-American confrontation of the past two decades will soon be eliminated. Many of the sources of tension have their origins deep in the social structures and political institutions of the two countries. Resolution of these differences will not be accomplished overnight. Restraining the arms race, however, may shorten the time required for resolution of the more basic conflicts between the two superpowers, it may increase the chances of survival during that period, and it may enable the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. to work more effectively on the other large problems that confront the two societies.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: A HARD WORKING MEMBER OF THE NIXON TEAM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, SPIRO T. AGNEW is becoming a household word. This is so because members of the Washington press corps have learned that his attention to detail, diligence, and a quiet manner are the hallmark of Vice President AGNEW's relations with not only the executive branch, but the U.S. Senate as well.

I insert at this point in my remarks excerpts from four articles on the Vice President. These articles appeared in U.S. News & World Report, January 27, 1969, and March 17, 1969; the Washington Post, February 27, 1969, and Newsweek, March 10, 1969.

The materials follow:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 27, 1969]

AGNEW: WHAT TO EXPECT—AND WHAT HE'S REALLY LIKE

Fate, more than design, has molded the political career of Spiro T. Agnew.

Now more-precise plans are being laid for the man who rose from zoning-board member to Vice President in less than 10 years.

As he assumes the No. 2 office, some important tasks in the Nixon Administration are being set for Mr. Agnew.

Already, Mr. Agnew has had a part in inner-circle deliberations of the new Administration. This was when the incoming Cabinet was being chosen.

Richard Nixon reportedly has said that he had to read about President Eisenhower's

Cabinet choices in the newspapers when he was Vice President-elect, and that he was making sure this didn't happen to Mr. Agnew.

Nor will Mr. Agnew be left out of important discussions and decisions to come. For one thing, the new President has already said that his Vice President will participate in Cabinet meetings.

Mr. Agnew will be involved in security matters as a statutory member of the National Security Council. And problems of the cities will be a major concern for him, as a member of the Council for Urban Affairs.

On January 17, Mr. Nixon also announced that he has assigned Mr. Agnew the job of liaison with State and local-government officials in an attempt to make federal machinery "sensitive, receptive and responsive."

Nixon aides say that still other jobs are being planned for the Vice President. For instance:

Mr. Agnew will be given many foreign traveling assignments as a good-will ambassador. And he will not be restricted to Latin America, as some published reports have said.

Chairmanship of the National Aeronautics and Space Council and of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development will go to him. He will be given special assignments in the field of oceanography.

Mr. Agnew will appear on radio and television from time to time as a spokesman for the Administration.

Contrary to previous reports, Vice President Agnew's staff will be at least as big as the staff which served Hubert Humphrey, and maybe bigger. Mr. Agnew will operate from five separate offices—more than any other official in Washington. These will be in the White House, in the nearby Executive Office Building and on Capitol Hill, where he will preside over the Senate.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 17, 1969]

A NEW KIND OF VICE PRESIDENT?

In choosing Spiro T. Agnew as his running mate last year, Richard Nixon said:

"My primary concern was to select a man who had the courage, the character and the intellect—not only to be Vice President—but also to be an effective President if the need arose."

The Nixon Administration has been in office now for almost two months. Yet few people seem to know very much about Mr. Agnew, or what he is doing as the No. 2 man in the U.S. Government.

The Vice President is a 50-year-old lawyer who formerly served two years as Governor of Maryland and five years as chief executive of Baltimore County. Friends call him "Ted," after his middle name—Theodore. Associates describe him as "poised and controlled"—a man of dignity, fairness and common sense.

Mr. Agnew is the first Vice President to have an office in the White House itself. His quarters have been set up in the West Wing, down a corridor from the President's Oval Room office.

In addition, Mr. Agnew has a newly refurbished suite in the Executive Office Building—the rooms occupied by Lyndon Johnson when he was Vice President; the traditional vice-presidential offices off the Senate floor at the Capitol, and staff quarters in the new Senate Office Building.

SENATE DUTY

The Vice President's only constitutional duty is to preside over the U.S. Senate. Mr. Agnew takes this duty seriously, has made a point of being in the presiding officer's chair at the opening of Senate sessions.

Often he steps down to the floor to talk to Senators. Having spent most of his prior government service as an executive, he says the legislative process "is a whole new world

to me." Normally, he spends three or four hours a day on Senate business.

The Vice President cheerfully recognizes that his role is that of an "associate member," able to vote only in case of a tie. His main concern has been to win the trust and confidence of the lawmakers of both parties.

A PLEASANT SURPRISE

Veterans at the Capitol believe the new Vice President is gaining acceptance in Congress. He is the first man in 24 years to preside over the Senate without first having served as an elected member of that body—sometimes described as "the most exclusive club in the world."

A Republican Senator has observed:

"Agnew is a pleasant surprise. He is doing a whole of a job to cultivate the Senate. He has spent more time in the chair than his predecessor. He eats in the dining room at the Capitol—and I can't remember any Vice President doing that."

A Democratic Senator has commented:

"Agnew is a smooth politician. He knows how to talk to the Main Street American, and is proud of calling himself a middle-brow. He will beat the drums for Nixon all over the country. Democrats make a great mistake if they underestimate Agnew."

Recently, former President Johnson was quoted as saying he believes that Mr. Agnew is "underrated," and that "Nixon made a good choice."

By law or executive order, the Vice President is a member of the President's Cabinet and of the National Security Council, and vice chairman of the newly created Urban Affairs Council.

Moreover, Mr. Agnew is head of the National Space Council, Council on Economic Opportunity, Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, Peace Corps Advisory Council, Indian Affairs Council, Cabinet Task Force on Youth Opportunity, and Council on Physical Fitness. He also attends White House congressional-leadership meetings and is a member of the board of the Smithsonian Institution.

Recently, President Nixon assigned Mr. Agnew to work with the nation's Governors and mayors through a new Office of Intergovernmental Relations, with a 12-man staff directed by Nils A. Boe, former Governor of South Dakota.

Said a highly placed source:

"The Governors now feel they have an 'ambassador' in Washington. This new office should be helpful in bringing cooperation on domestic programs at all levels of government."

A GOOD RAPPORT

The Vice President feels that he has established a good rapport with President Nixon, whom he sees on an average of a couple of hours a day in various meetings. An official high up in the Administration describes their relationship in this manner:

"No President has ever been more considerate to his Vice President. They have the kind of mutual understanding that does not require constant consultation.

"Mr. Nixon is easy to communicate with, and precise in making his posture known. He is firm on principle, flexible on procedure. The President is always willing to listen to another approach, but he has his objectives clearly in mind, and he does not vacillate from day to day."

Mr. Agnew is becoming familiar with problems of defense and foreign affairs through frequent NSC meetings and private briefings by Government specialists. The same problems come up in meetings with congressional leaders.

The Vice President gets the same information on economic and monetary affairs that goes to the President from the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Agnew works closely with such key White House aides as Arthur F. Burns, Henry

Kissinger and Daniel P. Moynihan. Probably his closest friend in the Cabinet is Attorney General John Mitchell.

AN INSIDER'S VIEW

A White House insider gave this insight into the Vice President's activities:

Mr. Agnew is aware that he is the Vice President, and not the President. He presides at meetings when Mr. Nixon is away, but is careful never to push his own point of view on these occasions.

When the President is on hand, Mr. Agnew never hesitates to speak out on policy matters. Hardly a meeting passes when he does not voice an opinion. He has been a prime supporter of a new national urban policy. But Mr. Agnew has impressed on his aides that only the President can make decisions.

When the Vice President chairs a meeting, he does it "superbly." He is an intelligent questioner, good at drawing people out, helping them to formulate ideas. Mr. Agnew "talks to a point," and is "very precise."

The Vice President is very correct and does not want to appear overbearing. When Mr. Nixon was on an out-of-town trip, some members of the Urban Affairs Council invited Mr. Agnew to take the President's chair. "No," the Vice President replied, "I'll preside from my own chair."

As a former State and county official, Mr. Agnew tends to look at government programs "from the bottom up," rather than "from the top down." He is interested in how federal programs affect people at the local level. Also, Mr. Nixon wants more attention paid to the impact of federal policies on State and local governments.

In the future, Mr. Agnew's role as an Administration spokesman is to increase. The Vice President will be making some trips abroad as a "good-will ambassador"—but none, probably, before autumn. Also, Mr. Agnew will be greeting foreign visitors, and doing ceremonial things for the President. "For the time being," the White House insider concluded, "he is learning the ropes, just like the rest of us."

The Vice President's schedule on an average day is described as follows:

Between 7:30 and 8:30 a.m., he arrives at the White House from his home in a nine-room apartment at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

By 11:30 a.m., Mr. Agnew goes to the Capitol, where he is briefed by aides on the legislative calendar, appointments and other activities.

At noon, the Vice President opens the Senate session, staying on through the business of the opening hours, and sometimes coming back after a late lunch.

Between 2 and 3:15 p.m., he receives callers in the Vice President's office off the Senate chamber.

By 3:30 p.m., he returns to the White House for executive duties. Usually he leaves for home around 7 p.m.

At the outset of the Administration, an aide said, the Vice President "was out almost every night, attending official social functions." Now, he added, that has tapered off to "one or two evenings a week."

The Agnews have given a few small parties for friends. They hope to do more entertaining at home in the future for Congressmen, Cabinet members and the like.

INTEREST IN URBAN AFFAIRS

The Vice President has taken a special interest in work of the Urban Affairs Council. He is reported to believe that relief, or welfare, is one of the most difficult problems in the country. Also, he sees no immediate solutions.

The Council is coming up with new data on the cause and effect of poverty in city slums. This is said to point to a need for new leadership and a complete change of social environment.

The problem is being viewed in its impact on the total economy, with a backing-

up effect on the suburbs and rural areas. Solutions are to be aimed at drawing people out of the cities to populate underdeveloped areas.

The Vice President has been traveling around the country, speaking to such organizations as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Conference of Christians and Jews, American Management Association and Investment Bankers Association.

Mr. Nixon expects him to perform a variety of chores. At the recent Governors Conference, Mr. Agnew was asked to sound out State leaders on what could be done to curb student violence at colleges and universities. Later, the Vice President visited Cape Kennedy for the Apollo 9 space shot.

Mr. Agnew helped arrange the transfer of the Brooklyn Navy Yard to the City of New York, where—he said—private investment would be able to "develop an industrial park providing 3,500 jobs immediately and 20,000 jobs within three years in an area plagued by chronic unemployment."

POLITICAL CHORES

The Vice President is expected to carry the main burden of political campaigning and party building for the President—something that Mr. Nixon did during the Eisenhower Administration.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 1969]

AGNEW IS WORKING SERIOUSLY TO REHABILITATE HIS IMAGE

(By Don Oberdorfer)

With the President away in Europe, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew is spending his first week as the man in charge at home. Late last week, Mr. Nixon spent an hour with him in the Oval Office discussing procedures for this week and other matters, and foreign affairs experts introduced Agnew to additional mysteries during a "contingency briefing" at the White House Friday afternoon.

Displaying the self-effacement that is his current style, the new Vice President has said that nothing is different, observing that "the Presidency travels with the President." Still, he presided over the Urban Affairs Council Tuesday morning in Mr. Nixon's absence—a job he handled once before—and beginning today, he is acting as White House host to the National Governors' Conference. Friday, he plans to fly to Cape Kennedy to see the launching of Apollo 9, the first manned space spectacular under this Administration.

The notion of Spiro Agnew with even a little finger on the helm of State is horrifying to many Americans, and Agnew knows it. The ridicule and scorn heaped upon him during the fall campaign left him with a serious problem and, he acknowledges, with some bitterness. "I was hurt," he says frankly. "But I got over it. I have learned to take myself a little more lightly."

The question now is how to change the thinking patterns of his fellow citizens. Sitting in his still-bare office in the West Wing of the White House—the office Sherman Adams once occupied—Agnew senses that any conscious image-changing campaign would only be seen as self-serving. "Performance is the thing, and the job," he says, "I've done a lot of reading about political figures and the way they were looked upon, and it is amazing what was said about Thomas Jefferson at one time, even George Washington—it's all reversible. There's nothing stable about an image."

Agnew sees his role in the Administration as that of "an implementing factor, a catalyst for action," undertaking jobs assigned him by Mr. Nixon and learning at the same time the workings of the Federal Government. His Constitutional responsibility is presiding over the U.S. Senate, a task he has taken seriously to the point of almost slavish devotion. Though most Vice Presi-

dents delegate the job of presiding to the most junior Senators, Agnew has been present each day when the Senate opens at noon, and he usually remains in the chair for at least an hour, studying the names, faces and places of the lawmakers.

The Senators seem impressed. For his part, Agnew does not expect to become a hard-sell lobbyist for the Administration in the Senate—he finds that thought unseemly—but hopes to be helpful through “off-the-record” conversations with Senators on matters of delicacy.

In his White House committee jobs—as a member and substitute chairman of the Cabinet, the National Security Council, the Urban Affairs Council and the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy—Agnew is reported to be attentive and, at times, quite willing to speak up. At the first meeting of the Urban Affairs Council, he suggested the formulation of a written “National Urban Policy,” a document that has since been completed and circulated to the members.

Agnew expects to devote the largest share of his time and effort to the thorny problems of Federal relations with states and cities, with the new Office of Inter-Governmental Relations to help him do it. One of his pet ideas—expressed at meetings on this and other topics—is urban renewal-type U.S. aid to “new towns” like Columbia, Md., as a method of easing pressure in the central cities. While interested in the idea on its economic and social merits, he has also pointed out that Republicans have been able to win twice as much allegiance in the Columbia, Md., area as in the State as a whole.

During the Lincoln Day celebration, he was dispatched as the Administration’s top political speaker, liberally quoting from and extolling Mr. Nixon. He has briefed himself on space and oceanography, preparing for his job as the chairman of presidential councils in these two areas. In foreign affairs, he has been briefed by presidential assistant Henry Kissinger, CIA Director Richard Helms and others.

It is questionable how much impact all this is having or will have on those who feel Agnew unsuited to serve a heartbeat away from the Presidency. What people think of a man, he acknowledges, changes slowly. And he feels that in many aspects of his job he can be most effective if he works quietly, and ineffective if he is thought to be court-ing good publicity.

Mr. Nixon was faced with a similar problem of image-mending during his own tenure in the Vice Presidency. In his case, his most impressive public relations victories were scored abroad, in response to challenges in Moscow and Caracas.

Mr. Nixon may have this in mind in considering the public rehabilitation of Spiro Agnew. In a conversation at Key Biscayne, Agnew got the impression he should prepare for missions abroad starting sometime this fall. Just in case, the Vice President and key members of his staff are already receiving the necessary inoculations for foreign travel.

[From Newsweek, Mar. 10, 1969]
THE MAKING OF A VEEP

It was really a whole week in the sun for Spiro T. Agnew, who took office barely a month ago under perhaps the blackest cloud to darken a U.S. Vice President in recent memory. All week long, he minded the shop for his traveling boss with a firm hand and a foot that never once strayed mouthward. And by the end of it, Washingtonians who paid attention were beginning to do a double take on the new Veep. What they saw bore only the faintest resemblance to the bumbling Mr. Malaprop of the 1968 campaign who stumbled toward November along a trail strewn with slights of slums and “Japs” and “Polacks.” In fact, growing numbers in both political parties were cheering his perform-

ance to date. “As of today,” beamed Sen. Karl Mundt, South Dakota Republican, “he is the most pleasant surprise in the whole Nixon Administration . . . All I hear in the cloakrooms, in the Senate gym, everywhere I go is: ‘That Agnew has really got something.’”

What Agnew seemed to have was a disarming combination of modesty, tact, energy and quickness to learn. As presiding officer of the Senate, he capitalized on his single constitutional function to win friends and influence important people. As acting chairman of Cabinet-level committees in the President’s absence, he guided discussion effectively but unobtrusively. And as the Capital’s free-floating celebrity, he plunged enthusiastically into the exhausting round of receptions and dinners where political goodwill can be harvested in abundance.

No Shirking: Since the Inauguration, the Senate is where the Veep has spent most of his time—and been tossed some of his sweetest bouquets. Instead of shirking his tedious duties in the presiding officer’s chair as did almost all of his predecessors (Hubert Humphrey would regularly turn over the gavel to a junior senator shortly after a session started), Agnew has made a point of staying on for an hour or two of debate. He is the first Vice President since 1945 who has not served in the Senate himself and he has turned his inexperience to advantage. He has spent hours boning up on Senate rules with the parliamentarians and he has laboriously memorized the arcane phrases in which the Senate’s business is transacted (“Objection having been made, the resolution will go over under the rule”). “Humphrey and Johnson were restless and bored up there on the rostrum, and we could sense it,” says one veteran legislator. “Spiro Agnew is really interested.”

Down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue (Agnew generally starts and finishes his working day in his corner office in the White House West Wing), the Vice President has also been slowly building a new reputation for competence and modesty. At a meeting of the Urban Affairs Council when Mr. Nixon was away, Agnew was ushered toward the President’s seat at the Cabinet table. “Oh, no,” he said, “that’s for the President,” and he proceeded to chair the meeting from his own regular place across the table. “Agnew is a very good chairman,” reported one member of the group “He does his homework, reads the working papers and the talking points prepared for the President, and keeps the meeting going right on the point.”

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, people are learning that ADA officials in high positions of leadership under the former administration have now been replaced in our Government by members of the CFR.

Many of our colleagues are following with interest the change of hats—new faces and different names—but with the pursuit of similar goals. They ask who is the CFR?

Who is dictating the policies of the United States?

I include a recent documented report on the CFR, by Mr. Gary Allen, as follows:

THE CFR—CONSPIRACY TO RULE THE WORLD
(By Gary Allen)

(NOTE.—Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation’s top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*—a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to *American Opinion*. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.)

To every thoughtful American the foreign policy of the United States has for the past three decades been a compounding mystery and concern. Administrations have come and gone like the Ides of March, but spring never arrives—leaving America’s crusade against international Bolshevism a matter of mere words frozen in the drifts of a subversive blizzard.

As better than a third of the world has fallen to the Communists, and our sons have died by the scores of thousands to fight no-win wars from Korea to Vietnam, Americans have puzzled over why taxi drivers can understand the threat of International Communist Conspiracy while the “experts” of the State Department cannot. But, with a collective shrug of shoulders already overburdened with mounting taxes, installment payments, and Junior’s tuition at Riot Tech, the average American chalks up such things as the massive credit sales of advanced computers, metals, or jet engines to the Communist bloc as mere error—or stupidity—and goes about his business with the fading hope that the next Administration will somehow manage to bring to government as much common sense as that found in taxi drivers.

Such hopes are doomed to disappointment, because most Americans are being kept totally ignorant of the conspiratorial organizations whose members have set the same Leftist policies for the past ten Administrations. Clearly, these policymakers are not fools at all, but following carefully laid plans for our convergence with the Soviet Union as the base for a dictatorial government of the world. As long as the American public remains ignorant of this organized conspiracy, there are just two chances of reversing the catastrophic momentum of America’s foreign policy; slim and none.

Perhaps the nexus of this organized subversive effort in America is an Establishment-level organization known as the Council on Foreign Relations—the secret and incredibly powerful C.F.R. One of the extremely infrequent articles concerning this Council to appear in the national Press was published in the *Christian Science Monitor* of September 1, 1961. It began this way:

“On the west side of fashionable Park Avenue at 68th Street [in New York City] sit two handsome buildings across the way from each other. One is the Soviet Embassy to the United Nations. . . . Directly opposite on the southwest corner is the Council on Foreign Relations—probably one of the most influential semi-public organizations in the field of foreign policy.”

Although the formal membership in the C.F.R. is composed of fourteen hundred of the most elite names in the worlds of government, labor, business, finance, communications, the foundations, and the academy—and despite the fact that it has staffed almost every key position of every Administration since those of F.D.R.—it is doubtful that one American in a thousand so much as recognizes the Council’s name, or that one in ten thousand can describe anything at all about its structure or purpose. Indicative of the C.F.R.’s power to maintain its anonymity is the fact that despite

its having been operative at the highest levels for nearly fifty years, and having from the beginning counted among its members the foremost lions of the Establishment communications media, I discovered after poring over decades of volumes of the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* that only one magazine article on the C.F.R. has ever appeared in a major national journal—and that in *Harper's*, hardly a mass-circulation periodical. Similarly, only a handful of articles on the Council have appeared in the nation's great newspapers. Such anonymity—at that level—can hardly be a matter of mere chance.

Had it not been for a small group of highly informed and concerned Conservatives, who have for years painstakingly combed and cross-referenced the meager materials available, the Council's power and influence would remain a total mystery to all except the *Insiders* in control of the C.F.R.¹ As a result of recent attacks by these Conservatives, the wall of secrecy this organization has built around itself has been greatly reinforced. In the past, although little appeared in the Press concerning the C.F.R., rosters of officers and members could sometimes be obtained by subterfuge directly from the organization itself. In recent years, however, the Council's membership has become as closely guarded a secret as that of the staff of the conspiracy to which the C.F.R. is ultimately responsible.

What makes this secret organization so influential? No one who knows for certain will say. The *Christian Science Monitor*, which is edited by a member of the C.F.R., did note in the article of September 1, 1961, that "Its roster . . . contains names distinguished in the field of diplomacy, government, business, finance, science, labor, journalism, law and education. What united so wide-ranging and disparate a membership is a passionate concern for the direction of American foreign policy."

The C.F.R.'s passionate concern for the direction of American foreign policy has amounted to an attempt to make certain that policy continues marching Leftward towards World Government. The C.F.R. was criticized for precisely this by the Reece Committee, a Special Committee of the House of Representatives established in 1953 to investigate abuses by tax-free foundations. In the case of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Committee found that "Its productions are not objective but are directed overwhelmingly at promoting the globalism concept."

Despite nearly incredible pressure to remain silent, the Reece Committee disclosed that the C.F.R. has in fact come to be almost an employment agency for key areas of the U.S. Government—"no doubt carrying its internationalist bias with it." The investigation also showed that the C.F.R.'s influence is so great that it has almost completely usurped the prescribed activities of the U.S. State Department. The *Christian Science Monitor* confirmed this conclusion as follows: "Because of the Council's single-minded dedication to studying and deliberating American foreign policy, there is a constant flow of its members from private to public service. Almost half of the Council members have been invited to assume official government positions or to act as consultants at one time or another." [Emphasis added.]

The policies promoted by the C.F.R. in the fields of defense and international relations become the official policies of the United States Government with a regularity which defies the laws of chance. As "Liberal" columnist Joseph Kraft, himself a member of the C.F.R., noted of the Council in *Harper's* of July 1958: "It has been the seat of . . . basic government decisions, has set the con-

text for many more, and has repeatedly served as a recruiting ground for ranking officials." Kraft, incidentally, aptly titled his article on the C.F.R., "School For Statesmen"—an admission that the members of the Council are drilled with a "line" of strategy to be carried out in Washington.

It thus becomes clear that the best way to begin to understand what have seemed to be our insane defense and foreign policies is to take a long, hard look at the organization which has provided the key staff and direction for those policies. But one cannot, of course, understand the C.F.R. without first becoming aware of its background and antecedents. No group becomes so powerful by chance, and the roots go deep into conspiracy.

II

Until quite recently the origins of the C.F.R. have largely seemed, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. The man who let the skunk out of the sack is Carroll Quigley, Professor of International Relations at Georgetown University, who has been a lecturer at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces since 1951, and has lectured at the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department. Every student of the International Communist Conspiracy, and of the *Insiders* who manipulate it, will want to own a copy of the Professor's book, *Tragedy And Hope*, which provides an immense amount of new information on the subject not available from other sources.²

What makes Professor Quigley's volume doubly interesting is that the Professor, who was allowed access to heretofore secret materials of certain clandestine Establishment organizations, is a "Liberal" who, while presenting abundant evidence exposing the elitists seeking control of the world through a supergovernment, does not himself oppose the conspiracy. In fact, he makes it abundantly clear that he approves the aims of the *Insiders*, and scorns those foolish enough to oppose them. Lest the products of the Professor's enlightening research, which I shall subsequently review at length, cause anyone to think Professor Quigley to be some sort of an ivy-festooned avatar of Dan Smoot, let me reassure my "Liberal" readers by citing a few of his characterizations of American Conservatives:

"On the whole, the neo-isolationist discontent was a revolt of the ignorant against the informed or educated; of the Nineteenth Century against the insoluble problems of the Twentieth; of the Midwest of Tom Sawyer against the cosmopolitan East of J. P. Morgan and Company; of old Siwash against Harvard; of the Chicago Tribune against the Washington Post or the New York Times; or simple absolutes against complex relativisms; of immediate final solutions against long-range partial alleviations of frontier activism against European thought . . ."

Carroll Quigley goes so far as to ridicule Conservatives as racist, "petty bourgeois" hysterics defending middle-class morality. He writes:

"The virulence behind the Goldwater campaign had nothing to do with default of lack of intensity. Quite the contrary. His most ardent supporters were of the extremist petty-bourgeois mentality driven to near hysteria by the disintegration of the middle classes and the steady rise in prominence of everything they considered anathema: Catholics, Negroes, immigrants, intellectuals, aristocrats (and near aristocrats), scientists (and educated men generally, people from big cities or from the East, cosmopolitans and internationalists and, above all, liberals who accept diversity as a virtue."

It is clear from his writings that Professor Quigley considers himself no Conservative but one of the elitist aristocrats (forgive me—or "near aristocrats") destined

to eliminate the middle classes and rule the world. It is this colossal, smirking, gall which makes the information in his book even more illuminating and frightening. Obviously a creature of gargantuan ego, talking out of school to inform the world about how clever he is to know the way the world is really run, the Professor commits the most damning "confession against interest" to come out of the Establishment in decades.

Quigley traces the lineage of the C.F.R. back to Cecil Rhodes, the English adventurer who amassed a fortune in the gold and diamond mines of Southern Africa. While he follows the conspiracy of the *Insiders* back no farther than Rhodes, he does indicate that it did not begin even there. And, he notes that the man who bent Rhodes as a collegiate twig at Oxford was the notorious John Ruskin, noting of the conspiracy Ruskin called the "new imperialism":

"The chief changes were that it was justified on grounds . . . of social reform and not, as earlier, on grounds of missionary activity and material advantage."

Ruskin beguiled his students with tales of "England's downtrodden masses," did his best to fill his aristocratic charges with a sense of profound guilt, convincing them that their privileged position could not be preserved unless their power "could be extended to the lower classes in England itself and to the non-English masses throughout the world." So smitten with Ruskin's initial lecture was Rhodes that he copied it in longhand and kept it with him for thirty years.

Ruskin's ideas about using noblesse oblige as justification for the imperialism of the *Insiders* were used to rationalize political activities aimed at capturing the immense wealth of Southern Africa for Rhodes and the financiers and conspirators who were his backers. The indoctrination by Ruskin was thus turned into an instrument of conquest by Rhodes, on what we are asked to believe was the assumption—according to biographers Lockhart and Woodhouse—that God had chosen Cecil Rhodes to "paint the map of Africa red." Rhodes' biographer Sara Millin was a little more direct. As she put it: "The government of the world was Rhodes' simple desire." Quigley notes:

"In the middle 1890's Rhodes had a personal income of at least a million pounds sterling a year (then about five million dollars) which he spent so freely for his mysterious purposes that he was usually overdrawn on his account. These purposes centered on his desire to federate the English-speaking peoples and to bring all the habitable portions of the world under their control."

Cecil Rhodes' commitment to a conspiracy to establish World Government was set down in a series of wills described by Frank Aydelotte, a founding member of the C.F.R. and American Secretary to the Rhodes Trustees, in his book *American Rhodes Scholarships*. Aydelotte writes:

"The seven wills which Cecil Rhodes made between the ages of 24 and 46 [Rhodes died at age forty-eight] constitutes a kind of spiritual autobiography. . . . Best known are the first (the Secret Society Will . . .), and the last, which established the Rhodes Scholarships. . . ."

"In his first will Rhodes states his aim still more specifically: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world, . . . the foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the interests of humanity.'"

"The 'Confession of Faith' enlarges upon these ideas. The model for this proposed secret society was the Society of Jesus, though he mentions also the Masons." [Emphasis added.]

It should be noted that the originator on

Footnotes at end of article.

the profane level of this type of secret society was Adam Weishaupt, the monster who founded the Order of Illuminati on May 1, 1776, for the purpose of conspiracy to control the world. The role of Weishaupt's Illuminists in such horrors as the Reign of Terror is unquestioned, and the techniques of the Illuminati have long been recognized as models for Communist methodology. Weishaupt also used the structure of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) as his model, and rewrote his Code in Masonic terms. Aydelotte continues:

"... In 1888 Rhodes made his third will... leaving everything to Lord Rothschild [his financier in mining enterprises], with an accompanying letter enclosing 'the written matter discussed between us.' This, one surmises, consisted of the first will and the 'Confession of Faith,' since in a post-script Rhodes says 'in considering questions suggested take Constitution of the Jesuits if obtainable...'"

Apparently for strategic reasons Lord Rothschild was subsequently removed from the forefront of the scheme. Professor Quigley reveals that Lord Rosebury "replaced his father-in-law, Lord Rothschild, in Rhodes' secret group and was made a Trustee under Rhodes' (next and last) will."

The last will of Cecil Rhodes provides for bringing "Rhodes Scholars" from the Empire, Germany, and America for schooling in internationalism at Oxford. The plan, according to Rhodes' fellow conspirator, William Stead:

"... was that after thirty years there would be 'between two and three thousand men in the prime of life scattered all over the world, each one of whom would have impressed upon his mind in the most susceptible period of his life the dream of the Founder, each one of whom, moreover, would have been specially—mathematically—selected towards the Founder's purposes [World Government]...'"

Biographer Sara Millin writes of the qualifications for becoming part of this cadre:

"In speaking of these attributes [desirable in Rhodes Scholars] to Stead, Rhodes defined them, with that defensive cynicism of the romantic, as: smugness, brutality, unctuous rectitude, and tact."

At the very time the Rhodes Trust began to filter its "scholars" into Oxford, the University was of course coming under the academic domination of members of the Fabian Socialist Society, providing the Rhodes Scholars not only with the intended indoctrination and preparation to become part of an international government, but part of an international socialist government.

Quigley informs us approvingly that it was the aim of the Rhodes group to promote the economic doctrines taught in the London School of Economics. He does not mention, however, that the London School of Economics was established by the Fabians to teach the economics of international socialism. In fact, Professor Quigley is very careful to avoid so much as a mention of the Fabian movement.

At first glance it would appear that the Fabians were working at cross-purposes with the Rhodes conspiracy since Rhodes is said by his admirers to have wanted to extend "the British Empire" to encompass the entire world, while the Fabians wished to dissolve that Empire into an international socialist Utopia. Yet the strategy of using Fabian socialism clearly fits. Times were changing and a more subtle and devious approach was necessary to accomplish Rhodes' dream of World Government. The new ideology was doubtless provided by the Fabians. Those who doubt it have only to note the well-known influence of the Fabians on those organiza-

tions cited by author Frank Aydelotte when he proclaims that the carefully indoctrinated Rhodes Scholars from America:

"... have taken a prominent part in the work of such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations, the National Policy Committee, the League of Nations Association, Union Now, the United Nations Association, the Commission For the Study of Organization of Peace, the Universities Committee on Post-War International Problems, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the World Peace Foundations, and the research group attached to the State Department..."

Note that all are both Fabian-oriented and working for World Government. More distressing, Aydelotte concludes: "The number of those going into government is constantly increasing."

What happens to Americans passing through the Rhodes indoctrination at Oxford? Frank Aydelotte assures us: "If he have [sic] the capacity for assimilation, if he can become a part of what he meets, he may return from Oxford to the United States a citizen of the world." And, there can be little doubt of it. Some of the Rhodes alumni to wear the old school tie in our government are Dean Rusk (C.F.R.), Walt Whitman Rostow (C.F.R.), Senator J. William Fulbright ("formerly" C.F.R.), Harlan Cleveland (C.F.R.), Nicholas Katzenbach, and Senator Frank Church (C.F.R.). Rene Wormser, who served as counsel for the Reece Committee, points out in his book, *Foundations: Their Power And Influence*, that:

"At least one foreign foundation (the Rhodes Scholarship Fund) has had a strong influence on our foreign policy... [It] has gained great influence in the United States for British [Fabian] ideas. It has accomplished this by annually selecting a choice group of promising young men for study in England. The usually Anglophile alumni of this system are to be found in eminent positions in legislature, administration and education, and in the ranks of American foundation officials. They form a patronage network of considerable importance."

That is very nearly the understatement of the decade.

III

The scholarship scheme was not, however, the most important segment of Cecil Rhodes' commitment to World Government. His Illuminist-style "secret society" also spawned the world's most influential foreign-policy combine—including America's Council on Foreign Relations. Professor Quigley writes of the formalization of Rhodes' "secret society":

"They [Ruskin's disciples] were remarkably successful in these aims because England's most sensational journalist William T. Stead (1849-1912), an ardent social reformer and imperialist, brought them into association with Rhodes. This association was formally established on February 5, 1891, when Rhodes and Stead organized a secret society of which Rhodes had been dreaming for sixteen years. In this secret society Rhodes was to be leader; Stead, Brett (Lord Esher), and (Alfred) Milner were to form an executive committee; Arthur (Lord) Balfour, (Sir) Harry Johnston, Lord Rothschild, Albert (Lord) Grey, and others were listed as potential members of a 'Circle of Initiates'; while there was to be an outer circle known as the 'Association of Helpers' (later organized by Milner as the Round Table organization)."

Notice that the secret society as organized on the Illuminist pattern of "circles within circles," used in Baravia and France by Weishaupt; and that the Round Table group, which was later to spawn the Council on Foreign Relations, was not part of the inner circle.

Professor Carroll Quigley continues as follows:

"Thus the central part of the secret society was established by March 1891. It continued to function as a formal group, although the outer circle was, apparently, not organized until 1901-1913. This group was able to get access to Rhodes' money after his death in 1902 and also to the fund of loyal Rhodes supporters like Alfred Beit [a German financier from Frankfurt, and partner of Rhodes] (1853-1906) and Sir Abe Bailey (1864-1940)."

Later, financing was to come from the Astor family and, according to Quigley:

"Since 1925 there have been substantial contributions from wealthy individuals and from foundations and firms associated with the international banking fraternity, especially the [Andrew] Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, and other organizations associated with J. P. Morgan, the Rockefeller and Whitney families and the associates of Lazard Brothers and of Morgan, Grenfell and Company.

"The chief backbone of this organization grew up along the already existing financial cooperation running from the Morgan Bank in New York to a group of international financiers in London by Lazard Brothers."

Why would international bankers and financiers be interested in promoting a socialist World Government? Clearly, socialism is only the bait to obtain the support of the political underworld and to create the structure necessary to maintain dictatorial control. What this small group of financiers and cartel-oriented businessmen are interested in is monopoly control over the world's natural resources, trade, transportation, and communications—something that despite their great wealth they could not achieve otherwise. Therefore, the super-capitalists become super-socialists, realizing that only a World Government under their control can give them the power necessary to achieve their goal. Only this could explain why these extremely wealthy men would be willing to support movements which seem to be aimed at their own destruction. The financiers and cartellists do not expect to be injured by the socialists so long as they can manipulate them, using them for their own purposes. Professor Quigley confirms this:

"There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international... network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so." [Emphasis added.]

This clearly suggests that the directors of the network are convinced that they have little to fear from the Communists; that, in fact, they maintain some form or degree of inside control over the Communists.

To the Insiders of the Round Table, World Government is a Messianic cause. As Lionel Curtis, a member of the Round Table, phrased it: Through world federalism "the Kingdom of God could be established on earth." According to his obituary written for his fellow members of the Round Table, Lord Lothian (who ended his career as Ambassador to the United States) "held that men should strive to build the Kingdom of Heaven here upon this earth, and that the leadership in that task must fall first and foremost upon the English-speaking peoples."

Leaders of this group of would-be gods have been, according to Quigley:

"(Alfred) Milner, until his death in 1925, followed by Curtis (1872-1955), Robert H. (Lord) Brand (brother-in-law of Lady Astor) until his death in 1963, and now Adam Masic, son of Sir William and Brand's successor as managing director of Lazard Brothers bank."

Professor Quigley maintains that the power and influence of the Rhodes-Milner group since 1889, "although not widely recognized, can hardly be exaggerated." For example, the Round Table Group controlled the London Times and numerous other newspapers and periodicals on six continents, and also influenced literally hundreds of university faculties. Quigley discloses:

"From 1884 to about 1915 members of this group worked valiantly to extend the empire and to organize it into a federal system. They were constantly harping on the lessons to be learned from the [British] failure of the American Revolution and the success of the Canadian federation of 1867, and hoped to federate the various parts of the empire as seemed feasible, then confederate the whole of it, with the United Kingdom, into a single organization. They also hoped to bring the United States into this organization to whatever degree was possible."

"Stead was able to get Rhodes to accept, in principle, a solution which might have made Washington the capital of the whole organization or allow parts of the empire to become states of the American Union."

A loosely organized corps of the Round Table conspirators was thus formed in the United States prior to World War I. The chief personalities were George Beer, Walter Lippmann, Frank Aydelotte, Whitney Shepardson, Thomas Lamont, Jerome Greene, and Erwin Canham. This group's activities were coordinated with those of similar groups throughout the British Empire by frequent visits and discussions, and by a "totally anonymous quarterly magazine. The Round Table."

It was in the aftermath of World War I, however, that the Round Table conspiracy made its move for power and influence in America. According to Professor Quigley:

"At the end of the war of 1914, it became clear that the organization of this system [the Round Table Group] had to be greatly extended. Once again the task was entrusted to Lionel Curtis who established, in England and each dominion, a front organization to the existing Round Table Group. This front organization, called the Royal Institute of International Affairs, had as its nucleus in each area the existing submerged Round Table Group. In New York it was known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a front for J. P. Morgan and Company in association with the very small American Round Table Group."

"The American organizers were dominated by the large number of Morgan 'experts,' including Lamont and Beer, who had gone to the Paris Peace Conference and there became close friends with the similar group of English 'experts' which had been recruited by the Milner group. In fact, the original plans for the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations were drawn up at Paris. The Council of RIIA (which, by Curtis' energy came to be housed in Chatham House, across St. James' Square from the Astors, and was soon known by the name of this headquarters) and the board of the Council on Foreign Relations have carried over since the marks of their origin."

Although Professor Quigley's information is extremely revealing, it is amazing to note that he has very carefully omitted the name of one of the stars of the founding of the C.F.R.—the mysterious "Colonel" Edward Mandell House. This could hardly have been a mere oversight. For whatever reason, Professor Quigley thought House best left out of his discussions. Joseph Kraft (C.F.R.), however, tells us in *Harper's* that the chief agent in the formal founding of the C.F.R. was Colonel House, supported by such of his proteges as Walter Lippmann (C.F.R.), John Foster Dulles (C.F.R.), Allen Dulles (C.F.R.),

and Christian Herter (C.F.R.). It was House who acted as host for the Round Table Group, both English and American, at the key meeting of May 19, 1919, in the Majestic Hotel, Paris, which committed the conspiracy to creation of the C.F.R.

The conspirators had hoped to establish a World Government under the League of Nations, as an outgrowth of World War I. But, while President Woodrow Wilson and House (the man he called his "alter ego") were doing their best to restructure the world at Versailles, the ether of internationalist propaganda was rapidly wearing off back home. As the negotiations revealed that one side had been about as guilty as the other, and all the glitter of the "moral crusade" evaporated with Wilson's vaunted "Fourteen Points," the "rubes back on Main Street" began to stir and awaken. Reaction and disillusionment set in.

Americans hardly wanted to get into a World Government with double-dealing European crooks whose specialty was secret treaty hidden behind secret treaty. The guest of honor, so to speak, stalked out of the banquet before the poisoned meal could be served. And, without American inclusion, there could be no meaningful World Government.

Aroused public opinion made it obvious that the U.S. Senate dared not ratify a treaty saddling the country with such an internationalist commitment. The American public had to somehow be sold the idea of internationalism and World Government, and the C.F.R. was made to order for precisely that purpose. Again, the key was Colonel House.

IV

The significance of the hands of House in the construction of the Council on Foreign Relations can only be understood against his background as an agent for the *Insiders*. House, whose father was a representative in the American South for English financial interests, was Texas-born but educated in England. He was a long-time intriguer in Democrat politics and had been instrumental in electing several Governors of Texas (one of whom gave him the honorary title of "Colonel"). His move into national politics came with his early backing of Woodrow Wilson, who regarded him as his political mentor⁵ and relied heavily upon him.

The "Colonel" was strictly a behind-the-scenes operator who never had any official capacity, but who gained intense satisfaction as a master of the marionettes who occupied the center stage. His personal political philosophy was detailed in a prophetic novel entitled *Philip Dru: Administrator*, published by B. W. Huebsch, a favorite of the Left and for many years a prominent Fabian. The book was so loaded with political dynamite that no author was listed; but, in private letters to friends, House admitted authorship.⁶

In *Philip Dru*, Edward House laid out a thinly fictionalized plan for conquest of America. He described a "conspiracy"—the word is his—which succeeds in electing a U.S. President by means of "deception regarding his real opinions and intentions."⁷ Among other things, wrote the C.F.R. "founder," the conspiracy was to insinuate "itself into the primaries, in order that no candidate might be nominated whose views were not in accord with theirs." Elections were to become mere charades conducted for the dedazzlement of the booboisie. The idea was to use both the Democrat and Republican Parties as instruments to promote World Government.

House's outline for conspiracy is given excellent analysis by his fawning biographer, Professor Charles Seymour (C.F.R.). Pro-

Footnotes at end of article.

fessor Seymour states in *The Intimate Papers Of Colonel House*:

"The extent of Colonel House's influence upon the legislative plans of the [Wilson] Administration may be gathered from a remarkable document which deserves some attention. In the autumn of 1912, immediately after the presidential election, there was published a novel, or political romance entitled 'Philip Dru: Administrator.' It was the story of a young West Point graduate . . . who was caught by the spirit of revolt against the tyranny of privileged interests.

"As stupid and reactionary Government at Washington provokes armed rebellion, in which Dru joins whole-heartedly and which he ultimately leads to complete success. He himself becomes dictator and proceeds by ordinance to remake the mechanism of government, to reform the basic laws that determine the relation of the classes . . . and to bring about an international grouping or league of powers founded upon Anglo-Saxon solidarity. His reforms accomplished, he gives effect once more to representative institutions as formulated in a new American Constitution, better fitted than the old for the spirit and conditions of the twentieth century." [Emphasis added.]

Much that House outlined in *Philip Dru* became reality during the Wilson Administration. "All that book has said should be, comes about," wrote Wilson's Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane. "The President comes to Philip Dru [House] in the end."

In *Philip Dru*, Edward House wrote of establishing "Socialism as dreamed by Karl Marx." A major step towards achieving this was taken with the passage of the graduated income tax, a plank in the Communist Manifesto the realization of which House called for in *Philip Dru*. Of course, House's patrons, who helped push the graduated income tax, deftly sidestepped its effects by placing major portions of their own fortunes under the umbrella of tax-free foundations. (The idea, remember, is to destroy the middle class, not the wealthy.)

House also served the *Insiders* by acting as what Professor Seymour calls the "unseen guardian angel" of the Federal Reserve Act. In his book, "Colonel" House had Dru decree just such a new banking law providing "a flexible [paper] currency." Again, placing the control of money and all credit in the hand of the State was another plank from the Communist Manifesto. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* reveals that the "Colonel" was working hand in glove with certain Wall Street *Insiders* to promote the Federal Reserve Act under the guise of its being a move towards "democracy." Biographer George Viereck assures us that "The Schiffs [C.F.R.], the Warburgs [C.F.R.], the Kahns [C.F.R.], the Rockefeller [C.F.R.], and the Morgans [C.F.R.] put their faith in House . . ."

Many patriotic bankers, of course, opposed the Federal Reserve and other socialist legislation imposed on America by the Wilson-House regime, but conspirators are interested in control and, in the end, control resides in the power to expand government. He who controls the reins of government controls the people. Control the government of the world, and you control the people of the world. Much of the control over the people of America was originally engineered by Colonel House—who, by the time he acted as midwife at the birth of the C.F.R. in Paris, was an experienced and successful front man for the *Insiders*.

The C.F.R., as we have seen, was the brainchild of the Round Table conspiracy, acting with and through Colonel House. Its purpose was to promote the concepts of internationalism and World Government. This was to be

accomplished largely by infiltration of the government and both political Parties à la Philip Dru. You will recall it was House's plan to manipulate this "conspiracy" in such a way that opposing candidates would only seem to have differences; and, you may have noticed, today national candidates argue only over providing "new leadership"—not new policies. The move toward World Government has thus never so much as slowed. Key to this conspiracy in America has been the Round Table's Council on Foreign Relations.

v

The C.F.R.'s Twenty-Fifth Annual Report tells us this of the C.F.R.'s founding at Paris:

"... The Institute of International Affairs founded at Paris in 1919 was comprised at the outset of two branches, one in the United Kingdom and one in the U.S. . . ."

Later the plan was changed to create an ostensible autonomy because. "... it seemed unwise to set up a single institute with branches." It had to be made to appear that the C.F.R. in America, and the R.I.I.A. in Britain, were really independent bodies, lest the American public become aware that the C.F.R. was in fact a subsidiary of the Round Table Group and react in patriotic fury.

Professor Quigley provides a run-down on who was who in the C.F.R. when it was finally incorporated in 1921:

"The New York branch [of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, i.e. the Council on Foreign Relations] was dominated by the associates of the Morgan Bank. For example, in 1928 the Council on Foreign Relations had John W. Davis as president, Paul Cravath as vice-president, and a council of thirteen others, which included Owen D. Young, Russell C. Leffingwell, Norman Davis, Allen Dulles, George W. Wickersham, Frank P. Polk, Whitney Shepardson, Isaiah Bowman, Stephen Duggan, and Otto Kahn [all of whom were partners, associates, or employees of Morgan interests]. . . ."

"The academic figures have been those linked to Morgan, such as James T. Shotwell, Charles Seymour [House's biographer], Joseph Chamberlain, Philip Jessup and, more recently, Philip Moseley, Grayson Kirk and Henry M. Wriston. . . ."

"Closely allied with this Morgan influence were a small group of Wall Street law firms, whose chief figures were Elihu Root, John W. Davis, Paul D. Cravath, Russell Leffingwell, the Dulles brothers and, more recently, Arthur H. Dean, Philip D. Reed, and John J. McCloy."

According to Quigley, the most important financial dynasties in America during the Twenties were (in addition to Morgan) the Rockefeller family; Kuhn, Loeb and Company; Dillon Read and Company; and Brown Bros. Harriman. All were well represented in the C.F.R., and by such luminaries as Otto Kahn, Jacob Schiff (financier of Leon Trotsky and the Russian Revolution), Paul Warburg (Schiff's partner, architect of the Federal Reserve Act, and brother of Max Warburg who financed the Russian Revolution from Germany), William Averell Harriman, Albert H. Wiggin, Frank Vanderlip, and Herbert H. Lehman. In addition, the charter membership of the C.F.R. was comprised of 150 members of Colonel House's select Task Force for planning the Peace Treaty, plus one of the founders of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society named Walter Lippmann.

During the "return to normalcy" of the Twenties, the C.F.R. remained relatively quiet. In 1929, it acquired its headquarters property, the Harold Pratt House at 58 East 68th Street in New York, as a gift from the Rockefellers. Through the years the Rockefeller clan has continued to support the C.F.R. with generous grants from their tax-free foundations.

Much of the Council's financing has come also from the various Carnegie foundations.

There is, in fact, a great deal to indicate that Andrew Carnegie was neck-deep in the Rhodes conspiracy. The two were very close friends and Carnegie, who made millions in America yet never became an American citizen, dreamed like Rhodes of the re-uniting of England and America. The Reece Committee, in its investigation of the foundations, discovered that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace began propaganda activities for U.S. involvement in a European war several years before World War I began. The conspirators of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace were convinced that the best way to establish "world peace" was through a "world war," which would lead to World Government. The various Carnegie foundations were, and still are, heavily represented in the C.F.R. membership.

As World War II approached, the Round Table Group was influential in seeing that Hitler was not stopped in Austria, the Rhineland, or Sudetenland—and thereby was largely responsible for precipitating the holocaust. A second world war would greatly enhance the opportunity for establishment of World Government.

With the Round Table doing its work in Europe, the C.F.R. carried the ball in the United States. The Council's first task was to infiltrate and develop effective control of the U.S. State Department—to make certain that after World War II there would be no slip-ups as there had been following World War I. The story of the C.F.R. takeover of the U.S. Department of State is contained in State Department Publication 2349, *Report To The President On The Results of the San Francisco Conference*. It is the report of Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius (C.F.R.) to President Harry Truman. On page twenty we find:

"With the outbreak of war in Europe it was clear that the United States would be confronted, after the war, with new and exceptional problems. . . . Accordingly, a Committee on Post-War Problems was set up before the end of 1939 [two years before the U.S. entered the war], at the suggestion of the C.F.R. The Committee consisted of high officials of the Department of State [all but one of whom were C.F.R. members]. It was assisted by a research staff [provided by, financed by, and directed by the C.F.R.], which in February, 1941, was organized into a Division of Special Research [and went off the C.F.R. payroll and on to that of the State Department]."

"[After Pearl Harbor] the research facilities were rapidly expanded, and the Departmental Committee on Post-War Problems was reorganized into an Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policies [Completely staffed by the C.F.R.]."

This is the group which designed the United Nations—the first major successful step on the road to a World Superstate. Members of the C.F.R. group included Harold Stassen, John J. McCloy, Owen Lattimore ("conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet international conspiracy"), Alger Hiss (Communist spy), Philip Jessup, Harry Dexter White (Communist spy), Nelson Rockefeller, John Foster Dulles, John Carter Vincent (security risk), and Dean Acheson. Forty-seven C.F.R. members were among the American delegates to the founding of the U.N. in San Francisco in 1945.

Not only did members of the Council on Foreign Relations dominate the establishment of the U.N., but C.F.R. members were at the elbow of the American President at Teheran, Potsdam, and Yalta—where hundreds of millions of human beings were delivered into the hands of Josef Stalin, vastly extending the power of the International Communist Conspiracy. Administrative Assistant to the President of the United States during this time was a key member of the C.F.R. named Lauchlin Currie—subsequently

identified by J. Edgar Hoover as a Soviet agent, and C.F.R.-I.P.R. liaison to the President.

So completely has the C.F.R. dominated the State Department over the past thirty-eight years that every Secretary of State except Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and William Rogers has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. While Rogers is not C.F.R., Professor Henry Kissinger, the President's chief foreign policy advisor, came to the job from the Staff of the Council on Foreign Relations. It will be interesting to watch as Kissinger, not Rogers, runs America's foreign policy.

Having ensured that Eastern Europe would fall into the hands of the Communists, the C.F.R. helped to arrange the sell-out of China to the Communists. The propaganda which convinced Americans that Mao Tse-tung was an innocent agrarian reformer running an Asian branch of the A.D.A. emanated from a C.F.R. front known as the Institute of Pacific Relations. Professor Quigley reveals:

"After 1925, a somewhat similar structure of organizations, known as the Institute of Pacific Relations, was set up in twelve countries . . . on an interlocking basis with the Round Table Group and the Royal Institute of International Affairs."

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which investigated the American branch, concluded:

"The Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence."

"The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information originating from Soviet and Communist sources."

"Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist."

"The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives."

Quigley, whom you will keep in mind is biased in favor of the Round Table conspiracy, states:

"The influence of the Communists in IPR is well established, but the patronage of Wall Street is less well known."

"... The headquarters of the IPR and of the American Council of IPR were both in New York and were closely associated on an interlocking basis. Each spent about \$2.5 million dollars over the quarter-century from 1925 to 1950, of which about half, in each case, came from the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation (which were themselves interlocking groups controlled by an alliance of Morgan and Rockefeller interests in Wall Street). Much of the rest, especially of the American Council, came from firms closely allied to these two Wall Street interests, such as Standard Oil, International Telephone and Telegraph, International General Electric, the National City Bank, and the Chase National Bank."

Since the English and American Round Table groups were financed by men who had extensive holdings in China, why would they not be doing everything in their power to make certain that China did not fall to the Communists? This is what Alfred Kohlberg, a patriotic American who had investments in China, could not understand. Kohlberg was an I.P.R. member who, when he discovered its Communist domination, tried to fight the Rockefeller and Carnegie interests and expose the I.P.R. Through his efforts the Institute of Pacific Relations was exposed, by the McCarran Committee of the U.S. Senate—though the role of the C.F.R. was kept out of the scandal. The fact of the matter is that the Communist I.P.R. was run by such C.F.R. stalwarts as Owen Lattimore (the "conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy"), Soviophile Philip

Jessup, Dean Rusk, Communist spies Alger Hiss and Lauchlin Currie, and other such C.F.R. notables."

VI

Whenever one points to the strange affinity between a coterie of finance capitalists and Communism, one is treated as if he is a candidate for the funny farm. In spite of all the evidence in his own book, Professor Quigley, who describes the Eastern Establishment as "internationalist, astonishingly liberal," and admits the group "has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists," laughs at the idea that the two are linked. He does, however, admit:

"... the relationship between the financial circles of London and those of the eastern United States . . . reflects one of the most powerful influences in twentieth-century American and world history. The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called, perhaps facetiously, the English and American Establishments. There is, however, a considerable degree of truth to the joke, a truth which reflects a very real power structure which the Radical Right in the United States has been attacking for years in the belief that they are attacking the Communists. This is particularly true when these attacks are directed, as they so frequently are, at 'Harvard socialism,' or at 'Left-wing newspapers' like the New York Times and the Washington Post, or at foundations."

After describing how cosmopolitan and sophisticated these people are, the Professor actually tries to rationalize Communist activity in this Establishment conspiracy as a product of *naïveté*. Quigley writes:

"It was this group of people, whose wealth and influence so exceeded their experience and understanding [sic], who provided much of the frame-work of influence which the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers took over in the United States in the 1930's. It must be recognized that the power that these energetic Left-wingers exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie, and, once the anger and suspicions of the American people were aroused, as they were by 1950, it was a fairly simple matter to get rid of the Red sympathizers." [Emphasis added.]

This, of course, raises the question of just who is using whom? It is always assumed that it is the Communists who dupe others into doing their work. In most cases this is undoubtedly true; however, it strains credulity to believe that men who are the world's best businessmen and bankers, on the one hand, can be perennial pigeons in dealing with Communists on the other. Clearly there are *Insiders* manipulating both ends of the show.

The Reece Committee attempted to investigate this matter. Norman Dodd, chief investigator for the Committee, was told by the then-President of the Ford Foundation that the purpose of his Foundation "was to so alter American society that it could be comfortably merged with most of the Soviet Union." Dodd was then told that this was being done on "orders from the White House." Quigley says of the Reece Committee's investigation of tax-exempt foundations:

"It soon became clear that people of immense wealth would be unhappy if the investigation went too far and that the 'most respected' newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any revelations to make the publicity worth while, in terms of votes or campaign contributions. An interesting report showing the Left-wing associa-

tions of the inter-locking nexus of tax-exempt foundations was issued in 1954 rather quietly."

Dodd maintains that when the investigation began probing into "the so-called legitimate world" which is the real nerve center of the Communist movement, the investigation was quashed. Rene Wormser, counsel for the Reece Committee, states in his book *Foundations: Their Power And Influence*: "Mr. [Congressman Wayne] Hays told us one day that 'the White House' had been in touch with him and asked him if he would cooperate to kill the Committee." The man in the White House at that time was Dwight Eisenhower—a member of the C.F.R. who named six members of the C.F.R. to his Cabinet, as well as naming no less than twelve members of the C.F.R. to the rank of Under Secretary.

The answer to the question of who is using whom is at least partially answered by Professor Quigley, who reveals the following amazing information about C.F.R.-Morgan manipulation of the Left:

"More than fifty years ago the Morgan firm decided to infiltrate the Left-wing political movements in the United States. This was relatively easy to do, since these groups were starved for funds and eager for a voice to reach the people. Wall Street supplied both. The purpose was not to destroy, dominate or take over but was really threefold: (1) to keep informed about the thinking of Left-wing or liberal groups; (2) to provide them with a mouthpiece so that they could 'blow off steam,' and (3) to have a final veto on their publicity, and possibly on their actions, if they ever went 'radical.'"

What is more likely is that these Wall Streeters financed the Left because it was promoting the world Superstate sought by the Round Table Group. After all, despite the erroneous publicity about "wealthy Rightwing millionaires," there has been no corresponding financing of Constitutional Conservatives by these elements.

Quigley cites the alliance between Wall Street and the Left in creating *New Republic* magazine, which was organized by a Morgan associate and financed by an heiress to the Standard Oil trust. He writes:

"The original purpose for establishing the paper was to provide an outlet for the progressive Left and to guide it quietly in an Anglophile direction. This latter task was entrusted to a young man, only four years out of Harvard [where he helped found the Inter-collegiate Socialist Society], but already a member of the mysterious Round Table Group, which has played a major role in directing England's foreign policy since its formal establishment in 1901."

The young man was Walter Lippmann, described by Carroll Quigley as the authentic voice of the Eastern Establishment.

The *New Republic* was founded by Morgan agent Willard Straight, Herbert Croly, the first Editor of the magazine and a naive "Liberal" who accidentally stumbled into seventy-two officially cited Communist fronts or activities, makes perfectly clear in his official biography of Straight that the latter "was in no sense a liberal or a progressive, but was, indeed, a typical international banker and that the *New Republic* was simply a medium for advancing certain designs of such international bankers, notably to blunt the isolationism and anti-British sentiments. . . ."

Reader's Digest Senior Editor Eugene Lyons, in his book *The Red Decade*, extensively chronicles the services done for Soviet Russia by the *Insider*-controlled *New Republic*. Lyons writes:

"The American liberal aberration had its house organ, 'The New Republic,' which led all the rest in avid and indiscriminating acceptance of the myth of Stalin's Utopia."

What did serving as Stalin's press agent have to do with "advancing certain designs of such international bankers?" What indeed, unless it is promoting the interests of the C.F.R.'s goal of World Government? 10

The Round Table Group, using Morgan money, has at the same time used both of our political Parties and the Communists for its own purposes. Quigley reveals:

"The associations between Wall Street and the Left . . . are really survivals of the associations between the Morgan Bank and the Left. To Morgan all political parties were simply organizations to be used, and the firm always was careful to keep a foot in all camps. Morgan himself, Dwight Morrow (C.F.R.), and other partners were allied with Republicans; Russell C. Leffingwell (C.F.R.) was allied with the Democrats . . . and Thomas W. Lamont (C.F.R.) was allied with the Left."

Accordingly to Quigley the Lamont family was the "chief link" between Wall Street and the Communists—although Thomas Lamont, Morgan's partner, was active in Republican Presidential politics. As Phyllis Schlafly noted in *A Choice Not An Echo*, "Among the most influential kingmakers who profess to be Republicans in the Morgan banking group headed by Thomas S. Lamont Jr., son of the Thomas S. Lamont who masterminded Willkie's nomination. . . ." The Lamonts were also avid supporters of Eisenhower, and helped finance *Saturday Review* and the *New York Post*.

Quigley states that the chief evidence against the Lamonts "can be found in the files of HUAC which show Tom Lamont, his wife Flora, and his son Corliss as sponsors and financial angels to almost a score of extreme Left organizations including the Communist Party itself. . . . During this whole period of over two decades, Corliss Lamont, with the full support of his parents, was one of the chief figures in 'fellow traveler' circles and one of the chief spokesmen for the Soviet point of view. . . ."

Corliss Lamont, a member of C.F.R.-related groups such as the American Association for the United Nations and the Foreign Policy Association, was named by the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "probably the most persistent propagandist for the Soviet Union to be found anywhere in the United States."

In *The Bolshevik Invasion Of The West*, Louis Budenz, former Editor of the Communist *Daily Worker*, turned anti-Communist, writes of the current state of this Wall Street-Moscow axis and makes the following observations:

"It is the Communists in the United States themselves who continue to attest to the progress of the Soviet line, reporting continuously improvement of relations with the Rockefeller-Morgan interests in Wall Street. Right in the midst of the war in Southeast Asia we are informed that these financial giants push forward their program of help to the Soviet dictatorship."

The *Worker* of July 11, 1965, comes forward with this touching tribute to the House of Morgan's affection for the Sino-Soviet cause:

"The ironical result is that big businessmen are generally more progressive than big labor leaders. It is Thomas Gates (C.F.R.), chairman of the board of Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, who advocates reconsideration of our China policy, not George Meany. It is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that would explore means of expanding East-West trade, not the AFL-CIO."

The *Worker* of August 30, 1964, contained this statement from Comrade Victor Perlo:

"The change in the balance of world forces towards socialism and nationalism has impelled the more sensible and knowledgeable of the Wall Streeters to move to-

wards limited accommodations with the U.S.S.R."

Clearly, the *Chicago Tribune's* editorial on the C.F.R. of December 9, 1950, still applies: "The members of the Council [on Foreign Relations] are persons of more than average influence in the community. They have used the prestige that their wealth, their social position, and their education have given them to lead their country toward bankruptcy and military debacle. They should look at their hands. There is blood on them—the dried blood of the last war and the fresh blood of the present one [the Korean War]"

It goes without saying that the C.F.R.'s hands are now bloody also with the gore of 150,000 Americans in Vietnam, as the Council has succeeded in promoting as American policy the shipment of American aid and trade to the East European arsenal of the Vietcong killing our sons in the field.

VII

Today the C.F.R. remains active in working towards its final goal of a government of all the world—a government which the *Insiders* and their allies will control. And, they don't even try to hide it. *Study No. 7*, published by the C.F.R. on November 25, 1959, openly advocates "building a new international order [which] must be responsive to world aspirations for peace, [and] for social and economic change . . . an international order . . . including states labeling themselves as 'Socialist' [Communist]." To accomplish this the C.F.R. says we must "gradually increase the authority of the UN." As part of this effort, the Council on Foreign Relations advocates secret negotiations with the Communists as part of "disarmament":

"The U.S. should explore Soviet proposals for complete or partial disarmament . . . Efforts to resolve political conflicts with Communist powers should occur simultaneously with, not prior to, disarmament negotiation. Negotiate on these problems perhaps directly with the U.S.S.R. in secret. . . ."

President Kennedy responded by appointing the Chairman of the Board of C.F.R., John J. McCloy—formerly of the Rockefeller Chase Manhattan Bank—to head the U.S. Disarmament Agency.

The C.F.R. in *Study No. 7* also advocates a "more ambitious, longer term," foreign-aid program which would "avoid making aid contingent upon political commitments to the West." In addition, it recommends recognition of Red China and greatly expanded trade with the Communists supplying the Vietcong.

An endless interlock is maintained by the C.F.R. with the major foundations, the Foreign Policy Association, World Affairs Council, the Committee for Economic Development, Business Advisory Council, Institute for American Strategy, Commission on National Goals, American Assembly, National Planning Association, and Americans for Democratic Action. On the international level, the C.F.R. is heavily interlocked with the Bilderbergers, the English-Speaking Union, the Pilgrims Society, and with the parent organization, the Round Table.

The Council has completely dominated the Cabinet and chief advisory posts of the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson Administrations. President Nixon, a "former" C.F.R. member, has appointed or retained the following members of C.F.R. to high posts in his Administration: Henry A. Kissinger, Chief Foreign Policy Adviser (a paid member of the staff of C.F.R.); Henry Cabot Lodge, Chief Negotiator in Paris; Charles Yost, Ambassador to the United Nations (a paid member of the staff of C.F.R.); Arthur Burns, Counselor to the President; Harlan Cleveland, U.S. Ambassador to N.A.T.O.; George Ball, Foreign Policy Consultant to the State Department; Robert

Murphy, special consultant on international affairs; Robert F. Pederson, Counselor and Executive Secretary of the Department of State; Alan Pifer, consultant to the President on educational finance; Dr. Paul McCracken, chief economic aide; Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to Saigon; General Andrew J. Goodpaster, chief military policy advisor; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Middle East and South Asia; Jacob Beam, Ambassador to the Soviet Union; and, Gerald Smith, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Administrations, both Democrat and Republican, come and go—but the C.F.R. lingers on. This is why the more things seem to change, the more they remain the same. The fix is in at the top, where the same coterie of *Insiders*, bent on control of the world, runs the show.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The popular encyclopedia on the C.F.R. and its satellites remains former F.B.I. agent Dan Smoot's *Invisible Government*. Much updating material and a list of members for 1966 (obtained circuitously) can be found in Phoebe Courtney's *The C.F.R.* Both books are available for one-dollar each from American Opinion Library, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178.

² Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy And Hope, A History Of The World In Our Time*, The Macmillan Company, New York, Collier-Macmillan Limited, London, 1966. Though the volume is nearly 1,350 pages long, it is *must* reading for the student of political conspiracy in our time.

³ See Rose Martin, *Fabian Freeway, Western Islands*, 1966.

⁴ Let me emphasize here that the matter of the machinations of international financiers is an area in which misinformation abounds. There is much literature in the field which contains dubious or totally false data and simply idiotic economic theory. Many authors writing in this area have drawn vast conclusions on the most doubtful sort of "evidence." We recommend that readers venturing into this field maintain a healthy skepticism concerning any work which does not cite thoroughly reputable sources (and that even then care be taken against contextual fraud). This is a field from which those seeking to become students of the Communist Conspiracy can find themselves rocketed hopelessly into orbit—for all practical purposes effectively removed from the struggle against the Communists.

⁵ Quigley's attitude toward this conspiracy and his sources of information are revealed in the following statement: "I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies. . . . but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known."

⁶ House was described by a friend of twenty-five years' standing as "highly radical, more than liberal, in the political-social sense."

⁷ Edited by Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers Of Colonel House*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1926, pp. 152-159.

⁸ Although partially thwarted by the loss of Wilson to illness, House succeeded in 1932 with F.D.R., who went straight from the Chicago convention to huddle with the "Colonel" at the latter's Massachusetts home. In 1938, House told his biographer Charles Seymour: "During the last fifteen years I have been close to the center of things, al-

though few people suspect it. No important foreigner has come to America without talking to me. I was close to the movement that nominated Roosevelt. . . . He has given me free hand in advising [Secretary of State Cordell] Hull. All the Ambassadors have reported to me frequently."

⁹ The fact that a powerful C.F.R. contingent was moved into the State Department in 1939 is verified in the C.F.R.'s booklet, *A Record Of Twenty Years, 1921-1947*, which says of the financing for the takeover: "The program here described was largely financed by generous annual renewals of the initial grant of funds by the Rockefeller Foundation late in 1939. In addition, an annual grant of the Carnegie Corporation contributed to the success of the work."

¹⁰ C.F.R. Secretaries of State include Henry Stimson, Edward Stettinius, George Marshall, Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Christian Herter, and Dean Rusk.

¹¹ It is less than coincidence that the Council on Foreign Relations now advocates recognition of Red China "to pull China back into the family of nations." (See Richard Nixon's "Asia After Vietnam" in the October 1967 issue of the Council on Foreign Relations' official magazine, *Foreign Affairs*.)

¹² Straight subsequently launched the magazine *United Nations World*.

¹³ The *New Republic* has been enormously influential among American "Liberals" who do not realize they are tools being used for ulterior purposes. William F. Buckley Jr. says he began *National Review* to serve as a Right-wing *New Republic*, but has succeeded only in producing the world's most effective cure for insomnia while attacking anti-Communist activists. In fact, the editors of *New Republic* and *National Review* have arranged a deal whereby one may now receive both magazines at the same time for a reduced package rate.

Mr. Buckley, whose TV program is carried over C.F.R.-controlled stations, and whose column appears in such C.F.R. organs as the *New York Post* (owned by Jacob Schiff's granddaughter, Dorothy), never mentions the C.F.R. In his syndicated column shortly after the election of Richard Nixon, Buckley went so far as to give his seal of approval to the appointment of Nelson Rockefeller (C.F.R.) as Secretary of State—calling the man who along with partner Cyrus Eaton controls American trade with the Red bloc, an "anti-Communist." Mr. Buckley pretends the enemy is simply "Liberal" philosophy and ideology. He has become the Liberal Establishment's "house conservative," a "respectable and responsible" adversary,—one who never ever whispers about conspiracy.

FRANCE REAFFIRMS TIES WITH ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Michel Debre, the able French Foreign Minister, in a speech prepared for the National Press Club on April 9, 1969, reaffirmed France's ties with the Atlantic alliance. He took the occasion to remind his audience that his "presence in Washington for the 20th anniversary of the treaty is proof to the contrary" that the Atlantic alliance has lost its *raison d'être* for France.

In extemporaneous remarks after the question and answer period, the Foreign

Minister recalled for his audience the advice given to Louis XVI during the American Revolution by one of France's greatest Foreign Ministers, Vergennes, "Support the American insurgents." Debre concluded by saying that while the Americans are no longer insurgents, the friendship between this country and his is fundamental to world peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I insert excerpts from the text of the speech in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

STATEMENT BY MICHEL DEBRE, FRENCH FOREIGN AFFAIRS MINISTER

* * * * *
EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION

I will briefly recall before you these three fundamental ideas.

NATIONAL SENTIMENT AND SUPRANATIONALITY

Europe as described in geography and recorded in history is a mosaic of nations, each endowed with an affirmed personality, long ripened on the basis of its own ethnic and linguistic characteristics, of painful confrontations whose aftereffects are still visible in the heart of our continent. It is not possible to ignore this permanence of realities. It is not possible to build Europe starting from scratch and disregarding facts and feelings.

A day will perhaps come when, in Europe, French, Germans, British, Italians, Dutch, Belgians, Spaniards and still others will envisage no longer being what they are. But such is not the case. Europe in the twentieth century is not the new and vacant America of the end of the eighteenth century. National feeling remains and it is, moreover, fortunate that this is so. One cannot build Europe while scorning this reality which is, besides, a necessity for accepting social disciplines. It is a fact of history that Europe is not one motherland but a complex of motherlands. Moreover, liberty, as it is clearly seen in Eastern Europe, is linked to national sentiment. People revolt against any form of hegemony in the name of patriotism, which is the other side of a coin whose right side is liberty and whose other side is the nation. That is why the political pretensions of the supranational authorities make one smile or suffer.

However, the European nations must unite. If there is one nation which has affirmed this truth more than any other, it is, indeed, France: immediately following World War II General de Gaulle began teaching the French that the future, if it could not be founded on forgetting the past, should, however, be oriented in function of good and solidary relations with Germany. This policy has been followed with exemplary steadfastness and, today, as yesterday, we affirm and implement it. We have established between our two countries relations that, without making them disappear, are gradually blurring memories that one would have thought ineradicable. We will continue. Beyond this our duty is to organize in a rational manner, in order to make it constant, real and effective, the cooperation between European nations without questioning the personality of each of them, that is, conserving for each one, according to the laws of liberty and in keeping with the will of its people, the control of its destiny. One day may come when, by dint of cooperation between the leaders, of exchanges among the young people of shared industrial productions, of dangers accepted and overcome with the same determination, a new common sentiment will dominate the various national sentiments. But that can only be the result of time, of the will of men and of circumstances. An

evolution, which in the best hypotheses will be slow, must not be forced. In the meantime, any artificial mechanism, that is, any authority or organism which without legitimate bases seeks to impose fundamental orientation independently of national acceptance, creates a risk of rebellion, that is, it delays union.

A will to independence

One of the elements that may bring about the birth of a European sentiment is the will to independence. People readily distort independence by likening it to hostility. * * *

Look at the Common Market. It represented and still represents a great adventure for France—a real economic upheaval after generations of protectionism. * * * We are determined to complete its organization, and the French Government, moreover, has proposed various measures which aim at reinforcing the Common Market. We have even gone further, and we proposed, already a few years ago, to draw up between the Six a form of organized political cooperation which would have constituted the starting point of a European will and would have made it possible for Europe to play a constructive role in settling the conflicts that are tearing our planet apart.

We would like to go further and draw up, as regards energy, industrial investments and finances, a coordinated policy of states to set up the bases of a strong economy, capable through its research and development capacity of being one of the very great elements of international competition.

We have not been followed. However, I dare say that we were right. As we are right, it seems to me, about enlarging the Communities. As you know, we disagree with our partners on this point, for there are really two different philosophies in opposition. On one hand, there are those who want to enlarge the Community as a matter of principle, without really knowing where it will lead us, without even accepting to study concretely what would happen to the Community under the impact of those successive enlargements, and who are resigned to the spontaneous but, I repeat, the unpredictable evolution that will be born from that enlargement. Whereas we, for our part, intend to define beforehand among us Six the goals that we must safeguard, and among which we consider cohesion of thought and action and a truly European spirit of the undertaking to have priority.

The enlargement will probably come about one day, very difficult though it may be to fix a date, for it depends on many factors, some of which are outside of the six members of the Common market. But enlargement brings about so many unknown factors, notably as far as the political future is concerned, that there would be, in our view, a very serious danger in not studying beforehand, carefully and sincerely, the goals and the means.

I repeat, in wanting to preserve that independent position of Europe, we do not at all mean to set ourselves against the United States, as some simplistic interpretations have sometimes sought to imply, and the recent conversations between President Nixon and General de Gaulle showed us, moreover, that no ambiguity on this subject remained on this side of the Atlantic. The new climate of trust which has been established in French-American relations, and about which the French Government is particularly pleased, comes, it seems to me, from a more accurate evaluation of French policy's European goals, which President Nixon analyzed perfectly in his press conference of March 5.

I shall recall to you some of his statements:

"General de Gaulle believes that Europe should have an independent position in its own right, and frankly I believe that, too."

"The world will be a much safer place and, from our standpoint, a much healthier place economically, militarily and politically, if there was a strong European Community to be a balance between the United States and the Soviet Union, rather than to have this polarization of forces in one part of the world and another."

WESTERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

In the field of relations between the East and West, we hope for a radical change. * * *

The evolution that we are witnessing at the present time is going in that direction. We ourselves have been developing our contacts with the USSR for several years, and with the Central and Eastern European countries, with which we have many affinities and common memories, and which very eagerly desire an intensification of their contacts with the West, and with France in particular. Other Western European countries have done the same thing. As far as your Government is concerned, for a long time it has been engaging in significant discussions with the Soviet Government and it intends to persevere on that path. We are satisfied with the perspectives that can thus be opened for an improvement of your relations with the USSR, an improvement which would contribute, in an important way—I am convinced of it—to the general progress of détente.

Certainly, this road is pitted with obstacles, as we saw last summer. We witnessed at that time a violent reaction of the USSR to certain consequences of the détente, which seemed to us in the logic of an evolution desirable and realistic, but which in the present circumstances the Russians considered dangerous.

Despite this reaction, which we condemned and which we continue to deplore as long as it is manifested, we believe that the evolution which began to appear so clearly in Europe will necessarily continue. For, it responds to the action of invincible forces. And, if our faith in the détente remains, it is because we have the conviction that this evolution is in the interest of all.

Is this to say that, in our eyes, the Atlantic alliance, born out of the cold war, has lost its *raison d'être*? My presence in Washington, for the twentieth anniversary of the treaty, is proof to the contrary.

Between the two shores of the North Atlantic there exists a profound affinity, as the men and the women, for the immense majority, have the same past and share the same faith. From the two shores of the ocean springs the same ambition—that of participating in world peace by the combined weight of our influence and of progress, notably through cooperation from which we can have so many other peoples, our brothers, benefit. Finally, history teaches us that peace is never insured forever. Tragedies can occur, which will require our solidarity.

Certainly, we exclude integration, and this refusal is decisive. Integration is not the consequence of the alliance. To the contrary, among certain partners it risks weakening the alliance. France intends to keep command of her defense, as she intends to keep control of her policy. This is a fundamental requirement. It represents for a country such as ours a rule all the more essential in that, with time, the importance of the commitments of each may be subject to change. But we know so much better and more than anyone else the imperatives that, in case of extreme danger, solidarity imposes, that the Americans and the French can flatter themselves for never having been, throughout the wars of the past, in opposing camps. This is a tradition higher than the treaties. It is dear to us, to us French; we intend to hand it down to our children, as a guarantee of peace and friendship, based on a shared feeling of the price of liberty.