EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO AIR-CONDITIONING AND REFRIGERATION INDUSTRY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today, when the Federal Government is seeking to assume an ever-increasing role in the control and policing of the Nation's industries, it is a pleasure to comment on one industry that needs no policing. The air-conditioning and refrigeration industry polices itself.

Ten years ago, leaders of the then young industry foresaw the potential growth of central residential air conditioning and took positive action to establish standards that have insured continued high quality and dependability. This action, embodied in the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute's unitary certification program assures the consumer that any central air-conditioning system bearing the ARI seal of certification has been subjected to rigid testing and that the model meets minimum criteria for dependability and performance.

The term "unitary" is the industry word for a central air-conditioning system. Today, 70 percent of the unitary market consists of central residential equipment.

When the unitary certification program was established in January 1959, under the administration of the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, 530 models produced by 30 manufacturers were found to conform to ARI standards. Today, the ARI Directory of Certified Unitary Air-Conditioners contains more than 5,000 models produced by 61 participating manufacturers.

A similar program covering unitary heat pumps was initiated in 1964; in 1965, ARI consolidated the Certified Unitary Air-Conditioner Directory and the Certified Heat Pump Directory.

Models listed in the combined directory today represent more than 90 percent of the total U.S. production of the two types of equipment and a similar percentage of companies manufacturing them.

As a result of manufacturers voluntarily subjecting their products to the rigid testing requisite to certification prior to placing them on the market, the American consumer is assured that any certified unit he buys is accurately rated from a capacity standpoint and is dependable.

The tremendous growth of the air-conditioning market, particularly in the residential systems area, over the past 10 years attests to the overall effectiveness of the self-policing action of forward thinking industry leaders.

This program assumes even greater importance when it is considered in light of 10 years of continuous growth; 10 years that saw shipments of unitary air conditioners increase from 306,814 units in 1959 to 1,225,000 units by 1968, an increase of approximately 400 percent. The current annual growth rate of this multi-billion-dollar industry is 10 to 20 percent.

Ten years ago, prior to the initiation of the certification program, the consumer buying a central air-conditioning system was faced with a bewildering number of performance ratings and claims. Some units were rated according to the horsepower of their compressor motors; others were rated in tons; and, still others in electrical watts input. As a result, an individual not having an engineering degree found it practically impossible to compare the capacity of one unit against another.

Today, all certified units are rated in accordance with their outputs in British thermal units per hour—B.t.u.—and the consumer knows what he is getting for his dollar.

To qualify for that all-important ARI seal of certification, each new model, before it is put into production, is submitted to an independent laboratory where it undergoes stringent testing. It must meet minimum performance criteria to make sure it has the capacity claimed by the manufacturer. Capacity and dependability are the watchwords of the program. Once qualified for the ARI seal of certification, the unit is not forgotten. Approximately one-third of each participating manufacturer's basic models are tested at random each year. A smaller number of units are called in after having been shipped to distributors and tested for capacity and performance.

The program has paid off, not only for the consumer and the industry, but also for the Government. An indication of the acceptance of air conditioning generally and certification as well, is to be found in the fact that the Federal Housing Administration requires that air conditioning installed in FHA-guaranteed homes at the time of construction shall meet the requirements of the ARI standards upon which the certification program is based. More recently, Housing and Urban Development as well as the Department of Defense have come to rely upon ARI's certification programs.

The air-conditioning and refrigeration industry did not stop with the unitary certification program. There are now certification programs for central system humidifiers, room fan-coil units, room air-induction units, air-cooling and air-heating coils, central station air-handlers, transport refrigeration equipment—used in cooling refrigerated trucks and trailers—and drinking water coolers. Several additional programs are currently under development by the institute.

I am happy to know that the air-conditioning and refrigeration industry has succeeded so thoroughly, proving that industries can regulate themselves through voluntarily establishing and conforming to sensible standards for its products.

That the industry recognized the need for regulation and certification and acted to bring programs into being that protect consumers without some Government agency having to step in is particularly commendable.

I would like to congratulate the industry and the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute which represents it for their success. It is another example of free enterprise at work under the American system.

LT. DON C. LEWIS GIVEN OUTSTANDING AWARD

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Marine 1st Lt. Don C. Lewis, of Texas, on April 8 received the Outstanding Naval Aviation Student of the Year Award, presented annually by the Daughters of the American Colonists.

Lieutenant Lewis was chosen because of his record of outstanding academic achievement and flying ability as demonstrated through the Navy-Marine Corps aviation training program.

This young officer, at the age of 25, is presently flying the Navy-Marine Corps F–4 Phantom, a high-performance fighter-attack jet. He is serving as a section leader for Fighter-Attack Squadron 451 at the Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station in South Carolina.

A graduate of Junction, Tex., High School and of Abilene Christian College, Lewis became interested in aviation through his father who owned a Piper Cub. An older brother, Ted, is presently a commercial pilot for Braniff, while his younger brother flies for Allegheny.

Lieutenant Lewis entered the Marine Corps in January of 1967 when he reported to the officer's candidate course at Quantico. Commissioned in March, he then was assigned to the Naval Air Station at Pensacola for flight training. While there he was chosen student of the week, student of the month, and also made the captain's list for academic achievement in November of that year.

Married to the former Miss Sandra Miller of Junction, Tex., Lewis resides with his wife and young daughter, Carla Renee, in Laural Bay, S.C.

At the recent award ceremony the lieutenant was given a gold wristwatch engraved with this inscription: "Presented by the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, to 1st Lt. Don C. Lewis, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, honor cadet, 1968."

Mr. Speaker, I salute this outstanding young American. It is reassuring to observe the progress of such energetic, intelligent, and dedicated young men. In just such young men rests much of the hope for the future of our country. They deserve to be recognized and encouraged at every opportunity.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PEACE, COMMERCE, AND HONEST FRIENDSHIP

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the privilege of introducing H.R. 7432, a bill which would deny favored tax treatment to any tax-exempt organization which engages in political activity. The main thrust of my bill is to prevent labor unions from using tax-exempt compulsory dues for the support of particular political candidates.

One of my distinguished colleagues in the other body, Senator PAUL FANNIN, recently presented a speech to the Labor Relations Institute, Federal Bar Association, relative to the growth of union power. For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert this speech into the RECORD:

PEACE, COMMERCE, AND HONEST FRIENDSHIP

(Speech by Senator PAUL FANNIN, Republican of Arizona, before the Labor Relations Institute, Federal Bar Association, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 6, 1969)

"We strongly believe that the protection of individual liberty is the cornerstone of sound labor policy."

That is a quotation from the Republican platform of 1968, and I think that contrary to the general idea that platforms are written in controversy, supported with vigorous rhetoric or trepidation and then promptly forgotten—we shall see a Republican Administration living up to its platform and campaign promises and striving toward an attainable goal of peace, commerce and honest friendship.

The first priority in labor policy for this Administration will, I believe, be the enforcement of labor laws we have in a fair and impartial manner and in the way they are written.

Under the previous Administration the rights of individual workers have too often been subordinated to the interests of labor unions, a result which is contrary to the intent of the Federal labor policy as adopted by Congress in the National Labor Relations Act.

Quoting again from the Republican Platform to which President Nixon pledged his support upon accepting the Party's nomination last summer in Miami:

"Today the basic rights of some workers, guaranteed by law, are inadequately guarded against abuse. We will assure these rights through vigorous enforcement of present laws, including the Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act, and the addition of new protections where needed. We will be vigilant to prevent any administrative agency entrusted with labor-law enforcement from defying the letter and the spirit of these laws."

I was in Miami when Mr. Nixon accepted the nomination and the platform. I know of nothing he said during the campaign which contradicted the platform stand. It seems apparent to me that he will continue to do what he is pledged to do—enforce the laws—in the letter and the spirit in which they were enacted by Congress. I believe he will do this—not *if* he can, but *when* he can.

When the platform language spelled out "an administrative agency entrusted with labor-law enforcement . . . defying the spirit and letter of the law," I am reasonably sure the National Labor Relations Board was uppermost in the minds of those drafting the platform language.

The reason for this is clear. The "Kennedy-Johnson" board has not only repealed the Landrum-Griffin Act, but through one-sided administration and persistent—if not consistent—distortion and disregard of Congressional intent in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act, has rendered most of the safeguards provided by the Act for the individual, ineffective.

May I pause a moment here to say that there are many other points at which the intent of the people, as expressed through their elected representatives, has been ignored by Executive fiat. Possibly the most flagrant in the news recently is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which has undertaken to set itself up as a complete "czar" in the field of government contracts. If the OFCC is allowed to continue unchecked it will be impossible for the Defense Department to buy a box of thumbtacks without checking first with the Secretary of Labor. This is a dangerous situation—dangerous to the security of the Nation. I have introduced legislation to clear up this overlap and contraction. This is a digression from my main theme and I cite it merely to point out the general problem and areas of difficulty encountered in the quasi-judicial status of our regulatory agencies. This is an extremely thorny area and I trust that in the foreseeable future some of you will come forward with better solutions than we now have in the area of technical regulations and independent agencies.

To return to my point—demonstrating the NLRB's disregard of the rights of the individual, and riding roughshod over the intent of Congress—if you examine the legislative history and the language of the National Labor Relations Act you find that it was created with practically the sole aim of protecting the individual employee—union member. There are simply no "protections" as such, awarded to unions.

Yet, administration of labor law by the very entity designed to protect the rights of individuals, has been twisted in such a way as to "protect" unions and leave the individual open to exploitation.

Let me cite a few examples. I know there are many, and possibly you are familiar with them, but some of these cases are so obvious in their pro-union bias that I find it difficult to believe them.

For example, in 1963 when a young, married steelworker on the West Coast grew dissatisfied with the representation he received at the hands of his local Steelworkers Union, he drove 50 miles to an NLRB regional office to inquire if he had any rights under the law.

He was assured by a government lawyer at the NLRB that he had every right to seek to replace the Steelworkers local with another union. He returned to work and proceeded to circulate a decertification petition.

As you might imagine there was an immediate explosion in the local union's headquarters. Immediately the leaders scheduled a meeting to put the young man on trial for "undermining the union." His request for a secret ballot was denied. With less than a third of the local's members present the President called for a show of hands. The steelworker was "convicted" by a vote of 20 to 15. Thereupon the young breadwinner was fined $500, suspended from the union and charged with the "costs" of his trial.

He filed charges with the NLRB and while awaiting their decision was the target of continued union harassment. Finally the Board handed down its decision. It gave the young man no help and no protection.

The NLRB noted our young man indeed had the "right" to file the petition as he did. But nonetheless, the Board held that the union's "disciplinary action" against him was permissable. (Richard Price vs. NLRB and United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO No. 154 NLRB 690).

This case demonstrates that when the rights of the individual and the rights of a union clash there is little question as to the winner. The employee invariably bears the brunt of these decisions. Is it fair to require that a man belong to a union—give the man no choice—and then let that union choose to discipline him when he does what it is lawfully his right to do?

I have introduced a bill to remedy this situation. It is S. 424 and it would prohibit unions from engaging in this sort of thing.

You have heard of the famous Allis-Chalmers case in which 100 union members were fined for refusing to engage in a strike when the union had already called a strike before taking a vote. The legislative history so clearly runs in the opposite direction to that taken by the NLRB in this case that it again defies belief. The NLRB held that a union has the right to fine members for refusing to engage in a strike. Senator Taft, in responding to critics debating the Taft-Hartley Law on the Senate Floor who feared that Sec. 8(b)(1)(A) would impair the effectiveness of strikes said . . . "All it would do would be outlaw such restraints and coercion as would prevent people *from going to work if they wished to go to work.*"

Mr. Justice Black cited this very language in his dissent in the Allis-Chalmers case (338 U.S. 175 (1967)). Obviously the Board has so twisted the law that it now operates in a manner exactly opposite that intended by Senator Taft.

The Board holds that a union may penalize or fine any employee who produces more than the union thinks he should produce. (*Wisconsin Motors Corp*, 145 NLRB 1097 (1964)).

The Board rules that the employer must turn over to the union the names and addresses of all employees so that the union may contact them in their homes, no matter how much the employees may object to disclosure of their home addresses and to being harassed by the union at home. (*Excelsior Underwear Co.* 156 NLRB 1236 (1966)).

As an alleged "corrective" of employer misdeeds, the Board frequently fastens a union upon employees without a vote, and indeed even though they may have voted decisively against the union. (*Bernel Foam Products Co.* 146 NLRB 1277 (1964)

Many other examples could be given to show that the entire thrust of the Labor Board under the Kennedy-Johnson Administration has been to strengthen the power of labor unions at the expense of the rights of the rank and file employees.

There are those who point to statistics showing Board decisions for and against unions are about evenly divided. They shy away from a close examination of the precedent setting cases, however; for there the bias in favor of the unions as opposed to the rights of the individual is so rank as to be nauseous.

If you have a penchant for statistics, try these on for credibility:

In the recent well publicized campaign of the Textile Workers Union of America, to "get"—that is to organize—the J. P. Stevens company, one of America's largest textile manufacturers, there are some interesting facts. I am reliably informed that the NLRB hearing examiner totally discredited over 300 management witnesses while totally crediting the testimony of over 100 union witnesses.

Now does it not seem at least a little strange that out of at least 300 persons called by the Stevens management to support its position, the trial examiner could not find a *single* witness whose testimony was credible to him; and does it not seem

equally strange—at least very extraordinary—that out of more than 100 witnesses which the TWUA called to present its side of the case, that *every single one* was such a paragon of truth, purity and light that their testimony was totally credited by the trial examiner? It seems strange to me.

So now you know that I have some question, at least as to the impartiality of the National Labor Relations Board. What is to be done about it?

Of the present five Board members, three are Democrats, two are Republicans, appointed to five year staggered terms. The first vacancy does not come up until December of this year when Republican Sam Zagoria's term expires. He was appointed by President Johnson and is the only member who has not been reappointed to a second term.

Mr. Nixon may designate a new chairman if he wishes. It apparently will be August of 1970 before the term of the present chairman Frank McCulloch expires.

Even if the Board should be reorganized, and if a new majority, favorable to a return to interpretations of the law in accordance with Congressional intent were obtained, there would still remain the problem of the courts. The present board has fairly frequently been reversed in the Circuit Courts, but has gone on to be sustained often in the Supreme Court; whose bias in favor of union labor is a matter of public record.

That leaves action in the Legislative and Executive fields. Looking first at the Executive:

Considerable attention is being given to President Nixon's attitude toward strikes in major industries affecting the National interest. In the Atlantic and Gulf Coast dock strike of longshoremen he exhibited a firm refusal to allow the Federal government to be drawn into the strike settlement, other than as a mediator, coupled with an equally firm indication that when the limit of public tolerance of inconvenience was passed, drastic action would be taken. A settlement was reached.

I do not think you will see a return to the Johnsonian practice of "knocking and locking." That is knocking management and labor's heads together and locking them up until a settlement is reached. I am glad to see it go. In my opinion the missing partner in that kind of deal is the poor guy at home who is going to have to pay more for whatever labor and management produce.

Those who say they were surprised by President Nixon's refusal to be drawn into such an argument should not be. Quoting again from our 1968 Platform:

"Healthy private enterprise demands responsibility—by government, management and labor—to avoid the imposition of excessive costs or prices and to share with the consumer the benefit of increased productivity. It also demands responsibility in free collective bargaining, not only by labor and management, but also by those in government concerned with these sensitive relationships."

And may I just read this from the Platform also:

"We will bar government-coerced strike settlements that cynically disregard the public interest and accelerate inflation. We will again reduce government intervention in labor-management disputes to a minimum, keep government participation in channels defined by the Congress, and prevent backdoor intervention in the administration of labor-laws."

From Mr. Nixon's previously expressed intention to follow the ideas set forth in the platform, I think we can reasonably expect to see him continue to follow a similar course as circumstances dictate. I think you can agree with me that there is nothing the President has done up to this time that is inconsistent with his platform pledge.

Last, we can turn to my own area—the Legislative—and see what prospects lie there.

First, I do not believe that the chances for specific legislation to reform real abuses in areas where labor law has been found in need of amendment are diminished in the 91st Congress. While I am no longer a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it is my intention to introduce a series of bills which will serve to extend and strengthen individual employee rights.

Some of these proposals are already in the hopper, some are yet to come.

S. 817 is a bill which would provide an opportunity for workers, on strike for over 30 days, to indicate by a secret ballot their desire to continue the strike or return to work. Such a ballot, if it supported the strike, would indicate to management the determination of workers to continue to accept economic hardship in order to win the demands presented by the union. Such an indication of a determined spirit would, I believe, help bring a strike to an earlier settlement by putting pressure on the losing side to come closer to agreement in their bargaining.

I have already mentioned S. 424—prohibiting a union from levying fines upon their membership in exercise of their legal rights.

S. 425 amends the emergency dispute provision of the National Labor Relations Act, letting injuctions obtained to end emergency disputes stand until the dispute is resolved.

S. 426 would end the card-check fraud, which is still another example of how the Board has dodged around the clear language of the law which states that a secret ballot shall be held.

A very serious problem that demands the attention of the new Administration is the widespread use by unions of their members' dues money for political activities and for making cash contributions to political candidates. This has reached enormous proportions in recent years, and it has been estimated that well over $100 million was spent by Labor in the national elections in 1968.

What makes this practice so iniquitous is that much of this money is collected by the unions under compulsory union ship arrangements, with large numbers of workers having to pay dues to the unions against their will and with knowledge that their money will be used to support candidates which they, the workers, oppose. Moreover, the rank and file members never have any voice in the decisions as to which candidates are to be supported or opposed by the union. Even the elected union officials at the local level have no say-so in these matters, their function is to see to it that the dues money is transmitted to COPE organizations.

Here is a prime example of infringing on the rights of individual workers. Forcing a worker to support candidates and causes he opposes, the union denies him his constitutionally protected freedom of association, freedom of speech and freedom of political action. In my opinion, he is also deprived of property without due process of law. Here is what Justice Hugo Black had to say on the subject in his dissenting opinion in *Machinists Union* v. *Street*, 367 U.S. 740. The Court refused to look into the constitutional aspects of compulsory union membership. Mr. Justice Black dissented and said:

"There can be no doubt that the federally sanctioned union-shop contract here, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others, who spend a substantial part of the funds so received in efforts to thwart the political, economic and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law. This injects federal compulsion into the political and ideological processes, a result which I have supposed everyone would agree the First Amendment was particularly intended to prevent."

Continuing to quote Justice Black:

"Doubtless employers could make the same arguments in favor of compulsory contributions to an association of employers for use in political and economic programs calculated to help collective bargaining on their side. But the argument is equally unappealing whoever makes it. The stark fact is that this Act of Congress is being used as a means to exact money from these employees to help get votes to win elections for parties and candidates and to support doctrine they are against. If this is constitutional the First Amendment is not the charter of political and religious liberty its sponsors believed it to be . . ."

There is the further fact that in spending their members' money in this manner the unions are engaging in unlawful activity in direct violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, an act which makes it a crime for any union to make any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to federal office including president, vice president, senator or representative, and provides for punishment by fine and imprisonment for any union officer responsible for making, or any candidate who receives, any such contribution.

This criminal statute has been on the books since 1947, but no serious effort has been made to enforce it, and as a result the unions make believe it doesn't exist. Vigorous enforcement of this law by the new Administration would go a long way toward curbing this serious abuse of union power and provide more effective protection to rank and file employees.

Unions enjoy a tax exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code, and this alone should disqualify them from engaging in political activities. Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code lists various categories of exempt organizations among which are labor unions, fraternal clubs, religious, charitable and educational organizations, chambers of commerce, civic associations and so on. Of the more than two dozen groups listed there is only one group that can engage in political action without being disqualified for tax exemption, and that group is labor. A chamber of commerce group that spends any part of its funds for political purposes would quickly lose its exemption status, and the same would happen to a religious or educational organization, a public welfare organization, a social club or any of the others. Only one group has the privilege of engaging in political action and still retain the exemption status.

Now, the interesting point is that there is nothing in the statutory language which would authorize this special treatment for unions, nor is there any legislative history to support it. It is purely and simply a position that has been followed by the Internal Revenue Service, and officially articulated for the first time under the Johnson Administration. In other words, the Treasury says, we will recognize a union as tax exempt no matter how much of its money it spends for political purposes, and notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act makes such expenditures a Federal crime. This is incredible! It points up more than anything else the tremendous political influence of organized labor under the previous administration.

Here again is an area in which the new administration can take action to correct an abuse of power. Tax exemption is a privilege, and if unions are to continue to enjoy that privilege they should be expected to abide by the same rules as other exempt organizations. There is no logical justification for carving out a special rule for them, particularly when this special rule, in effect, condones flagrant and persistent violations of a Federal criminal law. I expect to introduce legislation that will help correct this problem.

It is my hope that President Nixon will ignore advice he is reportedly getting from some pro-union quarters asking him to support what is called "common situs" picketing legislation. In my view, this type of legislation that permits one small union to shut down an entire defense installation, would be extremely harmful to the national security, not to mention trampling upon the rights of those employees who may not be involved at all, but are nonetheless affected by such an action. In my talks with many other Senators, both Republicans and Democrats—the Administration would find itself embarrassed by the lack of support for such legislation.

Finally, I would just like to say a word about the larger interests in these matters. All of us—lawyers, legislators, employers and employees—tend to get bound up in our own narrow perspective. There are 202 million Americans in our national total. 202 million individuals. We cannot deal with the lives and fortunes of these individuals lightly.

The 1968 Republican Platform plank on labor concludes with this pledge:

"Effective methods for dealing with labor disputes involving the national interest must be developed. Permanent, long-range solutions of the problems of national emergency disputes, public employee strikes and crippling work stoppages are imperatives. These solutions cannot be wisely formulated in the heat of emergency. We pledge an intensive effort to develop practical, acceptable solutions that conform fully to the public interest."

To me these words set forth the goals I put as a title to this speech, "Peace, Commerce and Honest Friendship."

There is little detail that I can add to those goals at this time. The President has asked Secretary Shultz to develop new approaches to deal with national emergency strikes providing more options to the government. My own bill, S. 425, will protect the public interest, but will not settle the dispute.

We must work, and work together to find means of settling these disputes involving the national interest keeping in mind all the facets of the Nation.

I am sure with your thoughts, your work and your cooperation, the job can be done. Thank you.

THE NAZI HOLOCAUST

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1969, the world observed a solemn commemoration of an era from our darkest past, an era so extraordinarily shocking to humanity that we can only call it "The Holocaust." April 14 was a day of mourning for the 6 million who died at the hands of a deranged and barbarous madman, who saw among the Jewish people an excuse for his own momentous failings and an alibi for the shortcomings of a senseless program of hate and domination. It was not enough to point the lying finger of false guilt at the Jews for imagined wrongs; he, Adolph Hitler, chose instead to annihilate the entire innocent Jewish community of Europe.

The brutality of the Nazi holocaust can never be exaggerated. Its effects can never be dismissed, or even fully recognized. Six million people were systematically and wantonly tortured, maimed, starved, beaten, exhausted, defiled, and degraded until they were dead. The few survivors who limped from the death camps after the war were scarred physically and spiritually by the ordeal to which they had been subjected. The world of reasonable men was also scarred by the realization that they had been witness to the greatest mass-murder in the long history of mankind. The genocide of the Jews of Europe is so overwhelming that it is almost beyond the comprehension of sane men.

As if the crime of murder of a people were not enough, men of good will also realize that the manufactured reasons for the holocaust were equally based; there were no reasons, only the folly of a demented mind. The Jews were killed because they were Jews. There were no Jewish crimes to punish, no Jewish insurrections to put down, no Jewish conspiracies to foil, no Jewish subversions to stop, no Jewish acts of treason against the Nazi regime or against any government or any people. Jews who had lived in peace with their fellow men were killed because they were Jews.

It is to remember and to reflect upon this ultimate surrender to blind rage and unbridled hate that the Knesset of the State of Israel proclaimed April 14 to be a day of mourning for the 6 million. I am disappointed that I am unable to attend the sixth annual Queens Memorial Service being held on that date, but I shall be with them in spirit, just as I shall be with the 6 million in spirit. Those who gathered at "Young Israel," under the chairmanship of Eli Zborowski, for the memorial service sponsored by 50 synagogues and lay organizations in the Borough of Queens dedicated themselves anew to an enlightened search for an end of prejudice. They offered a prayer for the 6 million martyred on the altar of inhumanity. I ask my collegues in the House and the Senate to pause in rememberance of those who surrendered the cherished possession of life and to vow that we, as free men, will make every endeavor that this final act of madness shall not be repeated.

BASES IN SPAIN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a number of us spoke out in this House last month in opposition to any renewal of the Defense Agreement between the United States and Spain. If any further arguments against this pact were needed, they have now been supplied by Messrs. Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond. In a column which has been read by millions of Americans, the Drummonds outline the humiliating conditions under which we operate in Spain in order to avoid giving offense to the Franco Government. The Washington Post called further attention to the Drummonds' column in an editorial last Sunday. In order that both these documents, and the shocking situation they outline, may be still more widely known, I insert the editorial and the column in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1969]

THE SPANISH BASES (II)

What follows here is a secondary matter, not at all concerned with whether or not the four bases the United States leases from Spain are necessary to the deterrence of Communist aggression. The leases on these bases are now up for renewal, and the Administration has given its agreement in principle. The price tag is something on the order of $175 million in military hardware for the Franco government for a five year renewal; it is the money which is being worked out now, in negotiations between Madrid and Washington.

But there is another price that is being exacted, and it is a price—in our judgment—no self-respecting government should be obliged to pay. It seems that American servicemen stationed in Spain, and visitors to the bases who intend to make any public pronouncements, are given two documents by American authorities: a "policy directive" dated April 4, 1966, and a "sensitivity briefing guide" dated Feb. 19, 1969. This has all come to light through the diligence of Mr. Roscoe Drummond, who printed much of it in a column last month. Here are quotations from the "briefing guide."

"Do not discuss Hitler or Nazi Germany. Since Hitler and Mussolini provided military aid to General Franco during the civil war, (Franco) is against derogatory references (about them). As you may never have a favorable reference, it approaches a universal prohibition.

"Anticommunism in general is good and usable. Favorable references to communism and pro or con discussions of communism should be avoided.

"Dictatorship and references to it should be avoided. Be especially wary of comparisons between dictatorships and freedom.

"Do not emphasize the existence, activities, etc., of the Common Market. Spain is interested in joining it but do not mention this.

"Do not talk about religion in Spain or Spanish regional policies. However, if someone has visited a church recently and wants to describe the visit, this is permitted. Talking about Spanish restrictions on Protestant religious activities is NOT permitted."

These are directives which were recently handed to an America lady who was about to be interviewed over the Armed Forces Radio Station in Spain. It is sleazy. It is cheapjack. It demeans the United States, and it demeans Spain, and one can only wonder at the mentality of the official who wrote the documents, and the ethics of the government which put them into effect. They are only one more reason, albeit a secondary one, why the leases on these obsolete and obsolescent bases should not be renewed, not for $175 million or for ten cents.

[Prepared for Sunday, Mar. 30, 1969]

THE REIGN IN SPAIN

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

Millions of dollars in hard cash is not the only price the U.S. is paying to Franco to maintain military bases in Spain.

There is a more subtle, more suffocating, more galling price.

We also submit to oppressive and undignified censorship, doing violence to the very principles by which a free people live.

Would you believe that the United States has bowed to the Spanish demand that it not fly the American flag over any U.S. military base in Spain? It's true—and no such restriction applies at other U.S. military posts in Europe.

Would you believe that the U.S. has agreed not to play the American national anthem over the United States Armed Forces radio stations anywhere in Spain unless it hap-

pens to come at the beginning of a baseball game or some other such event? It's true—and this restriction applies to no other U.S. base in Europe.

Would you believe that nothing but favorable references to Hitler, Mussolini and dictatorship are permitted? It's true.

And this is not all. There are other wide-ranging restrictions and inhibitions and "areas of sensitivity."

They are not secret. They are not classified. But they are not generally known except among the American military in Spain; certainly not in the United States. But when an American visitor to a U.S. base in Spain accepts an invitation to be interviewed on the Armed Forces radio stations, he is presented with a "policy directive" dated April 4, 1966 and a "sensitivity briefing guide" dated Feb. 19 last year and told to read them carefully, very carefully.

When he does, he likely finds it easier to be silent than to speak. We quote from the "briefing guide":

"Do not discuss Hitler or Nazi Germany. Since Hitler and Mussolini provided military aid to General Franco during the civil war, prohibition is against derogatory references. As you may never have a favorable reference, it approaches a universal prohibition.

"(Caps) NATO (end caps) should not be discussed. Casual references are permitted in canned programs, but should be avoided in locally produced programs.

"Anti-communism in general is good and usable. Favorable references to communism and pro and con discussions of communism should be avoided.

"Dictatorship and references to it should be avoided. Be especially wary of comparisons between dictatorships and freedom.

"Do not emphasize the existence, activities, etc., of the common market. Spain is interested in joining it, but do not mention this.

"Do not talk about religion in Spain or Spanish regional religious policies. However, if someone has visited a church recently and wants to describe the visit, this is permitted. Talking about Spanish restrictions on Protestant religious activities is (caps) NOT (end caps) permitted.

"Do not play the U.S. National Anthem or any other national anthem."

These are not pro-forma, theoretical restrictions. They are in constant use and this report is based on the first-hand experience of one who has been subjected to them.

He asked a high-ranking officer if it would be improper for him to air these facts in the U.S. and to protest against our continued acceptance of these restrictions. He was told that such action would be greatly appreciated by those on the post since the military are deeply irked by having to comply with these restrictive rulings imposed on them as a result of the political negotiations.

If these rented bases in Spain were a matter of national survival, such ignominious restrictions would be more tolerable. But now that the bases are of declining military value, shouldn't more weight be given to whether the U.S. should subject itself to such indignities?

POST-DISPATCH WARNINGS ON VIETNAM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during 1954 and 1955, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published a series of four editorials warning against U.S. involvement in the war in Indochina, which later became the Vietnam war.

These editorials were written by Irving Dilliard, after consultation with the late Joseph Pulitzer, then editor and publisher. Mr. Dilliard is now professor of journalism at Princeton University.

In these editorials Mr. Dilliard appealed to President Eisenhower, in somewhat the same vein as I have recently appealed to President Nixon. Because they have a message for today, helpful in our examination of what to do about the war, I have placed the full texts below:

A War To Stay Out of

The time has come for each citizen of the United States to decide what he thinks his Government in Washington should do or not do about the war in Indochina.

If the citizen has not yet made up his mind on this question, he actually may not have very long to do it in. Military authorities have expected the fall of Dien Bien Phu momentarily for several weeks. It may collapse at any minute. If it does surrender, the Communist-supported rebels will win the biggest prize of the war—a bag of some 12,000 French and Viet Namese troops.

Quickly in the train of that loss to the West may come a series of fast-moving events including perhaps: fall of the Laniel Government followed by a political crisis in France; suspension of the Geneva conference; demand in France that the war be ended if the United States does not take it over; decision in Washington as to whether our troops are to be sent to Indochina to prop up the French.

It then would be too late for the American people to make up their minds about the Indochinese war. Any decision to stay out should be made now, in advance, while there is indisputably time for that decision to make itself heard and effective.

As of now there is uncertainty and confusion with respect to policy in Washington on Indochina. At last week's press conference, President Eisenhower said that this country has gone as far as it can go under the mutual assistance pact. As he said, we have sent technical assistance. We have provided money. We have moved in equipment. But he also said that it would not be acceptable to us to see the anti-Communist defense of the Indochinese area crumble and disappear.

How would our non-acceptance be established? The President did not say that we would demonstrate our non-acceptance by putting troops in Indochina. But significantly he has not repudiated Vice President Nixon's off-the-record statement to the American Society of Newspaper Editors that Indochina must be held for the West even if it required this country to send troops there to hold it.

That troop statement still stands as Eisenhower Administration policy insofar as Mr. Nixon, who often presides at meetings of the National Security Council, speaks for the White House.

Whether Indochina is the first of a row of upended dominoes, to use the President's figure of speech, the French colony, as the map shows, occupies a key relationship to Southeast Asia. If Indochina falls to the Communist then Red China will in effect have a common boundary with Thailand—and beyond Thailand and Burma lies India. The desirability of keeping the manpower and the resources of that vast area out of the Communist orbit does not need to be argued. It will be a blow to the West if Communist infiltration becomes easy. It will be a bulwark to the free world if Southeast Asia remains outside the control of Communism.

To the end that Indochina may not fall before the Communist sickle, the United States has been for many months largely keeping up the French-Viet Namese cause. We are said to be bearing now about 80 per cent of the cost of the war. Our world-traveling emissaries—Vice President Nixon, Secretary Dulles and former Gov. Adlai Stevenson—have put their efforts into the struggle.

The United States Information Service, including the Voice of America, has sought to convince the Asian natives that they will be better off on the side of the Western nations than under Communist tyranny. Notwithstanding the shortcomings in our practice of what we preach, let this appeal be greatly increased and let the French do their proper part belatedly by granting freedom to the peoples of Indochina.

But if Southeast Asia is important to the free world, why not go into Indochina with troops, as Vice President Nixon has said may be necessary.

Indochina must be judged on its own set of facts. What we are called on to do at this time is to decide about Indochina. We are not called on at this moment to decide about the whole of Southeast Asia.

The one most fundamental fact about the war in Indochina is that it is a war which started nearly eight years ago as a revolt against French colonial misrule. The natives rose up against white governors whom they regarded as oppressors. They did this before the Communists had defeated Chiang Kai-shek on the Chinese mainland. Thus the outside Communist support that the Vietminh rebels now enjoy was insinuated into a war that was wholly native in its origin. The French still regard the war as a civil rebellion and it is for that reason that this war has never been taken up at the U.N.

To be sure the war in Indochina has changed a very great deal since its inception as a native revolt. The Chinese Communists saw in Indochina an opportunity to identify themselves with a popular uprising. They shrewdly attached themselves to the Indochinese struggle to throw off white colonial rulers.

The consequence is that more and more support for the Vietminh has come from Peiping and that more and more the war has developed into a contest between Communism on the one hand and the French, as representatives of the free world, on the other.

The United States is compelled, therefore, to take into account both the native origin of the Indochinese war and the substantial extent to which the Vietminh side has been taken over by the Chinese Communists.

The differences between the Indochinese war and the war in Korea, which was a United Nations war, are so clear that they need only be mentioned. The United States and the other free world nations in the U.N. took their stand in Korea because the North Korean Communists were guilty of a naked military aggression. By force of arms the Communist invaders crossed a boundary set by the U.N. between North Korea and the Republic of Korea.

Had the U.N. not stood by the Korea Republic, which it had created, the U.N. would have rendered itself utterly meaningless. The U.N. would have gone the way of the League of Nations which failed to guarantee the principle of popular self-determination after its proclamation by Woodrow Wilson in his famous 14 points.

Wilson's great principle was tersely restated by President Eisenhower in a historic address on American foreign policy in April, 1953, when Mr. Eisenhower said: "Any nation's right to a form of government and an economic system of its own choosing is inalienable." So saying the President reiterated one of the basic tenets in the U.N. Charter, signed at San Francisco nearly a decade ago.

This acknowledged and respected right of nations to governments and leaders of their own choosing caused the United States to

enter the Korean war. Now that same right stands between us and entry into the Indochinese war. We could not take over this colonial war, of which the people of France long ago grew sick and tired, without placing ourselves not only against the Vietminh rebels but also all the Indochinese natives who are so determined to govern themselves.

Entry into the Indochinese war would not only take the United States into a conflict where basic principle would be against us. It would also in effect revive our recent war in Asia—for which a peace has not yet been concluded—in an area that would be far more difficult for our armed forces. We were able to use nearby Japan as a base for the war in Korea.

The map shows that the nearest bases to Indochina would be Formosa, the Philippines and Singapore—all much farther from Indochina than Japan is from Korea. The supply lines to Korea were long and wearing, but those to Indochina would be much longer and much harder to maintain.

Entry of the United States in Indochina with troops would, in our judgment, almost certainly bring Communist China into the fighting with full force of arms. Americans then would be fighting Chinese in direct conflict with President Eisenhower's 1952 pledge to get American forces out of the war in the Orient so that Asians themselves might settle Asian disputes.

The Kremlin then could watch with grim satisfaction while the life and treasure and substance of the United States were poured into a stooge war. For whether or not the Soviets could stay out of such a war, a long, exhausting struggle between the United States and China in the jungles of Southeast Asia would put our economic system under heaviest strain. Moscow could hope for the internal collapse, which it so confidently predicts, of capitalism in the United States.

Gen. Omar Bradley, one of the great military leaders of World War II and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff until replaced by Adm. Radford, said two years ago that a general war in Asia, involving the United States, would be "the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time."

The present thinking of our top military planners was stated in last Sunday's Post-Dispatch by our military analyst, Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, retired. He wrote that the Defense Department's planners "believe that war with China, direct or second-hand through Indochina, should be avoided at all costs. Once involved in China, with Russian resources and manpower untouched, the really vital area of Western Europe could be lost while the United States was trying to extricate itself from the mud and jungles of the Far East."

Assume, however, that the United States were to disregard the basic right of self-determination in Indochina. Assume that we went to war on the side of French colonialism. Assume that Russia did not join the fighting and that eventually we were able somehow to subdue the Chinese Communists. What then?

Would we maintain a long military occupation in China as we have in Germany? Would we keep thousands of troops in China for years as we have kept troops in Europe, in Japan and in Korea? Would we appropriate the billions of dollars that would be required to feed and clothe and house the masses of Chinese war victims? Would we, after fighting the Asians, thus seek to win their good will? And if we would do it, could we do it?

There are risks in the seemingly inevitable collapse in Indochina, grave risks. We should do all we can to persuade the French to grant full freedom to the native peoples and thus prepare the way for the most satisfactory settlement possible.

We can and should use this as an opportunity to proclaim the fundamental philosophy of the free world—the dignity of individual man, the right to choose and the sanctity of democratic elections—in contrast with the iron rule of Communism.

We can and should make clear that our decision not to go to war in Indochina is a decision for Indochina alone.

We can and should make clear that we stand firm in our determination to resist Communist aggression aimed at conquest of the free world.

The risks that go with entering this war are limitless. At their worst they include atomic warfare and the destruction of the civilized world. Those are risks to be run if the United States is attacked or if we are required to go to war to defend allied forces in Europe. But they are not risks to be indulged in to support a discredited colonial regime in the jungles of Indochina.

Already our Government has taken steps that could lead down the road toward all out involvement. These steps include the dispatch of plane maintenance crews, the delivery of fighting aircraft and the establishment of an airlift to ferry French troop replacements. Each of these steps has been taken, so we believe, with the best of intentions. But each in its way has been a warlike act. Each might well have been countered by the Chinese Communists with more warlike acts by them on the other side.

The Post Dispatch does not question President Eisenhower's ability as a military leader or his experience in world affairs. On the contrary, we readily recognize these as primary among the qualities for which he was so overwhelmingly elected the nation's Chief Executive. But Dwight D. Eisenhower, like every President before him, needs the benefit of public opinion to help him in the wise conduct of his heavily burdened office.

To that constructive end, we state it as our profound conviction that the Indochinese war is a war to stay out of.

Let Washington take no more steps that may have the effect of edging us closer to military engagement in Indochina.

Let our Government end the warlike acts that can now be charged against us by the Indochinese rebels.

Let there be no more hasty, irresponsible statements about Indochina by our public officials.

Instead, let us, with our allies, in the President's own words, do what we can to "work out a practical way of getting along" in the world.

A War To Stay Out of (II)

On May 5—nearly four weeks ago—the Post-Dispatch printed an editorial on the international situation, with particular reference to Indochina. The plight of the French in their jungle colony was already critical, although Dien Bien Phu had not then fallen. We called the editorial "A War To Stay Out Of."

The passage of time has only reinforced our opinion. The war in Indochina is still largely a colonial civil war although it has been heavily infiltrated by the Communists. The war continues to be a war to stay out of.

Yet the danger of involvement not only continues. In one sense at least it grows the greater as the military situation deteriorates and white civilians in Hanoi are threatened with possible brutalities. What the next several weeks may bring cannot be anticipated. The American people need to prepare themselves for almost any possible development.

The first clue appears likely at Geneva. At any rate that is where the possibilities of a cease-fire are now being reviewed. The Communists have their ideas and the French have theirs. Whether a meeting of the minds can be arranged only time will tell.

* * *

Meanwhile Communist Vietminh military forces are proceeding with their troop movements designed to crush the French-Viet Nam defense of the vital Red river delta—the immediate rebel objective after the fall of Dien Bien Phu. From Paris comes the news that France has ordered 80,000 draftees called to the tricolor five months early in order to replace at home regular troops which are to be sent to Indochina.

If there is a meeting of the East and West minds at Geneva and an "honorable" agreement is reached—one which provides for a cease-fire on terms that represent a give and take—then that will be all to the good. The hostilities can be ended and the truce can be internationally supervised much as the peace in Korea is being supervised.

If a fair peace can be arranged then the following best step is to establish a means for keeping the peace in Southeast Asia. Any alliance for that purpose ought to be primarily Asian, but it will need to include the United States. Emphatically it should have U.N. indorsement. The participation of India will be essential if the alliance is to have fullest respect in Asia.

Such an alliance would have as its chief purpose the guaranteeing of the peace. It would function in the Southeast Pacific much as NATO functions in the North Atlantic section of the world. It would serve as notice to the Communists that any naked aggression would be resisted by united action with force of arms, just as the attack across the thirty-eighth parallel was resisted in Korea by the U.N. members, including the United States and, let us not forget, with the approval of India and the Philippines.

If a fair peace cannot be worked out at Geneva then presumably the Indochinese war will go on to its military termination. So long as it continues where it is and on its present basis, there is no question, in our opinion, that it remains a war to stay out of. The United States must be eternally vigilant that it is not drawn into an Asiatic war which would drain off our resources and thus most seriously endanger our capacity to fulfill our tremendous obligations to freedom in Europe.

To say this is not to say that this country can do nothing about helping Southeast Asia resist Communist infiltrations. There is much that we can do and much that we should do. Economic aid and technical assistance should be employed in every effective way possible.

Instead of cutting back this help to Asiatic countries, we should be extending it. We should remember that high-sounding statements of political ideals are well and good in their place, but that they get scant attention when men, women and children are hungry.

Our overseas aid programs have not been perfect but they have their creditable achievement. That the Marshall plan helped stop the spread of Communism in Europe is not open to question. Technical assistance has made us friends here and there among the great masses of population from the Pacific ocean, across Southern Asia, to the Mediterranean. It has its values that no amount of arms, necessary as arms may be, can in themselves provide.

A diplomatic move that would tend to bring East and West closer together would be for the U.N. to grant the Chinese Communist government's desire for admission to the U.N. This is a move the United States could support without in any way blessing the Peiping regime and for which this country might get in return concessions from China of much value to us.

All the while the United States should work to create a truly Asian defensive alliance of U.N. members—all the while that it redoubles its economic and technical help—this country should be increasing the effectiveness of its defense forces. Our Government in Washington must be careful to avoid dangerous tax cuts and equally dangerous curtailments in the defense program.

The military establishment should not be allowed to grow topheavy, yet it must be strong enough in this uncertain world to meet an emergency should one arise. The means must be found to encourage re-enlistments, now seriously in decline. The reserve and guard units also must be improved through the development of better training programs. For in the event of an outbreak, the reserve forces would be urgently needed in the armed services.

Finally every encouragement must be given to scientific research which leads to the development and production of new weapons. Here, in the vast and intricate electronic field, it would be only rankest folly to fall behind.

In short, then, the war in Indochina is a war to stay out of.

The United States should do all it can to help work out a structure for peace in Southeast Asia, but we must recognize that the Southeast Asians have their destiny largely in their own hands.

We can help in many ways and one way that is primary is to keep our defense strong enough that it will in itself be a deterrent to war.

A WAR TO STAY OUT OF (III)

Readers of Monday's Post-Dispatch, were served fare of ominous news about the danger of United States involvement in the Indochinese war. Here are the high spots in summary form:

1. On excellent authority, Marquis W. Childs, Post-Dispatch Washington correspondent, reported the French as saying that American policy makers have promised the United States will intervene with sea and air power if the Communist forces press on at Hanoi for a full measure of victory. The prospect is that this showdown will come quickly—within the next two weeks.

2. Prime Minister Nehru warned in India that it will not take long for the world to learn whether it is headed for peace or war. He said: "Issues of vital importance to the future of the world are being debated at Geneva. Probably the present crisis is a more dangerous one than any we have had before. The next two or three weeks or even less may indicate whether we will go toward some peaceful settlement or toward the great disaster that all have feared."

3. The Washington Post, in an article by its diplomatic correspondent, Chalmers Roberts, said that President Eisenhower was prepared to go before Congress last April 26 and ask for authority to enter the Indochinese war with an air strike at Dien Bien Phu. The President was dissuaded, so The Washington Post reports, because the British would not agree.

Without casting any reflection on Mr. Childs' reporting, can it actually be that United States leaders have made a promise to go to the relief of the French in Indochina if Hanoi begins to turn into another Dien Bien Phu? Can it be that without any consultation with the American people, the President, some two months ago, actually was preparing himself to ask for authority to enter a jungle conflict that started as a civil war against French colonial misrule?

Assuming that these questions are to be answered in the affirmative, as Mr. Childs and Mr. Roberts have already answered them with their news reports, then the American people do not know nearly enough about what is going on in Washington with respect to the issue of peace or war.

If the White House has made a pledge to the French that this country will intervene in Indochina, surely the people who would be called on to bear the arms and to gear themselves to a war economy should be told about it.

If President Eisenhower was so strongly persuaded last April this country should enter the Indochinese fighting that only British non-cooperation kept us out, that should be known.

Mr. Eisenhower has said that he would never take the nation to war without explicit approval from Congress. We believe that he means what he says. Just the same these forebodings keep coming up. The wrong situation might quickly develop and out of it could come hostilities, World War III and hydrogen bomb warfare.

What would that gain us? As no less an Eisenhower Administration spokesman than Defense Secretary Wilson said Monday at the University of South Carolina, "a third world war is not the answer" to the problem of stopping Communism. An all-out war involving the United States and China over Indochina might even advance the cause of Communism. Certainly it would set the peoples of Asia against those whom many Asians regard as white exploiters.

The Indochinese war is a war to stay out of. Our mission is to join in protecting our allies in Europe and by doing so to protect ourselves as essential to the maintenance of a free world.

As Commander-in-Chief, Dwight D. Eisenhower occupies a position of leadership for all the people. He owes it to both his office and the nation to take us all into his confidence. He must remember that candid discussion of issues was one of his chief promises in 1952.

ANOTHER WAR TO STAY OUT OF

Eight months ago, when some military leaders in the United States were all for getting this country involved in the Indochina war, the Post-Dispatch described that tragic, draining conflict as "a war to stay out of." We think the time has now come to describe the Chinese civil war in the same plain terms. The Chinese war also is a war to stay out of.

The danger of becoming involved in the Chinese civil war is all the greater now that Chiang Kai-shek has decided that he wants to evacuate the Tachen Islands and needs the help of the United States in doing so. The President has ordered the Seventh Fleet to fulfill Chiang's request and this means that our vessels are going into Chinese coastal waters in which the civil war is being waged.

If the Chinese Communists allow the evacuation to proceed peaceably there should be no harm to our ships or aircraft or the personnel on them. But if fighting breaks out in the redeployment, this country could easily be the victim of an inflammatory incident and thus drawn into the long struggle between the two Chinas.

This hazardous development follows in the train of the President's special message and overwhelming passage in Congress of the resolution of authority for which he asked. In his message Mr. Eisenhower said that while he did not suggest enlargement of our "defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores," he believed "the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities."

This special message and the act of Congress in passing the Richards George resolution implementing it have had two contradictory results.

One result is to further the cause of peace. Peace is furthered to the extent that the message served as a clear warning that the United States will defend Formosa as part of a Far Eastern protective chain, including Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines, against Communism's spread.

HOW FAR ARE WE TO GO?

But there is also the opposite result. The message and the resolution added to the uncertainties that already existed about the Far East. Thus they increased the risk of war. This increased risk arises from the fact that the message and the resolution went beyond the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores and, in a vague way, referred to closely "related" areas. These last three words were widely interpreted to include not only the Nationalist-held Tachen islands and the Quemoy and Matsu island groups, but also areas of concentration of Communist troops, war planes and ships on the mainland.

Some members of Congress read this as an indication that the Eisenhower Administration might be considering "preventive war" against the Chinese Communists. These Senators and Representatives wondered whether the request for the resolution was in part designed to obtain the approval of Congress in advance for a possible strike that the military might consider necessary against the Chinese mainland.

President Eisenhower was quick to recognize the gravity of these concerns. While the resolution was under debate in the Senate, he sought to reassure Congress and the country by saying that he alone would make any decision to use our forces beyond the defense of Formosa.

These pledges were reassuring in so far as the President's course was concerned, but they did not remove all the areas of doubt. In fact Mr. Eisenhower himself confirmed the existence of this uncertainty at his latest press conference on Wednesday. He said in effect that the United States would use its forces to protect Formosa and the Pescadores. He then declined to answer as to Quemoy and Matsu.

UNCERTAIN POLICY AS TO QUEMOY

The President and his staff have access to military intelligence that properly is denied to the rest of us. It may be that he has good reason for keeping silent at this time on the United States intentions concerning these small coastal islands that are both geographically and historically part of mainland China.

The appearance at least is different. The appearance is that this silence with respect to Quemoy and Matsu is a continuation of what Secretary Dulles described some months ago as a policy of keeping the other side "guessing."

If this is all the policy there is on Quemoy and Matsu, then it happens that the people of the United States and their friends in the free world are kept guessing no less than our possible enemies. From this confusion and doubt arises the continuing fear of an unnecessary involvement of the United States in the Far East.

Let us assume that the situation in the Chinese civil war is as it appears to be. Then Chiang's Nationalist soldiers on Formosa cannot by themselves ever hope to invade the Chinese mainland. Neither can Mao Tse-tung's Communist forces, however much the Peiping propagandists bluster, now or in the immediate future, attack and capture Formosa. If this is the situation, and there are sound reasons to believe it is, then a United States policy of non-involvement in the Chinese civil war takes form.

The first element in this policy of non-involvement is not to be maneuvered into losing one or more vessels of the Seventh Fleet, or supporting aircraft, and the personnel, while Chiang's evacuation of the Tachens proceeds.

DANGER IN THE DEFENSE TREATY

Chiang Kai-shek was our ally in World War II and that is reason enough to sympathize with him in his concern for his men on islands that lie so close to the Communist mainland. We may hope that he will get his personnel and equipment off the Tachens, but not at the price of involving this country in war.

The second element in this policy of non-involvement is to be careful not to become caught up in the still more dangerous zones of Quemoy and Matsu just off the mainland.

The speculation that the United States might help redeploy Chiang's troops from the Tachens in order to strengthen his forces on Quemoy and Matsu envisions a maneuver that is doubly dangerous. In such a ferrying operation, a United States naval vessel would run the risk of being destroyed at the

Tachens, at Quemoy or Matsu or anywhere en route between them.

The third major element in a policy of noninvolvement, so the Post-Dispatch believes, is rejection by the Senate of the mutual defense treaty between the United States and Chiang.

This proposed treaty, which Secretary of State Dulles signed last Dec. 2, was ratified unanimously by Chiang's refugee assembly Jan. 14. It is pending in the Senate committee, where it carries strong indorsement by the President.

We are fully aware of the arguments for ratifying this treaty. Approval by the Senate would bolster the morale of Chiang and his troops. Conversely disapproval would seriously embarrass them in the eyes of their Communist enemies.

These considerations of morale are important. However, they are not the only considerations. If the United States becomes a treaty partner with Chiang, he is our colleague for better or worse. In view of his regime's record of corruption on the mainland and brutality on Formosa, he might deliberately provoke a military aggression that would involve our forces.

There is some protection for us in the provision that either party can, on a year's notice, abrogate the treaty. But long before abrogation could take effect, an act of war might occur.

A letter exchange, filed with the treaty, states that neither side is obligated to give military assistance if military action is taken without prior consultation between the parties. We might be reassured by this were the other signatory not Chiang. But we do not trust him and we do not think that the President or the American people should trust him. Chiang's opposition at this moment to a cease-fire is warning not to join with him in a mutual defense treaty.

BETWEEN IMPERFECT ALTERNATIVES

The choice is between imperfect alternatives and we think it is the wiser, sounder course to take the alternative that is more likely to turn out better for the United States and the free world.

Therefore we propose:

First, that while the United States should not in any way weaken its warning to Communist China to keep hands off Formosa and the Pescadores, this country make it a strict policy not to run risks, in the waters of the coastal islands, likely to involve the United States in war.

Second, that the possibility of achieving a cease-fire be explored to the fullest notwithstanding the denunciation of a truce by Chiang and the rejection by Chou En-lai, Chinese Communist diplomat, of a U.N. cease-fire conference, except on extreme terms that Chiang could not accept. Inside the U.N. or on the outside, through some such grouping as the British commonwealth states which met at Colombo, Ceylon, the search for a fair cease-fire formula must go on.

Third, that plans be undertaken for an eventual solution of the problem of Formosa as an international responsibility. This might take the form of a U.N. trusteeship. It might evolve as an international protectorate under the watchful eyes of the nations of Southeast Asia which recently concluded a defense pact for their part of the world similar to NATO for the Atlantic area.

This might well mean that the United States would be forced to send troops to Formosa to participate in an international army. But by some means Formosa's integrity must be secured for the Formosan people either through the U.N. or other international agency. If the prospect does not look too bright, we must not forget that the U.N. stopped military aggression in Korea.

PROBLEM OF CHIANG'S TROOPS

Fourth, that the difficult question of the disposition of Chiang's troops (in the event of a cease-fire and the securing of Formosa) be approached as a matter similar to the problem of the prisoner exchange following the Korean war. Some of Chiang's troops doubtless would be glad to return to the mainland and their homes and families if they had the opportunity. Others could not return without being killed.

Fifth, that a climate be developed which would enable the free world to place trust in pledges from the Communist side—something not now possible. This would require the observance by the Communists of the truce in Korea. It would require the freeing of American and other U.N. personnel now held in prison. It would require full respect by the Communists for the integrity of the remaining free areas of Indochina and observance of a cease-fire in the Chinese civil war if a truce should be worked out.

Conceivably these steps, if taken in fully demonstrated good faith, could lead to the eventual admission of the Peiping Government to the U.N. as the government-in-fact of China. The very thought of Communist China at the U.N. is repugnant to Americans who have been outraged repeatedly by Red Chinese inhumanity.

Yet admission of the Chinese Communist Government to the U.N. would be no more than recognition of a geographical reality that can be seen from looking at the map. It would not mean approval of the inhumane acts of Red China any more than the presence of the Soviet Union at the U.N. means our indorsement of the Kremlin and its totalitarian rule.

UPSETTING TO SENATOR KNOWLAND

Admission of the Peiping Government to the U.N. would come, if it ever came, only after a demonstration that Red China had learned the meaning of peaceful co-existence. No less a person than John Foster Dulles himself made a statement last March of the terms under which Red China might conceivably enter the U.N.

Some of these proposals will be anathema to Chiang. Some of them will bring outcries from Senator Knowland of California, who has been Chiang's chief apologist in the Senate for nearly 10 years. Admittedly they run the risk of sharpening the foreign policy division within the President's party in Congress. This is regrettable, but it is a political fact that the Eisenhower Administration must face sooner or later.

No American citizen who cares for the future of his country wants the Communist areas of the world to spread further. He does not want appeasement. He does not want a Munich in the Far East. And he is ready if necessary to fight to keep Communist aggressors from taking over vital areas that could be used as stepping stones.

Neither does the citizen want a hydrogen bomb in his backyard as the result of some wholly unnecessary incident. And the unguarded trigger that might put that bomb in his backyard is thousands of miles away in the Far East.

PRESSURES ON THE PRESIDENT

The pressures on President Eisenhower for deeper involvement are tremendous. They come from his highest military leader, Adm. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other officers of high rank. To his great credit, the President has resisted these pressures up to now.

A year ago the President said the free nations should do what they can do "work out a practical way of getting along" in the world. In this new crisis that still must be our goal.

The President needs the benefit of public opinion to enable him to resist the continuing pressures for involvement. He needs more than ever the country's help in working out that practical way of "getting along."

What this country may be required to do in connection with an eventual defense of Formosa, no one can foretell. But the Chinese civil war, as it swirls about the small coastal islands—the Tachens, Quemoy and Matsu—is another war to stay out of.

HITLER'S CHILDREN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Headstart program's experience has proven it to be but an expensive experiment in controlled environment. All of the Headstart money taken from the taxpayers has but furnished free Federal baby-sitters to a selected few.

Yet, despite the admitted record of solving nothing the political environmentalists would slide off the disillusioned defeat by announcing the program must be shifted from young children to infants and toddlers, 3 years and under in age.

Some folks just cannot accept the facts of life or acknowledge heredity as a factor. So now, we are to have Federal nursemaids until the cradle robbers again prove themselves wrong or until that group once known as parents complain, the social experimenters will continue exploiting little babies as sacrificial statistics.

When Hitler experimented in genetics and environment his programs were called Fascist, inhuman, against the laws of nature and God, and the operation labeled "Hitler's Children."

How quickly we forget. Even Hitler was highly exuberant over his plans to upgrade the poor and unfortunate of the Aryan race.

One expects next to hear of a plan for euthanasia to legalize the murder of children, 5 and under, because of birth defects and mental deficiencies to mend the social scientists ego and upgrade their statistics.

Under unanimous consent I submit a news article from the Evening Star for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 10, 1969]

HEADSTART CHANGING AGENCIES, AGE FOCUS

(By Richard Critchfield)

President Nixon is creating an Office of Child Development to seek new ways to rescue very young Americans—especially infants—from the mental and physical handicaps of being born poor. The new office will take over Head Start, the popular preschool education program. It will be operated directly under Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch, rather than by its current "parent," the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The President said yesterday HEW will be given the task of adapting Head Start to new scientific findings which show that the "process of learning how to learn begins very, very early in the life of the infant child."

He said this would involve "finding a balance" between the right to privacy and "the sacred right of parents to rear their children" and the national need to insure the "full potential" of poor children through better early environment.

Nixon reiterated his administration's commitment to the needs of the country's poorest children from birth to 5 years of age.

first announced Feb. 19, along with his plans to move Head Start and the Job Corps from the Office of Economic Opportunity on July 1.

But he went further yesterday, saying modern science has confirmed that the child of impoverished parents can suffer "lasting disabilities" and that this can lead "to the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next."

"It is no longer possible to deny that this process is all too evidently at work in the slums of America's cities and that it is a most ominous aspect of the urban crisis," Nixon said.

"It is just as certain that we shall have to invent new social institutions to respond to this new knowledge."

Aside from indicating Head Start should redirect its efforts from the preschool playground to the crib, Nixon also struck a second theme by stressing that many urban problems, such as the process of child development, defy quick remedies.

"America must learn to approach its problems in terms of the time span those problems require," he said. "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."

Among a number of child experts and OEO officials canvassed today, there seems to be a consensus that the President is responding to a growing view that what a poor child really requires is the kind of environment a financially secure home and community offer other children from birth.

Head Start has been regarded as only a small step in an effort to furnish constructive educational experiences for all poor children from birth.

Currently, 55 percent of the 218,000 children enrolled in Head Start's full-year program are 5 years of age or older. The average age of 471,000 children in the summer program is 5 years and 10 months.

Although Nixon did not specify a new target age yesterday, there has been some talk of 3 years.

Yesterday at the White House, Secretary Finch outlined steps he intends to follow to reorient Head Start next fall:

The number of parent-child centers for infants and toddlers 3 years and under will be doubled from the present 36, increasing the number of children involved in this pilot program from around 3,000 to 6,000.

Communities will be asked to try out some new test programs in infant education.

HEW will encourage communities to use funds now spent on summer programs for 225,000 children—about half the total spending—for enrolling 50,000 to 60,000 children in full-year programs.

Finch said many communities have requested bigger full-year programs but that Head Start's fiscal 1969 budget of $320,000 and a requested fiscal '70 budget of $338,000 would remain unchanged.

HEW will seek greater use of poverty funds for elementary and secondary education for Follow Through programs so children can keep their head start.

The guidelines set by OEO for Head Start will remain unchanged. These include insistence on parent participation, comprehensive services, the use of volunteers and the opportunity for local churches, schools or community action agencies to sponsor their own programs.

Fears that Finch might rewrite the guidelines have been voiced by congressmen as one objection to Head Start's spinoff.

One of the first things Dr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Nixon's chief urban adviser, did in the White House was to telephone Joseph Froomkin, a psychologist in HEW, to ask him to jot down a summary of his well-known criticisms of Head Start.

Froomkin wrote Moynihan a memorandum saying Head Start's programs were too short, placed too little emphasis on educational content and needed to be targeted toward much younger children.

Moynihan, an assistant secretary of labor under President John F. Kennedy, is an expert on jobs, but not on child education.

At his first meeting with OEO officials Feb. 9, he pulled a sheet of paper out of his pocket and read what has since become known as the Froomkin evaluation.

Now, two months later, refined and buttressed by massive research, the outlines of the Froomkin evaluation approach to Head Start seem unchanged. The Nixon administration's budget for jobs in the private sector may go up three or four times this year, while that for Head Start will remain the same.

THE SCOTT REPORT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Sloane, of Springfield, Va., has called my attention to "The Scott Report," by Columnist Paul Scott, for April 4, 1969, describing a campaign allegedly being mounted by certain members of the press against the confirmation of former Deputy Chief of Security at the Department of State, Mr. Otto Otepka, for appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. Sloane feels, and I agree, that Mr. Scott's discoveries and comments concerning this anti-Otepka campaign, deserve the widest possible attention. I therefore welcome this opportunity to insert the column in full at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington News-Intelligence Syndicate]

THE SCOTT REPORT

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—A dramatic new chapter, with far-reaching implications for the future security of the U.S., is developing in the Otto Otepka case.

Opponents of the former Deputy Chief of Security at the State Department are preparing an all out campaign to block a Senate vote on his nomination to the Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB), an independent government security agency.

Otepka, after five years of persecution and vilification by the State Department, was nominated last month to the SACB by President Nixon.

The nomination, now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee, was a partial victory of Otepka who had been stripped of security duties and demoted by Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State, for cooperating with a Senate Committee exposing security lapses in the State Department.

The nerve center for the new onslaught against Otepka, scheduled to begin after the Easter congressional recess, is the prestigious New York Time's Washington Bureau.

Neil Sheehan, the newspaper's controversial Defense Department correspondent, has been given the assignment to write a series of articles designed to indirectly link the veteran security officer with right-wing groups—none of which Otepka had ever been a member or actively supported.

Significantly, Sheehan is the former bureau chief for the United Press International in Saigon who openly worked during the early 60s for the downfall of South Vietnam's anti-communist President Diem.

Pierre Salinger, press secretary for both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, assailed Sheehan as one of a trio of American newsmen that "announced to one and all in Saigon that one of the aims of their stories . . . was to bring down the Diem government."

More recently in a panel discussion in New York on "The Peace in Asia", Sheehan presented the following view on communism:

"We might abandon the idea that communism is our enemy in Asia. We must be willing to tolerate their enmity. I am suggesting that in some countries a communist government may be the best government."

CASTING THE SHADOW

Insiders at the New York Times say Sheehan's anti-Otepka series was scheduled to begin earlier this week but the death of President Eisenhower and his state funeral temporarily delayed their appearance.

Several of the persons involved in the volunteer raising of funds for Otepka's costly and long-drawn-out legal battle for vindication report that they have already been badgered by Sheehan about their political affiliations.

In one case, Sheehan spent more than 45 minutes on long distance phone grilling James Stewart, of Palatine, Ill., Director of American Defense Fund which raised money for Otepka's legal defense, on whether he was ever a member of the John Birch Society.

When Stewart argued the question was irrelevant and offered to discuss the issues of the Otepka case with Sheehan, the correspondent changed the subject, asking for the names of all the contributors to Otepka's defense fund.

On being told that more than 4,000 persons had contributed, Sheehan said he wanted "only the names of the big contributors". This Stewart refused on the grounds he needed approval of the individuals to give out their names.

THE BOSTON RALLY

Sheehan also quizzed Stewart at length about his group's fund-raising stand for Otepka at the New England Rally for God, Family, and Country, held in Boston in July, 1968 and attended by more than 1,000 persons.

"I have reports that Otepka manned a fund-raising booth at the Boston rally and solicited funds for his case," stated Sheehan. "Is not this true?"

"No, and you know it," replied Stewart, "Otepka had nothing to do with that stand."

What Sheehan didn't mention to Stewart was that another New York Times reporter had turned in the same negative report earlier. After spotting Otepka and his wife among the spectators at the Boston meeting, the reporter kept a watch on Otepka only to learn that he had nothing to do with the fund raising stand.

Other persons involved in the fund raising for Otepka's legal defense which cost the veteran security officer nearly $30,000, have also been intensely questioned by Sheehan.

Sheehan has been in contact with aides of several Senators, including William Proxmire (D. Wis.) and Jacob Javits (R. N.Y.), who plan to use his forthcoming stories to try to block Otepka's nomination.

Several State Department officials, who helped influence Secretary of State William Rogers to bar Otepka's return to that Agency, also have been in contact with Sheehan.

THE BIGGER ISSUE

While Otepka will be the central target of the coming attack, many congressional security experts see the campaign as having a much broader objective.

One memorandum being circulated among these experts, warns:

"The coming campaign against Otepka is designed to prevent, by smear and attack, efforts to strengthen the Subversive Activities Control Board, through the appointment to it of strong, conscientious securities specialists, and so bring about its destruction.

"The campaign will follow the pattern of the highly successful one by which the Eisenhower-Nixon program to train Americans in red tactics through civilian-military seminars was destroyed, through using General Walker as the target.

"Now, Otto Otepka is the target, and the objective is the nipping in the bud of the restoration of a strong security staff and operation within the government."

Thus, the battle lines are being drawn for a historic security showdown that could rattle a lot of windows in the national capital.

CONVOY TO MURMANSK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, foreign affairs debates constantly revolve around the question of a "detente" with the Soviet Union. A realistic appraisal reveals the fact that the constant belligerence, deceitfulness, and continued efforts toward global control by the rulers of the Kremlin make a "detente" under present circumstances a difficult and dangerous situation.

An interesting insight into Soviet attitudes and manipulations of history is dramatized in an editorial carried by the Chicago Tribune, Wednesday, April 9. This commentary dwelling on a major World War II effort speaks for itself:

CONVOY TO MURMANSK

Anyone around during World War II knew the meaning of the words "Murmansk run." They conjured up the chilling spectacle of allied convoys running the gauntlet of German planes and warships to Murmansk, 170 miles above the Arctic circle, the main center of western aid to the Soviet Union during the war.

From August, 1942, when the British navy escorted the first convoys for Russia, the "Murmansk run" became the Kremlin's lifeline for survival. Thru icy waters and storms, battling continuous attack by enemy submarines and planes based in Norway, the convoys struggled north with their precious cargo of tanks, trucks, guns, and other supplies—at fearful cost. Thousands of British, American, and Canadian sailors lost their lives in this desperate effort to save their Soviet ally.

A westerner might think that, in the normal course of events, "Murmansk run" might have some meaning to the Russians—at least to those who live in northern Russia's only ice-free port. But they don't. A reporter visiting Murmansk found that no one there had ever heard of the war time convoys which saved Russia.

There is no memorial, no plaque, to commemorate the almost incredible efforts of the convoys and their naval escorts which fought their way around Norway's dreaded North cape. The section of the city museum in Murmansk dealing with the war ignores completely the effort of the western allies. It is as if Russia had fought the war in a vacuum.

Today the Russian port on the Barents sea is busier than ever, with almost double its pre-war population. All the old men who unloaded the war time convoys have died or moved away. No one is left to remember what the words "Murmansk run" meant to a nation fighting for its life. Today that nation's masters would rather look to its missiles pointed at the nations that once made the run to Murmansk to save Russia.

TAX LOOPHOLES

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is particularly appropriate today, April 15, to underscore the almost desperate need for tax reform. The blatant inequities of our present tax system and the all too ready availability of means of avoiding income taxation by the rich, have created indignation throughout our Nation. The "Page of Opinion" of the Wisconsin State Journal on April 7 posed the question whether tax reform would come this year, as it highlighted the need to eliminate the numerous loopholes in our tax laws.

This editorial also cited the excellent piece on taxes done by my esteemed colleague and good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, BILL PROXMIRE. Senator PROXMIRE has consistently been at the forefront of the battle for meaningful tax reform. I commend highly his excellent article "The Tax Loophole Scandal," which appeared in the April 1969 edition of the Progressive magazine and which was reprinted in the Journal.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial and Senator PROXMIRE's article in the RECORD:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Apr. 7, 1969]

WILL REFORM COME THIS YEAR? REMEMBER LOOPHOLES ON T-DAY

As Apr. 15 draws near, the agonies of the income tax become intensified.

It's little comfort to realize that while the average citizen pays hundreds of dollars in federal taxes, some Americans with fantastic incomes are liable for no tax at all.

For instance, extreme cases are 155 tax returns from 1967 with adjusted gross incomes above $200,000 on which no federal taxes were paid; 21 of those had incomes over $1 million.

And from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes from $7,000 to $20,000—who pay taxes on full ordinary rates—come more than one half of the individual taxes in the United States.

The evidence is massive that tax loopholes not only cost the federal government billions in revenue, but are grossly unfair to the average American taxpayer.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) outlines the shocking inequities in a story reprinted on today's Page of Opinion. Just as shocking as the loopholes is the lethargy of the Congress in correcting the problems.

In this 91st session of Congress is the first real sign that maybe something will be done, maybe. The House Ways and Means Committee began hearings on Feb. 27 which are still going on.

The spotlight is focused on the tax reform recommendations issued early this year by the Treasury Department which deal with most of the cumbersome jumble of personal income tax laws.

Unfortunately, the treasury's recommendation is minus a proposal to correct one of the biggest loop-holes going: the mineral depletion allowance which permits the oil industry to pay only a fraction of what most corporations must fork out.

It is this type of loophole, so carefully protected by industry lobbyists, which stands in the way of congressional action—the lawmakers in control of tax committees have close ties to these special interests.

Surely high on the list of reforms should be a realistic deduction for dependents—the present $600 deduction bears no relationship to the actual cost per dependent. Doubling that figure would be a start.

The fact that some wealthy individuals pay no tax is another must area; there should be a minimum even for those with the ability to sink all their funds in "low-interest," tax-free municipal bonds.

There are hundreds of other loop-holes that need attention and many of them are described on this page, but the problem is winning change and not recognizing the faults.

The Apr. 15 deadline also should be a deadline for all taxpayers to notify immediately their representatives and senators of their desire for tax reform now.

[From the Progressive magazine]

HARD-TO-CHANGE REVENUE LAWS—THE TAX LOOPHOLE SCANDAL

(By Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE)

As the average taxpayer fills in line 12a of his Federal Income Tax Form 1040, he must wonder why he pays so much while others, more favored economically than he, pays so little.

If he is a middle income taxpayer with a wife and two children and $12,000 of taxable income after taking his ordinary deductions, he pays almost 20 percent of it directly to the federal government. This year, as recorded on line 12b, he must pay, in addition, 7.5 per cent of his regular income tax payment, which is the equivalent of 10 per cent of the tax liability he has incurred since the surtax went into effect last April.

Piled on top of the federal income tax bill of our middle income family are the federal excise taxes, such as on gasoline; Social Security payments, and state and local income, real estate, sales, personal property, and gasoline taxes. As he signs his name to the tax form this year, more likely than not the taxpayer will also have to dip into his savings and write out a check for an amount beyond that withheld.

These are heavy burdens. In the past they have been borne out of a deep sense of responsibility and loyalty to the country. But this year, if our taxpayer is reasonably well informed, he also knows that many far wealthier than he bear a much lighter burden. In 1967 some 155 individuals with incomes of more than $200,000 each paid no federal income tax at all. Twenty-one of these had incomes of more than $1 million but paid nothing.

HOW COME?

If our taxpayer's indignation continues to grow it could lead to a breakdown of the present tax system.

The first question our irate taxpayer may ask is "How is it done? How can a man with a million dollars in income pay no federal income taxes when I pay 20 per cent?"

The loopholes are legion. Among them are the depletion allowances for virtually every mineral, especially oil, the tax shelters for real estate investment, the capital gains treatment for stock options, the dividend exclusion, the special tax breaks for conglomerates, the no-tax status of foundations, the exemption accorded municipal bonds and especially municipal industrial bonds, farm losses used by hobby farmers to offset other income, and the gimmick by which depletion allowances can be used to offset taxes owed on other income.

But the key items by which the wealthiest

citizens avoid paying any taxes at all are through the unlimited charitable deduction, the array of special privileges for oil and gas producers and investors, and the exclusion for capital gains.

For a person to qualify for the unlimited charitable deduction, the taxes he pays plus the charitable contributions he makes must equal ninety per cent of his "taxable" income in eight out of ten consecutive years. He can then qualify for future unlimited deductions for charitable contributions instead of the 30 per cent limit in the law.

CONTRIBUTION

But the gimmick is the word "taxable" income. The allowance for depletion of an oil well, the intangible drilling and development cost deduction, capital gains, and various depreciation items are all deductions taken before arriving at "taxable" income. Thus, the "taxable" income of high income groups can be quite low. By contributing only small amounts to charity, millionaires often can qualify for unlimited charitable deductions.

The alleged "charitable contribution" itself may also be of dubious value. The Treasury Department has provided an example: One taxpayer took an unlimited charitable deduction of 21.6 million dollars for property he gave to a charity, but the original cost of the property was only $467,000. Thus, by donating an asset for which he paid a relatively small amount, he took a deduction worth forty-six times the amount.

Another method used by wealthy families to achieve the unlimited charitable status is to have minor children make contributions in 8 of 10 consecutive years which, when combined with the taxes they owe, make up 90 per cent of their "taxable" income. This is done in years when both the incomes and contributions of the children are low. When, upon maturity, they inherit huge fortunes, they are able to avoid taxes on their large incomes throughout the remainder of their lives.

Perhaps the most notorious examples of slipping through loopholes occur among taxpayers whose incomes are derived from gas and oil. Both individuals and companies benefit from a panoply of credits and deductions. Dry holes are written off, deducted as business losses. Depletion allowances equal to 27.5 per cent of gross income ranging up to one half of net income can be taken.

LOW TAXES

About 90 per cent of capital costs, which non-oil companies would have to depreciate over twenty years, may be "expensed" or charged off in the first year by oil companies through the intangible drilling and development cost deduction. This includes many of the construction costs at the site, drilling costs, mud, roads, and the like. Finally, the oil companies have the "golden gimmick" by which American firms can credit the royalties they pay to Middle Eastern sheiks and potentates dollar for dollar against the taxes they would otherwise owe in the United States.

As a result, numerous major oil refining companies paid little or no federal corporate income taxes in 1967, the last year for which data are available. Standard Oil of New Jersey paid only $166,000,000 in federal income taxes on net income of more than $2 billion, or 8 per cent. Texaco paid 2 per cent on earnings or net income of just under $900 million. Gulf, Mobil, Union, Marathon, Getty, and Atlantic all paid less than 8 per cent on net incomes exceeding $100 million each. Atlantic-Richfield paid nothing at all on net income of $145 million. But our hard-slogging middle income taxpayer paid twenty per cent of the $12,000 of taxable income he had left after his routine deductions.

The worst and most widespread loophole of all is that for capital gains. If a man buys property for $10,000 which on his death is worth $110,000, his heirs pay no federal capital gains tax on the $100,000 gain although they may pay a small inheritance tax.

If a bank loses money on the sale of bonds, it can be deducted as an ordinary loss against the present corporate income tax which runs as high as 48 per cent. But if the bank sells the same asset and makes an overall profit, it is treated as a capital gain and the tax is never more than 25 per cent.

THE PRIVILEGED

When a corporate executive sells a stock for $50 which he was allowed to purchase for only $10 a share under a company stock option, he does not pay the ordinary income tax rates on the $40-a-share profit. If he has held the stock for six months or longer, he pays an amount only half as much as his ordinary tax rates, up to a maximum of 25 per cent. Why should he pay no more than half of his ordinary tax rate when our hard-working, wage-earning, middle-income taxpayer must pay his full rate?

These privileges are not available to the average family. Almost all the dollar amounts of capital gains go to the top 10 per cent income group. Tax advantages, virtually denied to the poor, violate the concept that taxation should be based on the ability to pay. They favor unearned income over earned income, and they violate the fundamental principles of fairness on which our tax system should be based. More often than not, funds which are essentially ordinary income and are not real capital gains at all, are taxed at the capital gains rate rather than the higher income tax rate.

There are numerous reasons why the tax laws are in their present scandalous shape and why so little has been done about it. Every major branch of the government is at fault. Even the general public must take at least a small part of the blame. Those with specially privileged interests to protect often arouse large numbers of the public to fight the repeal of a loophole which only nominally affects them. The "widows and orphans" are often used to front for gigantic selfish interests.

The Treasury, like almost all the other major departments of the government, basically represents the interests of what they call their "clientele." The Treasury represents bankers and the financial community, as other agencies represent business, defense contractors, organized farm groups, and trade unions. The public interest is generally overlooked.

Neither Presidents nor the Treasury have been particularly zealous in their pursuit of tax reform.

LOOPHOLE GUARDS

All tax legislation must originate in the House. In the past, the Ways and Means Committee has tenaciously guarded loopholes and special tax privileges. Appointments from the Democratic side were made for so long by Speaker Sam Rayburn that on crucial issues the Rayburn appointees and allies still exercised control of the Committee. His litmus test was, how did the prospective appointee stand on oil? Only rarely, because of the workings of seniority, did an anti-oil depletion member slip through to a seat on the Ways and Means Committee.

The Democrats on Ways and Means make up the Committee on Committees that assigns House Democrats to committee posts. A newly elected representative dedicated to fighting special tax privileges and other inequities seldom finds himself in an effective committee post.

But the leadership's control extends well beyond this. There has been no vote in the House to eliminate or reduce the oil depletion allowance in the memory of almost any member. Tax bills are brought to the floor only under rules which prohibit such amendments. This is part of the protection afforded the industry.

If the Senate is so irreverent as to add a loophole-closing amendment, the House Conference Committee stands adamantly on its "Constitutional rights" to initiate tax legislation and kills the poor waif in one of the Capitol hideaways where conference committees meet in secret.

DOCILE YEARS

In the past all of this was glued together by campaign contributions funneled through the House and Senate campaign committees where interest groups made major contributions to those who stayed in line.

Appointment to the Senate Finance Committee, as in the House Ways and Means Committee, was reserved largely for those whose position on depletion was safe. Those opposed were locked out for years. Former Sen. Paul Douglas waited for seven years to get a place on the committee while those who had equal or less seniority moved toward the head of the table. In my own case, I tried in vain for five years for appointment to the Finance Committee only to see junior men, who held more orthodox views, selected. Finally, I took a seat on the powerful Appropriations Committee when a vacancy was created there on the death of Sen. Estes Kefauver.

After years of docility, the public is demanding tax reform. The Ways and Means Committee is holding hearings. Members of both House and Senate, who in the past have been lukewarm about closing loopholes, have suddenly found it an important subject.

But to win this battle the public must offset the skill of the special interests. They must keep up the pressure and continue to fight. They must do this because their interests are diffuse while those of particular interest groups are concentrated. While the public is outraged, its indignation is expressed in a general way. But those who benefit from the loopholes will send their highly paid, highly placed lawyers and lobbyists to argue against closing or shrinking any particular loophole. These advocates of privilege are skilled in reaching back into a Senator's state or community to enlist individual constituents in their cause. For example, when attempts were made in the early 1960's to repeal the lucrative, unlimited charitable contribution deduction, the presidents of the nation's major private universities, the recipients of much bounty bestowed upon them by millionaires who pay no federal income taxes, were enlisted in the fight against repeal by the legal counselors of the non federal income tax paying millionaires.

In another instance, when legislation was sought to collect at the source from corporations and banks the tax which was already owed on dividends and interest by the recipients, the affected institutions poured in tens of thousands of letters a week to key senators whose positions were pivotal. Most of the mail from irate constituents indicated they had been misled by the propaganda from the Washington-based trade associations which were fighting the bill. The measure died.

NEW INEQUITIES

One of the chief tactics of the special interests will be delay.

All of this need not be so. With determined presidential leadership to focus public indignation, reform could come and come quickly.

The public must also guard against new inequities that would result from the substitution of a program of "tax incentives" for tax reform. Most loopholes started as incentives.

The oil depletion allowance started as an incentive for "conservation." It now has little relationship to its original purpose. It promotes the misallocation of capital into marginal drillings. This, according to many economists, may well raise, rather than lower, the price of gas and oil because it is such an inefficient use of resources.

The depletion allowance illustrates why tax incentives are a poor way to promote economic or social purposes. It has grown until it now amounts to a tax drain of $3 billion a year. It is irrelevant to its original purpose. There is no annual budget review and it has proved almost impossible to reduce or terminate it. If the oil industry had to get the $3 billion by way of a direct subsidy—if that amount had to be included in the President's budget and appropriated by Congress—it would never be done. But the industry gets its largesse indirectly, through the back door method of an old tax "incentive."

In 1968, according to former Treasury Secretary Barr, more than $35 billion in tax revenues which the government did not collect were lost to the treasury because of such special credits and deductions.

Camouflaged as "incentives," a host of exceptions, credits, and deductions have riddled and eroded our tax system. That is why the outlook for reform depends upon the continued indignation and action of the taxpayers. The cause is not hopeless. These should be among our goals:

We should reduce the depletion allowance to, at most, 15 per cent for the big oil companies.

We should remove the "golden gimmick" as a loophole for the oil firms in the Middle East.

American movie stars living in Switzerland should pay their share of taxes to their own country.

After offsetting deductions are made for inheritance taxes paid, the heirs to huge fortunes should pay at least the capital gains rate on their new riches.

Most tax-exempt foundations should be required to pay taxes on the income they receive from investments in profit-making businesses.

The unlimited charitable deduction should be revised or removed.

Those with large incomes should not escape federal taxation. A minimum tax of at least 20 per cent should be required of all of those whose real incomes are large enough so that they would ordinarily pay that rate or many times that rate.

LEADERSHIP NEED

These reforms may appear to be "lost causes." But we should remind ourselves that in the recent past we have seen many lost causes won. Truth in lending, one man-one vote, open housing legislation, Medicare, repeal of the poll tax, to name only a few, were the lost causes of the decade of the 1950's the victories—even if not always fully won—of the 1960's.

If there is determined leadership by President Nixon, sustained by an aroused public, and focused on closing loopholes rather than promoting new ones, meaningful tax reform could be achieved.

We now join in a classic battle between the tax-paying, responsible public, on one hand, and powerful economic forces with lucrative special interests at stake, on the other. The battle is a test to determine whether we can make democracy work.

DOES U.S. FOREIGN POLICY ENTAIL FREQUENT WARS?

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois, has done some clear thinking about current U.S. policies toward the Soviet Union and China. He made a provocative presentation of his thoughts in a speech delivered Saturday, April 12, 1969, to the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia.

He suggests in his speech that U.S. policies toward each country are based more on mythology than reality, and that the basic myth we depend upon is that the Russians are more rational and more moderate than the Chinese. He states that these policies, which include continuing contact with Moscow and continued isolation of Peking have resulted in a weakening of the security of Western Europe and the polarization of the world into two spheres, that of the United States and that of the Soviet Union.

He does not suggest that Red China is our friend, but he does state that the interests of the United States would be better served if we revised our policies to reflect reality. We should deal with Moscow as it still is—secretive, hostile, unstable, and capable at any time of events akin to the Czechoslovakian invasion. We should, on the other hand, base our policies toward China on our national interests and not those of the Russians. In short, we should treat China on the same basis as we treat the Soviet Union.

It is my pleasure to insert the speech into the RECORD at this point:

DOES UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY ENTAIL FREQUENT WARS?

(By PAUL FINDLEY, Republican of Illinois, member, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives)

Writing in his book, "1940, The Fall of France," the former Chief of the French General Staff, Andre Beaufre said, "The collapse of the French Army is the most important event of the twentieth century." This was so, he said because "our downfall upset the balance which had been built up and maintained through the ages. Europe . . . found itself deprived of its western counter balance. The destruction of Germany which was to come, left in place of the traditional Europe, only a zone of weakness, while the USA and the USSR disputed between themselves the dominance of the world which Europe had lost."

One does not have to agree with General Beaufre that the collapse of the French Army is the most important event of the 20th Century. One must, however, be gripped—as I was—by his description of a proud nation in panic as it fled before the German armies: . . . "individual dramas lived out within the incomprehensible drama of France." He related how his fellow countrymen in order to protect their homes at Vierzon killed a French tank officer who wanted to defend the outskirts of the town. He described the chaos, confusion, disorganization, despair and resignation of a great nation, a great people who in the flight South first to Bordeaux and then to the shame of Vichy realized that their foreign policy and their military doctrines had failed them. Then, and only then, did they learn that the preservation of peace is not as easily established as the desire for it.

"In 1940," Beaufre continued, "we were really the victims of a series of events brought about by factors which had been apparent long before and of which the ineluctable consequences were not understood in time to grapple with them before it was too late. The great lesson of 1940 is that such maladies can only be coped with at birth, and only in the early stages is it possible to act effectively."

Maladies can be coped with effectively only in their early stages. This lesson from France of 1940 is an appropriate introduction to today's theme, "Does United States Foreign Policy Entail Frequent Wars?"

Clearly the greatest malady a nation can suffer is reliance on mythology in policymaking. To the extent that myths are rejected in favor of reality, the risk of fatal illness is reduced and the probability of national health and vigor enhanced.

To be useful as a counselor to policymakers, an historian or political scientist must "tell it like it is." He must distinguish between fact, what is a reasonable hypothesis and what must remain conjecture. If he fails to meet that test, he is a moralist or publicist, not an historian or political scientist.

Unfortunately, some members of the academic community do indeed fail the test and thereby contribute to the mythology which has excessively influenced policymakers. An overkill of words perpetuates myths and lays the foundation for one false assumption after another.

Vietnam comes first to mind. From the beginning our combat involvement there was based on assumptions which were either questionable or totally false. The leading faulty assumptions were:

1. That we responded to the invitation of a sovereign government seeking help to repel an invasion by forces of another nation.

2. That we were committed to send troops by treaty obligations and agreement of past administrations.

3. That our policy of containing communism required our intervention against Ho Chi Minh.

4. That with a little more effort and national unity the war would soon be over.

This mythology indeed entailed war for the United States—and a massive one at that.

Consider also the mythology of our policies toward Russia and China and the risk of war it entails.

Recent conduct by the Russians and the Chinese challenge several of the most important assumptions on which U.S. policy has been based. These assumptions concern the evolution of communist rule in Russia and its dependencies: the status quo and spheres of influence; and the conflict between Russia and China.

This mythology arises partly from a natural desire to believe that the Russian leaders are reasonable, moderate men, more closely associated with Western civilization than Oriental. Believing that they fear war, we have transmuted that negative fear of war into the assumption of a positive desire for detente and Great Power cooperation. Our view of China is directly opposite.

We employ a double standard. While we seem to pay more attention to Russia's words than her deeds, curiously in evaluating China we do the opposite. We pay more attention to the rhetoric of Chinese foreign policy than her actions, which, for the most part, are temperate.

Consider our contradictory policy towards these two seemingly hostile powers.

For twenty years U.S. policy towards Russia has been predicated on the assumption that the greater the contact with the West, the more moderate and responsible Moscow will be. Toward Peking, the policy has been the opposite: Isolate Peking politically, economically, and culturally. While the United States worked aggressively, even when the Russians showed no interest, in enlarging contacts and relations with the Soviet Union, we steadfastly refused for many years to consider seriously communicating with Peking.

Mythology has predominated in other strange ways. Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary the United States continued to believe that ideology was not a guiding force in the Soviet Union, that the newly emerging managerial and technical classes

would be the "gravediggers" of Communism, and that China, not the Soviet Union was the greatest threat to our security.

Prominent voices dismissed almost every instance of hostile Soviet conduct as meaningless and hailed every superficial gesture of peaceful co-existence as a solid new breakthrough. The harrassment of allied rights in Berlin, Brezhnev's extremely hostile and violent speech attacking American society and reaffirming fundamental ideological hostility, Soviet arms shipments to the Middle East, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the sending of volunteers to Yemen were all overlooked or downgraded. The relatively enlightened plea for greater intellectual freedom in Russia and accommodation with the West by the Soviet physicist Andrei D. Sakharov was given far greater attention in the West than the immediate condemnation of his thesis by the Soviet leadership, and the imposition of even stricter censorship upon intellectuals, including domestic exile and long prison terms.

Nevertheless, accepting rhetoric for actions, appearance for reality, and hope for policy the U.S. made a fundamental shift in foreign policy priority.

It was a fundamental mistake. Under it, the United States placed Geneva ahead of NATO, detente ahead of Western European security. For eight years the path of U.S. foreign policy favored detente or bilateral cooperation with the Soviet Union at the expense of closer ties with our NATO allies. Washington appeared to accept the Soviet argument that our efforts to salvage or improve relations with Western Europe worked against detente with the Russians.

The critical point was reached when the Administration chose to override Western European objection to the draft of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty in order to achieve agreement with the Soviet Union. Basically, the United States chose bi-polar cooperation, in effect carving the world into U.S. and Soviet spheres of influence. The decision was based on the assumption that coinciding hopefully with the emergence of younger—more pragmatic—leaders and the growing demand in Russia for more personal freedoms and consumer goods, the treaty would lead to a reduction of mutual hostilities and suspicion and bring forth a genuine detente. Actually it resulted in proliferation of U.S. agreements with the Russians none of which dealt with the substance of Cold War issues.

The natural consequence of this policy of bilateral—often secret—discussions with the Soviets on matters affecting the very security of Western Europe was to weaken the alliance.

This, in turn, led to two ominous—though not necessarily contradictory trends in Europe. These trends threaten the peace in Europe, and the peace of Europe is the peace of the world. These trends resulted not only from the bilateral secret talks but also the tendency of the U.S. unilaterally to change its posture regarding Western defenses without consultation with those who would bear the results of any change should war break out.

The first trend was the development of national European nuclear defenses outside the framework and control of the Alliance. This is most clearly evident in France, although there are growing elements in West Germany and Italy that advocate this position. Britain has had national nuclear forces for years. The French believe that the U.S. commitment to defend Europe cannot be taken seriously. Consequently, French strategy was to develop its own defenses and be independent of any integrated command structure.

Although some observers brush aside as inconsequential the French nuclear force, others contend that:

1. The German refusal to abandon Paris for London and British entry into the Common Market is based largely on a desire for the advantage of two deterrent forces, French as well as United States.

2. The Soviet Union was serious in 1961 when it explained resumption of atmospheric testing because of French nuclear explosions.

3. The Soviet ABM system around Moscow is designed partly to counter French nuclear power.

It is a curious fact—but nevertheless true—that American arms negotiations with the Soviet Union and other secret negotiations have contributed to the proliferation of nuclear weapons by encouraging the French to develop their own program and pull out of NATO's command structure.

The second trend in Europe is distinct from the first and is most noticeable among the smaller European countries, although there is some sign of it in Germany. This trend is towards political accommodation with the Soviet Union. It is entirely possible to envision a series of Rappallo-like treaties which will effectively destroy the Western Alliance and render Western Europe a continent of Finlands.

Both of these trends should be alarming for the United States. I believe that if one more NATO nation acquires nuclear weapons most of the others who can do so will follow because of an atmosphere of mutual fear and distrust will have been generated.

The more the European states perceive that we are subordinating their national interests to the goal of bi-polar cooperation with the Soviet Union, the more inclined they will be to develop national deterrents, or, in the alternative, seek a political arrangement with the Soviet Union. Either course has obvious disadvantage and danger to the United States.

For some time, however, American policy makers have resolved this dilemma by picturing the Soviet Union as less hostile, and increasingly more comfortable as a status quo power. In that spirit all too often we have greeted even a temporary easing of Soviet harshness as a historic milestone to peace. This has created the illusion in Moscow that the risks of any course—such as invading Czechoslovakia—no matter how intransigent, can always be limited by superficial gestures. We have yet to convince the Soviet leaders—as well as ourselves—that their policy of aggravating all instabilities is inconsistent with a relaxation of tensions and detente.

Nor has the United States fully appreciated the political significance of the events of last August 20. If the Soviet Union considered itself threatened by even the liberalization of a Communist government—a reform movement, incidentally, led by lifelong Communists, many of whom spent their formative years in Moscow—what weight can one give to its avowal that it desires peaceful coexistence between different social systems? After all, to quote Professor Leo Mates of Belgrade, "If it is possible for unprovoked military intervention to follow negotiations and agreement, then the danger to peace is transferred to the domain of the unpredictable, which can but leave deep traces on the general behavior of states."

The traditional American reliance on the rationality and predictability of Soviet international conduct has been one of the pillars of international relations in the nuclear age. It took the candor of a longtime Moscow observer, Anatole Shub, to remind us how shaky that pillar really is. He wrote recently, "It need hardly be added that a system capable of such surprise as the invasion of August 20 is inherently capable of other surprises no less unpleasant."

I, for one, would have greater confidence in the sincerity of Soviet talk about detente if it were implemented consistently and not voiced just in moments of panic when Russia is threatened by a hostile neighbor or by internal economic or political distress.

Our Chinese mythology is equally distressing and dangerous.

The United States knows too little about China to predict or interpret accurately all the ramifications of certain events and personalities. Yet, a few general conclusions can be drawn.

One, Chinese foreign policy has been no more aggressive, provocative or irrational than that of Moscow. In fact, an impressive argument can be made that it has been less so.

Two, where the U.S. and China have only one serious political disagreement and that regards the status of Formosa; U.S. and Soviet interests conflict in a number of places—Berlin, Germany, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East.

Three, China and the Soviet Union are rapidly becoming each other's principal political and military adversary.

Four, while China may one day have the military means to extend substantially her territorial claims, she does not have it now. Militarily the Chinese are no threat to the territorial security of the United States and because of geography and other factors not a substantial threat to any of our allies, except possibly Formosa. The same cannot be said for the Soviet Union.

Compare for a moment the curious double standard the United States employs in judging Soviet adventures compared with those of China.

Although the United States succeeded in getting China labeled an "aggressor" in the Korean War, it is generally conceded by historians that the Korean War was in fact both started and stopped by the Soviet Union. Chinese troops intervened only after UN forces reached the Yalu River, and only in sufficient numbers to restore the pre-war partition. Chinese forces were long ago withdrawn from Korea, in striking contrast to the "temporary" Soviet Army still present in Poland, Hungary, and East Germany. About 400,000 Soviet troops are now stationed in Czechoslovakia. Although China has clashed with India in border disputes, the provocations no doubt originated from both sides. In any event, the Chinese forces extended only to the historic border as viewed by Peking. China did not, after all, claim or take any territory historically and indisputably Indian. All of this is not to say that China is our friend. There are some serious differences existing between the U.S. and China, but no more so than our differences with the Soviet Union.

My principal purpose in stating and contrasting the two countries is to remind Americans that in the field of international politics it is just not true that the Russians, like the Dodge Boys, always wear white hats. The United States would do well to remember the admonition of Clauswitz, "Support the weaker of your two adversaries. Accept the risk of abetting a potential future menace in order to check the present one." Bismarck was blunter: "The enemy of my enemy is my friend."

When the disparity between reality as it actually exists and reality as it is perceived by U.S. policy makers is as great as it is today regarding China and Russia, the chances for miscalculation are enormous.

What policies should the United States adopt regarding these two powers which will reduce the chances of miscalculation?

Here are my suggestions:

The United States should concentrate less on bringing about the evolution of the Soviet Union into a relatively democratic state and more on reducing its political hostility and threat.

We should deal with Moscow as it still is: secretive, hostile, unstable, insecure, suspicious, pushed in one direction by China and

in the other by her European allies—at the same time pursuing economic priorities which dictate a foreign policy and military posture inconsistent with world revolutionary leadership.

We should recognize that while our ability to influence domestic trends in the Soviet Union is almost nonexistent, we nevertheless have opportunities to influence Soviet external conduct.

We should reject forcefully any effort to contain China's ambitions by "ganging up" with Russia through even an informal alliance.

We should make it clear that the security of our Western European partners is paramount in our policy priorities, and acknowledge that peaceful trade and cultural contacts with the Soviet Union, while desirable, cannot be a substitute for settling the outstanding differences of the Cold War.

In moving to normalize relations with Eastern Europe, we must realize there are severe limits on the extent to which a U.S. carrot-and-stick economic program can reduce Soviet influence in that area.

Even the Czech invasion has not stamped out a strong trend toward external independence and internal democracy in Eastern Europe. In the longterm Russia can no more prevent this than Pope Leo X could prevent the Reformation. Yet the United States by giving unwarranted encouragement to such trends may in fact weaken them as the Soviets panic and precipitously move across borders trying to put out the flames of internal revolution much as the Armies of Austria-Hungary tried to extinguish the fires of revolution in 19th century Europe.

The Soviets are more sophisticated in dealing with Western Europe than we are in dealing with Eastern Europe. We can also learn from the French, and, like them, enter into normal political and economic relations with Eastern Europe. Trade and good political relations benefit both parties and ultimately the effect of improved trade with the West will be a gradual lessening of economic dependence on the Soviet Union which will in turn weaken Soviet political influence.

The United States should make it clear that its policies with China are based on our own national interests, and not those of the Russians, and that we are not interested in supporting directly or indirectly any military action against China.

The United States should place trade with the Chinese mainland on the same basis as trade with the Soviet Union. United States should seek to open a trading mission in Canton where the trade fair is held twice a year. The United States should no longer require a special endorsement on passports for travel to China.

Our willingness to have serious, direct negotiations on the problem of Formosa through the appointment of a special ambassador to the Warsaw talks should be stressed. The United States should work for a satisfactory solution to the question of Chinese membership in the U.N. whereby both Peking and Formosa could participate.

In short, the United States should attempt to treat China on the same basis as the Soviet Union.

Attempts to normalize relations with China and with Eastern Europe, the reestablishment of proper priority for Western European interests, and the rejection of our Soviet and Chinese mythology will go far towards reducing the possibility of frequent wars.

Admittedly, even if we sweep all the cobwebs from our policy-making process risk will persist. This is primarily because of the very nature of the political systems in Russia and China. Changes in power, and hence direction, come about through internal secret intrigue, not through public election campaigns. Our Central Intelligence Agency was taken by complete surprise when Khrushchev was deposed by Kosygin. But realism, logic and clarity on our part can reduce the possibility of miscalculation on the part of these insecure power centers.

Not all the danger of frequent wars emanates from Peking and Moscow, of course. In dispelling mythology a logical starting point is in Vietnam, where our involvement originated and developed on the basis of false assumptions. But even if the basic asusmptions had validity the investment and attention Vietnam has received is grossly out of balance, in light of its essentially peripheral interest to the United States.

Avoidance of future wars like Vietnam requires, in addition to the same realism, logic and clarity in dealings with the major hostile power centers, some practical restraints on the free-wheeling war-making authority of the American presidency. A proposal I made last year would require the President to report to the Congress promptly the details of military intervention anywhere in the world, together with full, detailed justification. This would help to re-establish the proper role of the Congress in war-making, discourage military adventurism, and at the same time permit the President the military flexibility circumstances may require.

From all this I must conclude that the frequency of wars for the United States is related directly to the ability of policymakers to reject mythology in favor of reality.

PIONEER PAN AM IN VIETNAM ROLE WITH OTHER LINES

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed by the U.S. Agency for International Development—AID—that Pan American World Airways will provide technical assistance to Air Vietnam in a program designed to expand and develop civil aviation in South Vietnam.

We are all aware, Mr. Speaker, of Pan Am's innumerable, remarkable accomplishments during World War II when, as the only U.S.-flag carrier then operating to Europe, the Orient, and around South America its fleet, vast by 1942 standards, became the nucleus for our Air Transport Command.

When the first Berlin crisis developed in 1948, Pan Am became one of the first air carriers to respond to its Government's plea to keep open the air corridors to West Berlin. Likewise, during the Korean conflict, Pan American carried out the great obligations and responsibilities placed in its hands by the Government of the United States.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, Pan Am, along with many other American air carriers, both scheduled and supplemental, has been doing a continuing job, under supervision of the U.S. Department of Defense, of getting supplies and hardware to our beleaguered troops in South Vietnam.

American know-how and experience are the prime ingredients of the program under which personnel of Air Vietnam, the national airline of South Vietnam headquartered in Saigon, will receive training, guidance, and advisory assistance from Pan Am.

The overall objective of the Air Vietnam-TAP project is to assist Air Vietnam in its development as a modern, self-sustaining air transport system operated by Vietnamese citizens. This will be done through advisory assistance and training for all departments of Air Vietnam. Pan Am's assistance will be limited to functions concerned with the operation and management of Air Vietnam, as distinguished from the construction, maintenance, and operation of airports, airways navigational facilities, and air traffic control systems of the country of South Vietnam.

Air Vietnam currently operates an extensive domestic service, including some 40 flights a day out of Saigon. The carrier's international service includes flights to Hong Kong, Manila, Taipei, Bangkok, Phnom Penh, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, Osaka, and Tokyo.

Pan Am has been active in providing technical and management assistance to foreign airlines for 35 years. Other TAP projects are currently underway with Iran National Airlines in Iran, and Ariana Afghan Airlines in Afghanistan.

I am pleased to note and to commend the continuing great contributions of Pan American, one of the world's great airlines, of which we may well be very proud as Americans devoted to the modernization and development of our famous air arms.

A RESOLUTION FROM THE RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONCERNING THE INSTITUTION OF A TAX-SHARING PROGRAM WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to request permission to extend my remarks to include the attached resolution which was passed by the Rhode Island General Assembly and approved by the Governor on April 1, 1969, entitled "Resolution Memorializing Congress to Institute a Tax-Sharing Program with State and Local Governments."

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION H1418

Resolution memorializing Congress to institute a tax-sharing program with State and local governments

Resolved, That the general assembly of the state of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to institute a tax-sharing program with state and local governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to each senator and representative from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the hope that they will use every effort to institute and expedite such a program.

Attest.

AUGUST V. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT MAN

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, Sarah McClendon, Washington News correspondent for the El Paso Times and other leading newspapers, has written a column about a great American, the late Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. I especially appreciated this review by Sarah McClendon of the Eisenhower years.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this article from the April 5, 1969, edition of the El Paso Times in the RECORD:

A WEST TEXAN IN WASHINGTON

(By Sarah McClendon)

WASHINGTON.—If any man ever could, Dwight D. Eisenhower probably could have become dictator of the U.S. The people were at times that close to adoration of the man. But he did not seize or use power in that manner. He was never a dictator at heart.

He wanted to be doing the right thing for his country and his government at all times, so much so, that when a mistake was made, he just could not understand it. And when there was any implied criticism, he just blew his top. It was not that he thought no one should criticize him. It was just that he was trying so hard to do his best, he could not see why others did not acknowledge at all times that his motives were high.

President Eisenhower actually did not forget the grass roots. It was probably this reason why he gave to the American people a great gift, a new institution in this country—the presidential press conference as it is today. Now the questions and answers of the President of the U.S., on the record is probably the most watched show on earth. Even the poorest minority groups and the most backward nations are now watching it. The nation had never had a presidential press conference like this before. President Truman for the first time let reporters sit down in a special room and thus make it possible for them to write. But once reporters were slow with their questions, Truman cut off a press conference in six minutes. Ike gave reporters a full 30 minutes of writing on their laps and let the conference be televised.

Early in the game, he was advised by some high-level officials not to accept questions from a certain busy-body woman reporter who might ask sharp questions. She was from the smaller papers and thus was not important anyway. A member of the President's staff spoke up and said, "She will always ask questions from the grass roots and it is important that a President know what the grass roots are thinking." Ike thought that was good advice apparently. James Haggerty, his press secretary, said "Therefore, we will always take your questions." The President did so.

Other people, however, adored Mr. Eisenhower so much that they had no brief for any persons who might imply criticism of his administration. Feeling was so high on his side that most newspapers in the country were strong for him and many people wanted to ostracize any one who criticized him. One woman wanted to drop any member of a club who raised any question of his actions publicly.

The President wanted so hard to give the best type of reorganization to the military machine that he was particularly sensitive to any doubts about his action in that regard. He felt hurt to the core when someone asked if he were building a one-man military rule. Being a perfectionist, he was put out when someone suggested a slip in getting copies of his speeches and messages to the members of Congress.

But one thing about him, when this was called to his attention, he immediately saw to it that the situation was corrected. Even today, members of Congress get copies of messages to read by the time they are presented to Congress.

President Eisenhower did not seize the opportunity which reporters gave him to use White House leadership to avert trouble between races in the civil rights field. He was strong about desegregation of schools at Little Rock. But when reporters made suggestions that he later try to avoid schism in the country by appealing to the citizens through ideological or educational methods, he stood apart.

Ike was a man who was ever trying not only to do his best, but to do better. He studied. He made numerous contributions. He was able to smooth over issues of division between sections, like on tidelands, natural gas rate structure, civil rights to some extent. He was once asked if he favored large dams downstream or small dams upstream where rain fell. At the time this was a big issue before the country, internally, but a new one for the less background White House press corps. A year later, Ike recommended to the press a book he said he had been reading, called "Big Dam Foolishness." He had learned.

He understood that reporters were trying to get news for their papers when they asked him questions. On two occasions, he demonstrated this. Once this writer asked him a question about public works, an urgent matter at the moment to many communities, and implied that perhaps too much time was being taken up with his golf to give to public works considerations. Feeling deeply later in the day that this implied he should not be playing golf for his health, she sent him a letter of apology, pointing out she was glad he played golf for relaxation and had slipped, in her zeal for getting out information to readers, on the issue. He replied immediately with a beautiful personal letter (which this writer keeps in her lock box at the bank for grandchildren to cherish) thanking her for the apology and acknowledging he knew of her interest in development of waterways resources.

The thing I like best about Ike was the time he responded so quickly and willingly to a question about why could not the nation match up hungry people in Appalachia who had had nothing but carbohydrates and fats in their diet, from surplus commodities for months with a surplus of green vegetables, in this instance, cabbages which could not be marketed, in South Texas. The growers were going to plow them under. The people in Kentucky needed green in their diet. The President rose to the occasion at once and said he would do everything he could. He did, too, and although several government agencies wrestled with bureaucracy to overcome barriers and the railroads were stopped in their efforts by their own red tape. Ike's responsive leadership enabled national volunteer organizations to accomplish the mission.

This simple man was truly a leader because he never forgot simple people.

EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker. Earlier today my able colleague from Ohio, Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, led a discussion of our policies toward east-central Europe and recent proposals by the American Hungarian Federation on this subject.

The Hungarian revolution of 1956 and the recent uprisings in Czechoslovakia attest to the fact that there is uneasiness in that part of the world. Fortunately the forces of nationalism are again on the rise. In addition, the youth of these nations are providing a powerful impetus for change.

It is impossible to solve all the problems of east-central Europe. However, an easing of tensions would serve all parties concerned. In this regard, an interesting proposal was recently submitted by the American Hungarian Federation to the President and to the Secretary of State. It proposes a neutralization of Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, and possibly Czechoslovakia.

I hope that this, and similarly constructive ideas, of the American Hungarian Federation receives serious consideration by our policymakers.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the Jews in the Soviet Union has been a serious concern of all peoples in the free world. Among the tens of millions of racial and religious minorities in that polyglot state the lot of some 3 million Jews has become particularly unenviable. They are deprived of elemental privileges and freedoms enjoyed by other non-Russian groups. They are denied the use of their own language; they are not allowed to have their own schools and their own publications devoted to Hebrew religious matters. They do not have any of these privileges even in communities where they constitute clear majorities. Moreover, the Jews in the Soviet Union suffer other discriminations and inequities.

The Soviet Government's attitude toward such injustices against the Jews is one of indifference and inaction. Petitions on the part of suffering Jews in the U.S.S.R., and protests on their behalf from abroad, have not altered the official Soviet attitude. The governments of the free world, including the Government of this great Republic, should make serious attempts to exert pressure on the men in the Kremlin in the hope of rousing them from their indifference toward the unenviable lot of the Jews. Under the existing international situation the least, if unfortunately the most, the peoples and governments of the free world can do is to publicize discriminatory practices prevalent in the Soviet Union, and ask the Soviet Government at least to allow the emigration of Jews to countries where they would be welcomed as enterprising and industrious builders of a better world.

An excellent example of the kind of publicity I have in mind appeared in the

New York Times of January 31, 1969. Headed: "We Appeal for the Jews of Silence," it is a full-page advertisment sponsored by the Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry and contains an appeal signed by hundreds of distinguished academicians, both Jews and non-Jews, at universities all over the United States. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this appeal is worthy of attention of every Member of this Congress, as well as other readers of the RECORD, I include it therein in its entirety:

WE APPEAL FOR THE JEWS OF SILENCE

Soviet Jewry, three million strong, constitutes the last great remnant of the vital, creative East European community destroyed by the Nazis. It is the inheritor of no less noble and illustrious a cultural tradition, and an even more ancient one, than that of any other people residing on Soviet territory—a tradition of learning and idealism, of cultural vitality and moral grandeur.

And yet, fifty years after the October Revolution, Soviet Jews, alone among the multitude of Soviet nationality groups, remain deprived of virtually every institutional opportunity to perpetuate their cultural, religious and communal life, despite legal and constitutional guarantees of such rights, which all other groups in fact enjoy.

Hence, gravely concerned with the current situation of Soviet Jewry, the undersigned call upon the Soviet government to demonstrate its wholehearted adherence to the humanitarian ideals incorporated in the Soviet constitution, and:

1. To embark upon a systematic educational campaign to combat anti-semitism. The resurgence of "anti-Zionist," i.e., anti-Jewish, propaganda in the wake of the Six-Day War represents a clear violation of the principles laid down by Lenin in the early 1920's.

2. To enable Soviet Jews who so desire to lead culturally fulfilled lives as Jewish Soviet citizens by restoring to them the necessary educational and publication facilities in Yiddish and Hebrew, as well as Russian. There is a manifest need not only for printed works in such fields as Russian Jewish historiography and textbooks, as well as belles lettres and the arts, but for advanced scholarly research.

3. To support newspapers and periodicals of Jewish interest in Yiddish, Hebrew and Russian.

4. To sponsor professional repertory theatres in Moscow and the other great centers of traditional Jewish culture and population.

5. To facilitate the formation of clubs and centers where Jewish youth and students may come together for cultural, educational and social purposes.

6. To provide channels comparable to those assured other Soviet nationalities through which Soviet Jews may maintain close cultural, intellectual and communal ties with Jewish communities in other countries.

7. To secure for the large Soviet Jewish religious community the same kinds of institutions and prerogatives accorded all other religions—for contact and communication among congregations at home and with religious bodies abroad, for the education of rabbis and other religious functionaries, for the production and distribution of religious publications and materials.

8. To open the door to the emigration of those many thousands of Soviet Jews who wish to be reunited with families living in the United States, Israel and elsewhere, families that were shattered in the ghettoes and extermination camps of the Nazi era, and for those who would choose Israel as their national homeland.

This appeal goes beyond mere institutions, beyond even the values of language, literature, culture, religion and history. It goes to the very heart of human dignity, to the right of the Jews to live as Jews.

We hope that our appeal will not go unanswered.

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE ON SOVIET JEWRY

Harris Schoenberg, Sec.
Nathan Glazer, Chairman.

Sponsors

Daniel Aaron, Smith College.
Daniel Bell, Columbia University.
Saul Bellow, University of Chicago.
Max Black, Cornell University.
Justus Buchler, Columbia University.
Arthur F. Burns, Stanford University.
Lewis A. Coser, Brandeis University.
Herbert S. Dinerstein, Johns Hopkins University.
Richard Ellmann, Northwestern University.
Victor Erlich, Yale University.
Herbert Feis, Historian.
Lewis S. Feuer, University of Toronto.
Herman Finer, University of Chicago.
Milton Friedman, University of Chicago.
Walter Galenson, Cornell University.
Eli Ginzberg, Columbia University.
Louis Gottschalk, University of Chicago.
Henry F. Graff, Columbia University.
Louis M. Hacker, Columbia University.
Oscar Handlin, Harvard University.
Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago.
Carl G. Hempel, Princeton University.
Abraham J. Heschel, Jewish Theological Seminary.
Richard Hofstadter, Columbia University.
Bert F. Hoselitz, University of Chicago.
Irving Howe, Hunter College.
Irving L. Horowitz, Washington University and Stanford University.
Abraham Kaplan, The University of Michigan.
Alfred Kazin, SUNY, Stony Brook.
Peter B. Kenen, Columbia University.
Milton R. Konvitz, Cornell University.
Robert Lekachman, SUNY, Stony Brook.
Abba Lerner, University of Cal., Berkeley.
Daniel Lerner, M.I.T.
Max Lerner, Brandeis University.
Seymour M. Lipset, Harvard University.
Seymour Melman, Columbia University.
Robert Merton, Columbia University.
Sidney Morgenbesser, Columbia University and Rockefeller University.
Ernest Nagel, Columbia University.
Albert B. Sabin, Children's Hospital Research Fdn.
Ithiel De Sola Pool, M.I.T.
Meyer Schapiro, Columbia University.
Benjamin I. Schwartz, Harvard University.
Melford E. Spiro, University of Chicago.
Lionel Trilling, Columbia University.
Melvin Tumin, Princeton University.
George Wald, Harvard University.
Jacob Wolfowitz, Cornell University.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Joseph Andriola, Leon Blitzer, Jack R. Cole, Lewis Hertz, Sol Resnick, R. M. Schectman, Berthold Schweitzer, Peter A. Toma, Sid Yakowitz.

BALTIMORE HEBREW COLLEGE

Moshe Aberbach, Joseph M. Baumgarten, Herbert Birnbaum, Raymond Bloom, Isaac M. Fein, Samuel Glasner, Sonish Kaplan, Samuel Litov.

BERNARD BARUCH COLLEGE

Herbert Arkin, Maurice C. Benewitz, Jerome B. Cohen, Henry Eibirt, Charlotte Katzoff, Aaron Levenstein, Louis Levy, Michael Wyschogrod.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

Fred Abrahams, Alexander Altman, Albert S. Axelrad, Carl Belz, Gerald S. Bernstein, Egon Bittner, Naftali Chaim Brandwein, Samuel Cherniak, Saul G. Cohen, Edward Eugelberg, Gordon Fellman, Neil Friedman, Lawrence H. Fuchs, Stephen J. Gendzier, Creighton Gilbert, Emanuel S. Goldsmith, Jack S. Goldstein, Robert Golub, Ben Halpern, Martin Halpern, Milton Hindus, Leon A. Jick.

Rosabeth M. Kanter, Jay S. Keycer, Raphael Kutscher, Dena Lida, Henry Linschitz, Elaine Loeffler, Joseph Lukinsky, Abraham H. Maslow, Baruch H. S. Mazor, Michael Mazur, Mordeca Jane Pollock, Janice Reisman, John P. Roche, Myron Rosenblum, Joshua Rothenberg, Judith Rice Rothschild, Murray Sachs, Morris S. Schwartz, S. Schweber, Mitchell Siporin, Zvi Sobel, Fred Sommers, John P. Spiegel, Betty F. Starr, Maurice R. Stein, Robert Szulkin, Alex Weingrod, Kurt H. Wolff, Harry Zohn.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Harry G. Albaum, Howard Allen, Mary Anastasio, Abraham Bargman, Carl Beaver, Ruth S. Becker, Melvin M. Belsky, Benjamin H. Blottner, Irwin Bloom, S. Bowfsky, Benjamin Brickman, May D'Amato, Netta K. Dershowitz, Jack G. Deutsch, Julius Ducher, Norma H. Eisen, Bernard Eisenberg, Abraham S. Eisenstadt, George H. Fried, Vojtech Fried, Seymour Fogel, William Forman, Mordecai L. Gabriel, Allen Gerwirtz, Harry M. Goldberg, Abraham I. Goldstein, Solomon Goldstein, Sidney Goodman.

Paul Haberfield, Alvin Halpern, Betty Hershenov, Marion Himes, Murray Hochberg, Isidore Hudes, Irene H. Impellizzeri, Ruth Jolson, Meyer Jordan, Jacob M. Kagan, Paul Kahn, Samuel Katz, Hannah King, Beta K. Kirsky, Samuel L. Kleinberg, Jacob M. Lebowitz, Morris E. Levenson, Herbert Leventer, Norman J. Levin, Melvin E. Levison, J. Nina Lieberman, Paul F. A. Maderson, Ezra Mendelsohn, Charlotte Mergentime, William E. Miller, George Moriber, Anne M. Newman.

Murray Pincus, Walter Prenowitz, Joshua Proschau, David Raab, Shirley Rausher, Madeline R. Roberta, Ronald Roman, Milton J. Rosen, Louis E. Rosenzweig, Benjamin Roth, H. Rottenberg, Florence A. Ruderman, Ezra Saltzer, Alden Sayres, Bernard Seidenberg, Rose Z. Sellers, Melvyn I. Selsky, Belle D. Sharefkin, David S. Shaw, Joseph L. Shulim, Fanny K. Singer, James Singer, David T. Slominsky, Robert S. Slotnick, Wolfe Snow, Michael I. Sobel, Frances M. Sonnenschein, Ian N. Spatz, H. Sussman, Harvey Wachtel, Ida Weiner, Solomon Weinstock, Norman C. Weissberg, David Westreich, Jack M. Wolfe.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Stuart H. Altman, Edward N. Beiser, G. Borts, John P. Brown, King Chen, Benjamin Chinitz, Elliot R. Goodman, Herschel I. Grossman, Yinmaw Kan, Mark B. Schupack, Jerome L. Stein.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

George E. Aherlof, Kinsey A. Anderson, Edward W. Barankin, Babette Barton, Sara A. Behman, Reinhard Bendix, Arthur R. Bergen, Stanley A. Berger, Ariel A. Bloch, Woodrow Borah, Scott Briar, William M. Brinner, Alma Burlingame, Jesse H. Chaper, Florence I. Faerstein, Gerald D. Feldman, David E. Feller, Walter Fischel, Werner Goldsmith, Frank Goodman, Robert A. Gordon, Ralph Greif, Charlotte Grossman, Gregory Grossman.

Linda Israeli, Eliahu I. Jury, Sanford H. Kadish, Herma H. Kay, Anne D. Kilmer, Ralph M. Kramer, Frank Kushin, Joseph Kuypers, Abba P. Lerner, Joseph R. Levenson, Alfred A. Lucco, Herbert Maccoby, Ora Mayrose, Jacob Milgrom, Henry Miller, Ralph E. Miller, Forrest Mozer, Ray Radner, Gordon C. Roadanel, Earl R. Rolph, Sheldon Rothblatt, David J. Sakrison, David J. Salensie, Gerard G. Salinger, Samuel Silver, Lawrence M. Stone, Lloyd Ullman, Benjamin Ward, Aaron Wildavsky, Kermit T. Wilke, David S. Winston, Seth L. Wolitz, Michael J. Zweitler.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS

Myron Bun, Alexander L. Groth, Ann Hertzendorf, Theodore Karp, Sol Perel, Jerome Rosen, Alvin D. Sokolow.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

Joseph M. Burns, Barry R. Chiswick, Henry Goodman, Werner Z. Hirsch, Jack Hirshleifer, Walter Kingson, Frank LaTourette, Josef

May, Benjamin Klein, William L. Melintz, Yale Mintz, Daniel Rosenthal, David L. Shapiro, Steven L. Spiegel.

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE AT LONG BEACH

Charles W. Austin, Ira S. Cohen, Robert L. Delorme, T. H. Erb, Raphael Hanson, Marsha S. Harman, Thomas N. Hubble, Lloyd Invi, William M. Johnson, George V. Kacevicz, William M. Leiter, Christian Loe, Robert S. Lorch, Jerry E. Mandel, George Mazarakis, Robert D. Miewald, James G. Powell, William F. Sater, John V. Shor, Barry H. Steiner, A. Jay Stevens, Donald Urquhart, Jerry L. Weaver, Donald Whirten.

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Gerald L. Baum, Daniel K. Bloomfield, Victor H. Frankel, Simon Horenstein, J. Horowitz, Roland W. Moskowitz, Howard J. Schwartz.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

I. D. Abella, J. Alperin, R. W. Antvers, Howard I. Aronson, David Atlas, Saul Bellow, Ross S. Benham, James E. Bowman, Terry N. Clark, Louis Cohen, Joseph Cropsey, Milton Ehre, Milton Friedman, Marc Galanter, N. Gelfand, G. Glauberman, Julian R. Goldsmith, Zvi Griliches, I. N. Herstein, Bert Hoselitz, I. M. Isaacs, D. Gale Johnson, Arcadius Kahan, I. Kaplansky, Sol H. Krasner, N. Lebovitz, Richard S. Lindzen, Sam Peltzman, Robin D. Powell, Howard Schachter, C. Schochet, Edward Siankiewicz, Lester G. Telser, Tymon Terlecki, Doreen Triber.

CHICAGO CITY COLLEGE

Otto Benca, Sidney M. Bernstein, David Erikson, Seymour Friedman, Herman Novar, Leon Novar, Irving B. Slutsky, Albert Soglin, Meyer Weinberg.

CITY COLLEGE OF THE CITY, UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

A. Abramowitz, Howard L. Adelson, James Arrowsmith, R. D. Auster, Morton Bard, Bernard Bellush, Ruth Blizer, Randolph L. Braham, Saul Brody, Alice Chandler, Morton H. Cohen, Madeline P. Cosman, John W. Cox, Allan Danzig, Gabriella De Beer, Howard Deixler, Tony De Melas, Sidney Ditzion, Miriam Drapkin, Harry Dym, Morris Ettenberg, Marnin Feinstein, Paul Fenster, John M. Firestone, Myer Fishman, Gerald Freilich, Stanley L. Friedlander.

Malcolm Galatin, Lloyd P. Gartner, Joyce Gelb, Robert V. Ghiradella, Jerome Gold, Richard Goldstone, James J. Greene, Abraham S. Halkin, Leo Hamalian, Mitch Haskel, Suzanne Hecht, Samuel Hendel, Eva Herzfeld, Edward J. Hoffmann, Lee Kaminetzky, Irving Kaufman, Benjamin J. Klebaner, F. Kool, Florian G. Kraner, Jack Landis, Jacob Landy, Harry Lazer, I. E. Levine, Harry Levtov, Phillip Liss, W. B. Long, Karl Malkoff, Jonah Mann, A. Marty, I. Mei, Stephen Meltsner, A. Melzer, Samuel M. Middlebrook, Stanley Milgram.

Samuel I. Mintz, Robert Naimaik, Peter W. Nesschalt, Sidney Neuman, Sven Eric Norton, Paul Oppenheimer, J. R. Renert, Edwin P. Reubens, Jacob Rothenberg, Charlotte S. Russell, Louis F. Sas, David Shelupsky, M. Silver, Richard Skolnick, Louis L. Snyder, Bernard Sohmer, Irvin Stark, Zvi H. Szubin, Abram Taffel, J. Taffet, Stuyvesant Van Veen, Edmond L. Volpe, Renée Waldinger, Barry Wallenstein, Sheldon Waxenberg, Michael Weiner, William Wernick, Joel H. Wiener, Henry Willard, Jess Witchell, Robert I. Wolff, Stanley Wyatt, Oscar Zeichner, Arthur Zeiger, Arthur J. Zuckerman, Martin Zuckerman, Elliot Zupnick.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Roger E. Alcaly, James Barros, Ivan Berg, Dan W. Brock, Gerson D. Cohen, Thomas S. Colahan, Henry S. Coleman, Samuel Coleman, Arthur Danto, Cyrus Derman, Fred W. Dupee, John E. England, John E. Englund, Amitai Etzioni, Horace L. Friess, Eli Ginzberg, Irwin A. Glikes, James Gutmann, Dale L. Hiestand, Peter H. Juviler, Irving Kalet, Jerome D. Kaplan, Morton Klass, Morton Klein, Richard Kuhns.

Nathaniel Leff, Sebastian Littauer, Steve Marcus, Howard Mc P. Davis, Dwight C. Miner, Ivan Morris, Charles Nadler, Ernest Nagel, Alfred R. Oxenfeldt, H. N. Porter, John Herman Randall, Jr., Orest Ranum, Sidney Robbins, Abraham Rosman, Joseph Rothschild, Leonard Sayles, Howard H. Schless, Robert P. Shay, James P. Shenton, David Sidorsky, Allan Silver, Michael Slate, James J. Walsh, Ellen Weinstock, Robert P. Woolf.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Alfred Brandstein, Felix Freudmann, Louis Gerson, Herbert Goldstone, David Ivry, Lewis Katz, Marcia R. Lieberman, Jerome H. Neuwirth, Helene Reschovsky, William Rosen, Mark Ross, Eugene Spiegel, Solomon Tilles, Murray Wachman, Sam Witryol, Elliot S. Wolk.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

M. H. Abrams, Moshe Anisfeld, Joel Aronoff, Vahan D. Barooshian, Toby Berger, Israel Berstein, Harry Bitner, Harley Bernbach, Max Black, Bert R. Brown, Kenneth Myron Brown, Lawrence D. Brown, Mark Brown, Sanford Budick, Harry Caplan, Patricia Carden, Herbert J. Carlin, M. G. Clark, Marshall Cohen, David Connor, Alice H. Cook, Stanislaw Czamanski, Joseph B. Dallett, Werner J. Dannhauser, David Dropkin.

Terrence Fine, Jerry Fink, Walter Galenson, Alexander Galley, Morris Goldfarb, Gerald Gordon, Leopold Gruenfeld, David L. Grunes, Baxter Hathaway, Judith Herz, Martin Horwitz, Andre T. Jagendorf, Alfred E. Kahn, Harry Kesten, Jack Kiefer, Gordon M. Kirkwood, Helmut B. Koenigsberger, Milton R. Konvitz, Richard L. Leed, Sidney Leibovich, Jay H. Levin, Simon Levin, Richard L. Lichoff, Simpson Linke, James McConkey, George Miller.

Maurice F. Neufeld, Paul Olum, David Patterson, Isaac Rabinowitz, Efraim Racker, Robert L. Raimon, Alex Rosenberg, Edgar Rosenberg, Anne J. Rosokoff, O. S. Rothaus, Arthur W. Rovine, Myron Rush, S. L. Sass, Abel Schejter, Harold A. Scheraga, Rudolf B. Schlesinger, D. N. Seidman, A. N. Shulsky, Benjamin M. Siegel, Allan P. Sindler, Walter Slatoff, Fred Slavick, George Staller, Peter Stein, M. Tenenbaum, Marvin Waldman, Lionel Weiss, John Windmuller, J. Wolfowitz, Donald B. Zilversmit.

ALBERT EINSTEIN MEDICAL CENTER (PHILADELPHIA)

Samuel J. Ajl, Marshall S. Greenberg, Samuel B. Horowitz, Stuart Licht, Harold Persky, Marvin A. Rich, Anna Steinberger, Emil Steinberger.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

S. Ben-Yehoshua, Herbert T. Berger, Meyer Bieber, Daniel Billen, R. D. Dresdner, Richard E. French, Charles W. Fristol, David Glithman, Irving J. Goffman, Norman G. Keig, Jacob H. Kress, Ted Landsman, David F. Pawliger, Joseph W. Perry, Samuel Proctor, Murray W. Shields, Martin L. Schulkind, Dale Truett.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Morton L. Burdick, G. R. Choppin, J. R. Fisher, Earl Frieden, Robert L. Fulton, R. E. Glick, Michael J. Greenberg, Werner Herz, Seymour L. Hess, Myles Hollander, M. L. Incardona, R. H. Johnsen, Michael Kasha, J. S. Leffler, Robert Leif, Mark Levin, Bruno Linder, Harry Lipner, Leo Mandelkern, Charles K. Mann, R. S. McEwen, Duane Meeter, Joe L. Mott, J. V. Quagliano, W. Rhoades, Martin Roeder, James C. Simmons, Irwin Sobel, I. J. Vickers, H. M. Walborsky, Stephen Winters.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Frederick H. Abernathy, N. Bloembergen, Howard R. Baum, Bernard Budiansky, Milton Budoff, G. F. Carrier, Jeanne Chall, Henry Ehrenreich, Myron Fiering, Rose Frisch, Nathan Glazer, Merle Goldman, Sydney Goldstein, John W. Hutchinson, R. Victor Jones, Harvey Leibenstein, J. Carrell Morris, William Paul, Peter S. Pershan, Eliahu Romanoff, George Rybicki, J. Lyell Sanders, Jr., Israel Scheffler, Lloyd Spielman, M. Tinkham, George Wald.

HUNTER COLLEGE

Marlies K. Danziger, Robert Fried, Milton J. Gold, Marvin J. Goldfine, Lawrence Goldstein, Lillian Loewe Gottlieb, Mildred Mendelson, Harry L. Miller, Nathan Reich, William Reiner, Benjamin B. Ringer, Pauline Roth, Anna M. Schlesinger, Gertrude K. Schlesinger, Bernard Schneider, Charlotte A. Seley, Nathan Stoller, Myrtle Vogelson, Ruth G. Weintraub, Walter Weiss, Gloria F. Wolinsky.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE

Bernard H. Baum, Louis A. Berman, Seymour Bernstein, Sarah B. Cohen, Frieda H. Engel, I. E. Farber, Irwin K. Feinstein, B. Greenberg, C. Gutlinger, David S. Hacker, Allen H. Howard, Samuel Kantorovitz, William Kaplan, Robert Kauf, Harold Klehr, Bernard R. Kogan, Eliezer Krumbein, Nathan Lerner, Julius Menacker, Oscar Miller, Sonia Miller, Yecheskel Rasiel, Yoram Sagher, Lawrence Solomon, Reuben Sandler, Arthur O. Seltzer, S. Shalit, Gary Siegel, Roger Skoenick, Alvin B. Star, Herman B. Weissman, Lester Winsberg.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA

Larry Beiman, Eleanor Blum, D. James Brademas, Rosa Lee Brill, David S. Lieberman, Ira H. Carmen, Morris Davis, Nathaniel H. Eisen, Bob Eisenstein, R. A. Eubanks, A. Belden Fields, Maxwell R. Garrett, William I. Goodman, Fred M. Gotthel, Albert Z. Guttenberg, Paul Handler, Joseph M. Heikoff, Theodore Hymowitz, Marvin E. Krasnow, Anne Martel, Stuart Nagel, Stuart S. Nagel, Alexander L. Ringer, Arthur R. Robinson, Nesbit Siems, Julian L. Simon, Marvin P. Steinberg, William H. Walker, Stanley S. Wallack, Marvin G. Weinbaum.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

David Baker, Joseph M. Belth, H. Bern, Robert F. Byrnes, Domonique De Lerma, James S. Diamond, Oded Feinberg, Henry A. Fischel, Maurice Friedberg, David H. Frisch, George Gaber, Murray Grodner, Harry Houdeshel, Albert Lazan, John R. Levene, Mitchell S. Novit, Bernard Portnoy, Menahem Pressier, Horace Reisberg, Marko Rothmuller, Lawrence Schulman, Michael Schwartz, Robert J. Seltzer, Leonard Sharrow, Gavriel Solomon, M. W. Taylor, Leopold Teraspulsky, Lawrence Walcoff, Eugene Weinberg, Eugene D. Weinberg, Irving Zeitlin.

JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

David Arzt, Joseph A. Brodie, Sylvia Ettenberg, Israel Francus, Shamma Friedman, Edward M. Gershfield, Neil Gillman, Henry Glazer, Simon Greenberg, Abraham J. Herschel, Abraham Holtz, Aaron Kirschenbaum, David C. Kogen, David Leiber, Samuel Leiter, Bernard Mandelbaum, Shalom Paul, Zebulun Ravid, Fritz A. Rothschild, Menahem Schmelzer, Eugene Weiner, Moses Zucker.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Arthur Davidson, Jacob Enoch, Herbert Friedson, Mark Mandelker, Theodore Palmer, David Paretsky, Allan H. Perlman, Howard Rosenfeld, R. Sokal, Lawrence R. Velvel.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Martin R. Baron, Seymour H. Baron, Ronald A. Brown, Bruce D. Downing, Raleigh M. Drake, Edward H. Friedman, Edward Gelerinter, Sherman Golub, Clyde Hendrick, Michel Hirt, Kenneth L. Hoving, Lawrence S. Kaplan, Marvin R. Koller, Roy S. Lilly, Lawrence E. Melamed, Horace A. Page, David C. Riccio, Stuart Taylor, F. Robert Treichler, Charles N. Winslow, Wesley C. Zaynor.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

J. Richard Aronson, William A. Barrett, Alvin Cohen, Frank T. Colon, A. Roy Eckardt, Samuel L. Gulden, Theodore Hallperin,

Arthur Larky, Daniel Leenov, Sutton Monro, Murray Schecter, Eli Schwartz, Andrew Weintraub, Albert Wilansky.

HERBERT LEHMAN COLLEGE

Marc Aronson, Stanley Bank, Theodore Benjamin, Arthur Blatt, Louis Chary, Joan Dyer, Edgar Feldman, Bernard Flicker, Edward Frankel, Phillip I. Freedman, Martin Hannes, Seymour Hayden, Jack Herz, G. Isaacs, Perry Kalick, Stanley Kaplan, Linda Keen, Bonnie M. Kind, Connor Lazarov, Aaron Lebowitz, Joseph Lewittes, S. Markstein, Richard Sacksteder, Jack Shapiro, Irving R. Stuart, Samuel I. Squires.

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

Marc Ames, Ephraim D. Dworetsky, Leonard Feigenbaum, Helen Ginsburg, Wally Glickman, Seymour Goldberg, Naomi Gramer, Paul Isaacs, Chemia J. Kleinman, Max Landau, Hyman S. Laub, Michael Lester, Benjamin Litt, Florence Miller, Ronald Mirman, Harry S. Pack, Howard K. Rice, Robert E. Rochlin, Roy Rubin, Adrian M. Salee, Leo Schloss, Martin Teiger, Israel Teitlebaum, Samuel Tenenbaum, Emanuel Tsantes, Walter Vasilaky, Herbert J. Weiser, Stephen J. Weiss, Jerry Witt, Philip Wolitzer, Kenneth Yee, Hyman L. Zuckerberg, Israel Zuckerman.

LOS ANGELES VALLEY COLLEGE

Marvin Abrahams, Milton Auerbach, Pat Blakeslie, Bernard Friedman, Jay H. Glassman, Edward J. Kunzer, Allan M. Levine, Samuel H. Mayo, Bernarr Mazo, Anatol Mazor, Milton Miller, Solomon Modell, Eugene Raften, Thoryamber S. Villa.

MARQUETTE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

H. Ankel, James J. Brush, Deane N. Calvert, H. Friedman, Albert W. Girotti, David M. Glick, Donald Greiff, Sidney E. Grossberg, Michael J. Hosko, John P. Kampine, B. Kassell, Robert S. Kemp, Alan H. Mehler, Samuel A. Morell, P. Roel, Sidney Shindell, F. Taketa.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE

George Beschner, Janet Brown, Shirley Buttrick, Harris Chaiklin, Paul Ephross, Hans S. Falk, Godfrey Frankel, Herman A. Gewisgold, Lily Gold, Ernest M. Kahn, Evelyn S. Kostick, Stanley Levin, Marvyn Novick, Max Siporin, Richard Sterne, Daniel Thursz.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

W. W. Bergoffen, J. R. Dorfman, Aaron Douglis, Morris Freedman, David A. Goldberg, Louis M. Greenberg, Meyer Greenberg, Sigmund Grollman, Inda Lepson, Esther Liberman, Leonard S. Rodberg, Phillip Steinberg, Saul Ragalsky, Leonora C. Rosenfield, James Walt, Leonard Woolff.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Ernst S. Abers, Martin Abkowitz, Richard B. Adler, Stamford Anderson, Naftali Auerbach, Stanley Backer, Michael Baram, William H. Bassichis, Sylvain Bromberger, E. Cary Brown, Stanley G. Brown, Noam Chomsky, Gerald Dworkin, Murray Eden, J. Edozien, Leonard J. Fein, Albert Feingold, Herman Fishbach, Franklin M. Fisher, Aaron Fleisher, Leo Friedman, David Frisch, Ernst Frankel, Sergio Fribini, Abraham Gal, O. Glaser, Leon R. Glicksman, Samuel A. Goldblith, Robert Goodman, Leon B. Groisser, Paul Gross, Bernard Gould.

Kenneth Hale, Morris Halle, John E. Harris, aDniel M. Holland, Hans Horms, Marcus Karel, M. M. Kessler, Zvi Kohavi, Nissan Leviatan, Kurt S. Lion, Earl Lomon, S. E. Luria, Philip Mandel, G. Hubert Mathews, Henry Millar, Paolo Nunberg, Herman Pollack, Ronald F. Probstein, Edward B. Roberts, Robert M. Rose, John Robert Ross, Jerome Rothenberg, Ethel Rubenstein, Gerald L. Schroeder, Marcel Semo, Ascher H. Shapiro, Huston Smith, Barry Spacks, Steven R. Tannenbaum, Peter Temin, V. L. Teplitz, Judith Thomson, Lester C. Thurow, George Wolf, Richard J. Wurtman, J. E. Young, Lawrence R. Young, Jerrold R. Zacharias.

M'GILL UNIVERSITY

W. G. Brown, Adi Eisenberg, Arthur Grosser, Michael Herschorn, Hyman Kaufman, M. P. Langleben, Samuel Melamed, William Moser, Edward Rosenthal, Charles Roth, David J. Simkin, D. Sussmen, Robert Vomly.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY (OHIO)

Robert Bernstein, Pat Capretta, Reo M. Christenson, W. Cunningham, R. A. DeLapp, Oran B. Dent, John S. Jahnke, Arthur G. Miller, Henry L. Minton, Donald W. Ormiston, Joseph S. Vannoy, Herbert Waltzer, Raymond White, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Gerald B. Abrams, Carl Cohen, Bertram D. Dinman, Alexander Eckstein, Philip J. Elving, Albert Feuerwerker, Sidney Fine, Selma Fraiberg, Ronald Freedman, Zvi Gitelman, Leonard E. Gottesman, William Gerler, Robert A. Green, Alexander Z. Guiora, David L. Gutmann, William Haber, Paul Ilie, Abraham Kaplan, Raoul Kopelman, Eugene Litvak, Jacob M. Price, Joseph A. Reif, Melvin J. Reinhart, Melvin Selzer, A. Sussman, Ronald S. Tikofsky, Martin R. Warshaw, Gerhard L. Weinberg.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Sheldon Cherney, Jerome O. Herniter, Stanley C. Hollander, William Lazer, Joseph Meites, Harold Wein, Abraham Zemach.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Naomi Arond, Carl A. Auerbach, Melvyn S. Berger, Hyman Berman, Isaac Chavel, Edward Coen, Harold P. Cohen, Angelo Cohn, Miriam Cohn, David Cooperman, Martin Dworkin, Arnold Enker, Herbert Feigl, Edwin Fogelman, Bruno H. Greene, Velvi Greene, Donald Kahn, Gisela Konopka, David Kopf, Samuel Krislow, Joseph J. Kwiat, Robert J. Levy, Walter Littman, Manfred J. Meier, C. Robert Morris, Meir Pilch, Samuel H. Popper, Ida Rapaport, Mordecai Roshwald, Samuel Schwartz, E. M. Sparrow, Emanuel Stadlam, Marvin L. Stein, Ruth M. Stein.

MONTEFIORE MEDICAL CENTER

S. J. Estrin, Morton Finkle, Garet M. Gordon, Joseph Halperin, William Horowitz, Abraham Jezer, David M. Morson, Thelma Jones Sack, Howard S. Schwartz, Arthur G. Ship, Marcus Widneran, Felix Wimpheimer, Jack Zeller.

NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Louis Berenson, Jay Diamond, Morris Grossman, Elliot Kleinman, Richard Lenter, Mel Morgenstein, Don Nagourney, Gerald Pintel, Bernard Sklar, Harriet Strongin, Adam Wiener.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

S. R. Blum, Gerald J. Bole, Pham Chung, Ralph C. D'Arge, Ronald W. Dolkort, Richard A. Ellis, Bernard Epstein, Julian Geristy, Micha Gisser, David Hamilton, R. Hersh, Emar Hille, Paul Jonas, Robert W. Kern, Jack Kolbert, J. Laustman, James V. Lewis, R. C. Metzler, Alfred T. Parker, Noel Pugach, Clifford Qualls, Guntrer E. Rothenberg, Patricia Sanborn, Ellen Spolsky, M. Szosz, Bernard Spolsky, Donald G. Teully, Henry J. Tobias, Howard Tuttle, Beverly C. White, Robert H. White, Nathaniel Wollman, Hanna Zacks, Shelemyahu Zacks.

NEW YORK MEDICAL COLLEGE

Edward J. Brownstein, Myron S. Denhotz, Marvin G. Drellich, Francine Gelfand, Vilmos Major, Y. Moadel, Moses Naftalin, Jack L. Rubins, David D. C. Savile, Edith T. Shapiro.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Sidney H. Aronson, Phyllis Bober, Roger Even Bone, Burton Budick, Howard L. Greenberger, Bernard Hallote, Brooke Hindle, Benjamin J. Katz, Diana Klebanow, Israel Knox, Dan H. Laurence, Harold Lazarus, Edward W. Lehman, Alexander Melamed, Norman Miller, Jonas Prager, Alex Rosen, David Rudansky, Leah C. Schoengood, Frederick C. Schult, Jr., Frieda Shaviro, Dennis H. Wrong.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

Donald Cohen, Leon Cohen, Martin Edelman, Robert Fairbanks, Walter Goldstein, John Gunnell, James Heaphey, Richard Kalish, Alvin Magid, Michael Moss, Richard Nunez, James Riedel, Roy Speckhard, Ronald Stout.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

Nate Back, Ulrich Bauer, Charlotte Catz, Maimon M. Cohen, R. G. Davidson, R. I. Davidson, Leslie Fielder, Paul Kurtz, Sol Messinger, Albert Somit, Philipp E. Veit, David Weintraub, Summer J. Yaffee, Marvin Zimmerman.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

D. Austin, Martin H. Bailyn, Adi Ben-Israel, Jochim Beug, Laurie M. Brown, Meyer Dwass, Arthur J. Freeman, C. R. Goedsche, Lillian Croag, Erich Heller, Hans E. Holthusen, D. Kahn, David J. Klein, Michael S. Koppisch, Gilbert K. Krulle, Peter L. Lehmann, Marvin B. Lewis, Eben Mathis, Stuart L. Meyer, Benjamin Mittman, Herman J. Munczek, Tilde Sankovitch, David Shemin, Arnold J. F. Siegert, Arthur B. Simon, Meno H. Spann, Norman B. Spector, Geza Von Molnar, Jacqueline L. Willrich, Art Wouk.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Benjamin W. Abramson, Manuel Barkan, J. D. Brilliant, Robert S. Brodkey, Arno Cronheim, Richard M. Goodman, Kurt Lessy, Leo E. Lipetz, Louis Nemzer, Melvin S. Newman, Samuel Rosen, Jerome Rothstein, Saul M. Siegel, James Tennenbaum, Marshall C. Yovits.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Joseph M. Allman, John Fred Beebe, Judy Bertelson, Herbert Bisno, James C. Davies, Steven Deutsch, David J. Finlay, Joseph R. Fiszman, Stanley B. Greenfield, Thomas Hovet, Jr., James P. Levine, Hal R. Lorwin, Guy F. Medler, William C. Mitchell, William Orbell, Stan Pierson, Stephen C. Reynolds, James L. Rice, Charles P. Schleicher, Lester G. Seligman, Clarence E. Shurber, Barry N. Siegel, Donald R. Van Houten, John E. Woodham, M. George Zaninovich, Harmon Zeigler.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Morton Benson, Daniel Cohen, Herbert S. Denenley, Aaron J. Gellman, Stephen R. Goldstein, A. Leo Levin, Louis D. Levine, Israel Live, Noah Prywes, Joseph R. Rose, Edward B. Shils, E. T. Siegel, Sheldon A. Steinberg, Stephen R. Sylk, Benjamin Wolf.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Gilbert Aberg, Keith Baker, Oded Bar-Or, Simar Belasco, Asa J. Berlin, Irwin Bernhart, Norman Davids, Harris P. Deverle, Samuel S. Dubin, Irwin Feller, Thomas Feuchtwang, Norman Freed, Robert S. Friedman, Maxwell Goldberg, Maxwell H. Goldberg, Norman Goldberg, Stella R. Goldberg, David Gottlieb, Richard Gordon, Howard Grotch, Henry L. Guttenplan, Melvin Gutterman, George Haspiel, Sabih I. Hayek, Julian Heicklen, Emil Kazaz, Edward Keynes, Michael King, Phillip Klass, Edward Klevans, Robert J. Laporte, Lawrence H. Lattman, Stanford Lembeck, Samuel H. Levine, Claude Lyon, Martin Marder, William R. Millman, Michael D. Morris, Richard T. Newcomb, Gerald Phillips, Ernest Rawitz, David M. Ricci, John D. Ridge, Theodore Slovin, Daniel Walden.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Abraham I. Braude, Bernard L. Cohen, Joseph W. Eaton, Lawrence M. Epstein, Walter I. Goldberg, Adolf Grunbaum, Jonathan Harris, Lois Jaffe, Allen I. Janis, Lewis Lehrman, Irving J. Lowe, Donald Magel, Arden Melzer, Rodney Pelton, Jerome L. Rosenberg, Barbara Shore, Edward Sites, Anatole A. Solow.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Paul Benacerraf, Donald Davidson, R. E. Grandy, Gilbert H. Harman, Carl G. Hempel,

Walter Kaufmann, J. M. Notterman, Terry Penner, George Pitcher, Richard Rorty, Mark Sagoff, T. M. Scanlon, Jr., James Ward Smith, Gregory Vlastos, John Wallace, Ledger Wood.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Arthur Aronson, J. P. Aubin, Fritz G. Cohen, H. Dan. Corbin, William A. Cramer, Chester E. Eisenger, Leslie A. Field, Harley Flanders, Solomon Gartenhaus, W. H. Gass, Sanford M. Goldstein, Edward Golub, Daniel H. Gottlieb, Jonathan Gressel, David I. Haas, M. E. Harr, Mark Harris, Samuel Harris, J. F. Hayes, Allen Hayman, David Hertzig.

Jules Janick, Albert Kahn, A. E. Kalson, Jerry Kaplan, Barnett Kottler, Martin Light, Michael E. Lipshutz, M. M. Miller, V. L. Newhouse, Sanford E. Ostroy, Norbert T. Porile, Earl Prohofsky, Henri Rothschild, Joseph Rubenstein, Marvin M. Schreiber, Stephen Robb, Jerrold Siegel, Edward Simon, Ralph C. Simon, Ethel Tessman, J. F. Treves, Arnold Tubis, I. Walterstein, S. Weingram, E. C. Zachmanoglou.

QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Abraham Bertisch, Milton Cohen, Joseph Levi, Naphtaly Levy, Gerald Meyer, Pedro Meza, Ronald C. Monticone, Sheila Polishook, Katherine Stabile, Frank White.

REED COLLEGE (OREGON)

Pearl Atkinson, William W. Bernhardt, Dean Cora Bamford, David Chaitkin, Marshall W. Cronyn, Roger B. Oake, John C. Pock, Victor G. Rosenblum, Laurens N. Ruben.

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

Melvin Granatstein, Ira Gross, Jerome R. Kutliroff, Albert Silverstein, Ephraim P. Smith, Arthur Stein, Robert G. Weisbord, Norman L. Zucker.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

Wilhelm Braun, Stanley Engerman, Ralph N. Haber, Richard M. Harris, Joseph H. Levine, Sidney Monas, Nathan Rosen, Stanley M. Sapon, Arthur H. Stone, Dorothy Stone.

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY (CHICAGO)

Robert I. Cohen, Gregory J. Grieco, Janice Jacobson, Burton S. Kendle, Ben Lebovitz, Crag Orear, Seymour Patinkin, Elsa G. Richmond, S. W. Specthrie, Morris Springer, Otto Wirth.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Sanford Aranoff, Joseph Badi, Philip W. Bennett, Norman M. Bronznick, Fred Einstein, Seymour Feldman, Joseph Johnson, Martin M. Hyman, Mark Keller, Nathan Kranowski, Robert M. Krauss, Hal G. Lewis, Simon Marcson, Stanley Messer, Seymour Rosenberg, Gordon Schochet, Martin Sherman, Silvan S. Tomkins, Luba Uveeler, Renee Weber.

SMITH COLLEGE

Alice Ambrose, Louis Auld, Ron K. Banerjee, David Batchelder, Marie-Rose Carré, Louis Cohn-Haft, Charles M. Cutler, Bruce T. Dahlberg, Rosalind De Mille, Herman Edelberg, Stanley Elkins, Laurence A. Fink, Theodora Foster, Grace Ganter, Edwin E. Fehen, Jr., Myron Glazer, Arnold Gussin, Jeffrey Horn, Randall Huntsberry, Seymour W. Itzkoff, Mervin Jules, Yechiael Lander, William MacDonald, Howard Nenner, Howard I. Parad, Helen W. Randell, Donald L. Robinson, Peter Rose, Lawrence Rosen, William Shepard, Harold Skulsky, J. Diedrick Snoek, Milton D. Soffer, Melvin Steinberg, Richard P. Unsworth, Irvin Wall, Allan Weinstein, Harvard Wescott, Jochanan Wignhoven, Margaret Yeakel.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Robert McAbee Brown, Herman Chernoff, Brad Efron, P. Herbert Leiderman, Robert Hofstadter, Arthur Kornberg, Ingram Olkin, Richard Olshen, Emanuel Parzen, Martin L. Perl, David O. Siegmund, Herbert Solomon, George W. Woodworth.

SUFFOLK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

David Bonfeld, Gregory E. Bush, Dorothea Echard, George E. Frost, Jr., John Gallagher, Caroline H. Gould, Ronald J. P. Lesko, Louise B. Perkal, Murray Polner, William Zukor.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

J. Brezner, Milt Elfant, Morris Katz, Ephraim Levin, L. Naum, E. Schoenfeld, Michael Szwarc, Gunter Zweig.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Carl Alper, Victor H. Auerbach, Danile Berger, Gerald J. Blidstein, George Blumtein, M. Eisen, Paul H. Elovitz, Stephen Fein, Daniel S. Fleisher, Walter J. Gershenfeld, Isadore W. Ginsburg, Michael Goldblatt, Leonard I. Goldman, Marvin W. Grossman, Emil Grosswald, Haym Jaffe, Alfred Katz, Norman Kendall.

Emil P. Liebman, Joseph J. Loewenberg, Maxwell S. Luria, Victor Marder, Phyllis Meisner, Bernard Meth, Eva D. K. Orlow, Louis Raymon, Bernard J. Ronis, Max Lee Ronis, Albert Schild, L. Schoenfeld, Stanley S. Schor, Samuel Seltzer, Sol Sherry, Eugene Shuster, Murray H. Shusterman, Sidney B. Simon, Herman Siplet, Adrian L. Steinberg, Edward C. Steinberg, Howard C. Wasserman, Philip P. Wiener.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

J. M. Albert, Joseph Aschheim, Gilbert Ginsberg, Solomon Kullback, Benjamin Nimer, Bernard Reich, Howard M. Sachar, George Steiner, Rafael Supervia.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Arnold Arons, John D. Bagdade, L. Bierman, J. G. Dash, Milton B. Gordon, Neal B. Groman, Howard Kaminsky, Mark N. McDermott, Eugene Natkin, Robert Puff, Edward A. Stern.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (CENTER SYSTEM)

Marion Bowe, Jane Burgess, Dorothy Delle, Edwin J. Dommisse, John Forde, Alan A. Grimm, Glenn Jacobs, James Knox Phillips, Rolf W. Roth, Ralph A. Russell, Donald Weast, Robert Wright.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (MADISON)

Edwin A. Azen, Harry C. Coppel, Alan D. Corré, Patricia Cosgrove, Joseph W. Elder, Edwin H. Epstein, Henry C. Finnery, Burton R. Fisher, Sterling Fishman, Leonard B. Glick, Herman Goldstein, Simon Hellerstein, Herbert Jacob, Herbert M. Kliebard, Lawrence W. Landweber, Herbert S. Lewis, Nancy M. Matthisen, David Mechanic, H. Andrew Michener, Robert J. Miller, Robert L. Rabin, Elaine Reuben, John W. Robby, Edward Rothstein, Irving S. Saposnick, Charles E. Sherman, Shalom Schwartz, A. Aaron Snyder, Seymour Spilerman, Richard L. Venezky, Grace G. Wahba, Julius R. Weinberg, Victor Wrigley.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (MILWAUKEE)

Len Levine, David Litchman, Jakob R. Loewenberg, Elihu Lubkin, W. K. Percival, Eric Schenker, David B. Shapiro, Michael M. Shurman, Raymond Weiss, Jack B. Zeldis.

YALE UNIVERSITY

David C. Duncombe, David Egger, Barry L. Eichler, Victor Erlich, Jack Farman, Louis B. Fierman, Dorothea Finkelstein, J. J. Finkelstein, Jacob Finkelstein, Joel Lawrence Fleishman, Tikva Frymer, Grace Goldin, Judah Goldin, Joseph M. Goldsen, Abraham S. Goldstein, Richard Greenberg, W. W. Hallo, John Harte, Richard Israel, Herbert Kaufman, Stanley R. Lavietes, Sid Leiman, Herbert D. Lewis, Joseph Lowin.

Leonard Marcus, Uri Navon, Ralph Roskies, Arthur M. Ross, Seymour Sarason, Gaston L. Schmir, Marc Schwartz, Erich Segal, Bernard G. Slavin, Samuel Slie, Elizabeth Socolow, Robert Socolow, Stanley Stern, Thomas O. Teatherwood, Joseph Tulchin, David L. Weisbrod, Caroline Whitbeck, Robert J. Wyman, Leonard Zegans, Israel Zelitch.

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

Esther Appelberg, Bernard Beer, Menachem Brayer, Moshe Carasky, Irving H. Cohen, Hebert C. Dobrinsky, Joseph Dunner, Morris N. Eagle, M. H. Finer, Beatrice Fleisher, David Fleisher, Daniel Gasman, Nathan Goldberg, Allan C. Goldstein, Sam Goldstein, Solomon H. Green, Irving Greenberg, Joseph Greenblum, Hyman B. Grinstein, Jos. Jausner.

Mayer Herskovics, Sidney B. Hoenig, Saul Hofstein, Arthur Hyman, Shelly P. Koenigsberg, Pauline Kra, Seymour Lainoff, H. Leaf, Eli M. Levine, Boris M. Levinson, Joseph Levinson, Edward Levy, Justin Lewis, Charles S. Liebman, Norman Linzer, S. Menkowis, Macy Nulman, Emanuel Rackman, Murray Raim, Esther Reich, Rae Rosenberg, Joseph Safran, Lloyd Sepleis, Alvin I. Schiff, Sherman Siff, Dorothy Sievers, Morris Silverman, Ernest Simon, Solomon Simonson, Marshall Sklare, Leon D. Stitskin, Abraham Tauber, Norman B. Tokayer, David Vitrogen, Bluma B. Weiner, Walter J. Wurzburger, Daniel Ziff, Eric Zimmer.

ADDITIONAL SIGNATURES

Jaime Alazraki, California at San Diego.
Harvey Babkoff, Biometrics Research.
Perry B. Bach, Cincinnati.
Jack Behar, California at San Diego.
Allan J. Berman, Queens.
Sidney Bernstein, Quinnipiac (Conn.)
E. Birnbaum, Toronto.
Irwin R. Blacker, Southern California.
Abraham Blum, Scientist.
Robert Boguslaw, Washington (St. Louis).
Yvonne Broadcorens, Simmons (Boston).
Eugene A. Counihan, Scientist.
Dennis Cutler, Scientist.
Herbert S. Dinerstein, Johns Hopkins.
Donald L. Edelstein, Cincinnati.
Emil L. Fackenheim, Toronto.
Rudolph Federman, Scientist.
Joseph A. Feldman, Duquesne.
Philip Feldmesser, Fairleigh Dickinson.
Robert A. Feldmesser, Dartmouth.
Henry Fenichel, Cincinnati.
Joshua A. Fishman, Hawaii.
Donald K. Frank, C. W. Post (L.I.U.)
Kathryn B. Feuer, Toronto.
Lewis S. Feuer, Toronto.
Melvyn P. Galin, Northeastern.
Lydia Gasman, Vassar.
Walter J. Gensler, Boston.
Boris Gertz, Lesley.
Martin Godofsky, Scientist.
Marshall I. Goldman, Wellesley.
Sheldon Goodman, Massachusetts.
David Gordon, Southeastern Mass. Tech. Inst.
Gershon Greenberg, Dartmouth.
Ann B. Grieco, Educator.
Michael Grossman, Amer. Ass'n. of Univ. Profs.
Irving Halperin, San Francisco State College.
Robert L. Hambkin, Washington (St. Louis).
Theodore E. Harris, Southern California.
Ron Heiferman, Quinnipiac (Conn.)
Edward Herman, Cincinnati.
Robert Hexter, Carnegie-Mellon.
Irving Louis Horowitz, Washington (St. Louis).
Andrew I. Kaplan, Scientist.
Julian Kaplow, Monroe Community (Rochester).
Helen Kassoff, Educator.
Sam Katz, West Virginia Medical.
Robert Kingson, Foothill College (Los Angeles).
Roy L. Kisliuk, Tufts.
Sheila Klass, Manhattan Community.
Allan Kornberg, Duke.
Sanford A. Lakoff, Toronto.
Joseph C. Landis, Queens.
Berel Lang, Colorado.
Norma Lang, Quinnipiac (Conn.).
Robert W. Langbaum, Virginia.
Irvin Larner, Washington (St. Louis).
Bernard Lazerwitz, Missouri.

Allan M. Lefer, Virginia.
Sara Lehrman, Chanton College (Pa.).
Harvey R. Levine, Quinnipiac (Conn.).
Joseph H. Levine, Rochester.
Mortimer Levine, West Virginia.
Lawrence M. Lewin, Georgetown.
Sidney Lieberman, Colorado.
Martin S. Lindauer, S.U.N.Y. at Brockport.
John Luna, C. W. Post (L.I.U.).
Zella Luria, Tufts.
Hershel Markovitz, Carnegie-Mellon.
Arthur F. Menton, Polytechnic Institute, B'klyn.
Michael A. Meyer, Hebrew Union.
William R. Meyer, Dartmouth.
Hyman P. Minsky, Washington (St. Louis).
Howard Needler, Colorado.
Marc M. Nezer, Northeastern.
Roy Harvey Pearce, California at San Diego.
Philip Plant, Manhattan Community.
Richard H. Popkin, California at San Diego.
Daniel D. Raylesberg, Fairleigh Dickinson.
Harold Resnick, West Virginia Medical.
H. Alan Robinson, Hofstra.
David C. Ronsenfried, Quinnipiac (Conn.).
Robert Rosenstein, Dartmouth.
Ronald I. Rubin, Manhattan Community.
Michael D. Schmidman, Manhattan Community.
Bernard E. Segal, Dartmouth.
Harvey Senter, Fairleigh Dickinson.
Jack Silberg, Lockhaven State College (Pa.).
Gordon I. Silverman, Dartmouth.
Sidney M. Stabl, Missouri.
Isidore Starr, Queens.
Joseph Sungolowsky, Queens.
Louis Tenenbaum, Colorado.
Philip R. Tromer, Women's Medical College (Phila.).
Carol Shaffer Twersky, Manhattan Community.
Robert C. Vernon, Simmons (Boston).
Chaim I. Waxman, Central Conn. State.
David B. Weisberg, College of Jewish Studies (Chicago).
David Weinstein, S. Alexander Weinstock Manhattanville Hebrew Union.
Martin Wierschin, California at San Diego.
Mary Glenn Wiley, Washington (St. Louis).
William S. Wilson, Queens.
Naomi Woronov, Manhattan Community.
Edith Wyschogrod, Queens.

Join our appeal

As a faculty member I support your appeal for the Jews of Silence and wish to add my name.

Name _____
Dept. _____
Univ. _____
Contribution _____

Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry, 315 Lexington Ave., N.Y.C. 10016, 689-7400.

(This ad was paid for by the signatories.)

A MAN WHO BELIEVED IN AMERICA

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in a very stirring tribute to the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mr. Thurman Sensing, of the Southern States Industrial Council, has written an article which should be read by all Americans. For that reason, I commend it to the attention of the Congress and the Nation as follows:

A MAN WHO BELIEVED IN AMERICA

For millions of Americans the passing of Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States and commander of the allied armies in Europe, provided a solemn occasion for recalling the vital qualities of leadership in this Republic.

Gen. Eisenhower was a product of the American experience and embodied patriotic virtues which are essential to this country if it is to endure. At a time when there is disorder in the land and not inconsiderable disloyalty to its values, as evidenced among the militants of the New Left, it is timely to bear in mind what is basic to greatness and to the survival of the American system.

Nowadays, militants angrily denounce "The System," and call for its overthrow or radical alteration. The militants have their camp followers in politics who try to sell the idea that the United States is riddled with imperfections and in need of radical reconstruction. Some officeholders, sad to say, believe that it is smart to adopt the New Left's slogans about this being a land of hunger and hardship.

Dwight Eisenhower was a product of the American System, and his success in life demonstrates how effective and worthwhile that system is. He was born into a family of modest means. His father was a worker in a creamery in Abilene. Today, "liberals" no doubt would describe his family as "deprived" or "disadvantaged." But the Eisenhower family didn't see itself that way. Members of the family worked hard; they had faith in America. Not only the future President but his brothers did well in careers, achieving substantial success. The story of the Eisenhower family is the story of countless other American families of modest means who believed in the virtues of work, thrift, and loyalty to God and country.

The man who later in life was to command the largest force of free men ever committed to battle was a man brought up to believe in self-reliance. He didn't have the comforts and pleasures of other young men from more affluent circumstances, but he didn't complain. He relied on his own abilities and energies. He didn't expect an OEO or any other agency to provide him with instant prosperity.

For the young Eisenhower, service to country was a wonderful opportunity, not something to be avoided by taking refuge in graduate school. Throughout his life, he adhered to West Point's injunction to follow the path of duty, honor and courage. These concepts are a million light years away from what the New Left intelligentsia teaches today. Instead of stressing duty, the "liberal" intellectuals urge young men to avoid national service. Honor is scorned by the Left intelligentsia as an outmoded concept. Instead, they urge the young to seek peace at any price, to believe that it's better to be "Red than dead." Finally, courage in defense of one's country is dismissed by radicals as a shopworn concept. They speak of the virtue of anarchy.

In the eight years that Dwight D. Eisenhower was President, he displayed none of the arrogance of power characteristic of some of his predecessors and successors. Though his administration disappointed some conservatives who hoped for a thorough house-cleaning of entrenched radical elements in the federal government, President Eisenhower was not afraid to show his belief in free enterprise. He brought businessmen into the Cabinet. As a result, America's affluence gained greatly in the 1950's. Home ownership grew enormously during the Eisenhower years. American society was strengthened and stabilized.

Like other outstanding men, Gen. Eisenhower made mistakes in his appointments and his policies, but he acknowledged mistakes. He was extremely reluctant to give moral approval to court-ordered experiments with public education. It has been written that he felt he erred greatly in using troops at Little Rock in 1956.

In the main, however, Gen. Eisenhower was in the central current of American thinking. He understood the strength of the American "system," and upheld it as a model of opportunity and enlightenment. He had no use for the strident doctrines of social revolution. He rejected the demagoguery and truth-twisting that is involved in describing America as a land of hunger and poverty. His confidence in the United States and its essential goodness and greatness should be remembered for years to come.

DAVID J. STEINBERG DISCUSSES FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, David J. Steinberg, secretary and chief economist of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, has written an excellent paper entitled "Our Foreign-Trade Policy Is Bankrupt" which urges a commitment to free trade that advances beyond mere rhetoric. I commend this paper to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD:

OUR FOREIGN-TRADE POLICY IS BANKRUPT

(By David J. Steinberg)

There is a serious infirmity in our national trade policy. It demands careful attention and an honest diagnosis. Consider the symptoms:

The government knows the general, long-range direction the country must go in an important area of economic policy—we have been going in that direction for 3½ decades. However—

It has not figured out a coherent way of proceeding steadily and confidently toward its ultimate objective in this field;

It is not even ready to articulate clearly and resolutely what the objective is and how quickly it should be sought;

It decides to take a breather (for a year or two or maybe more) to assess its past achievements and the policy terrain ahead, hoping to make some progress in alleviating problems here and there (obviously a patchwork approach);

It shows little if any appreciation of the importance of a definitive U.S. policy in this area to sound decision-making by business, labor, and government; and it appears unaware, or at least not too much concerned, that the loss of policy momentum will give heart and opportunity to interests that have opposed past policy in this field and seem bent on going back to what we thought and hoped were points of no return.

This seems to be a case of policy bankruptcy. And this seems to be where we are in our foreign-trade policy.

It seems strange, almost unbelievable, to say so. The United States for over three decades has advocated and done much to achieve freer world trade—negotiating with other countries the reduction of tariffs and other obstructions to the movement of goods across national borders. In June 1967, after four years of negotiations and a succession of agonizing crunches, it successfully concluded a highly publicized trade agreement (the Kennedy Round) with 52 other governments. It called this agreement "the most comprehensive assault on barriers to international trade that has ever taken place."

But where did we go from there? Where should we have gone from there?

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, perhaps the greatest legislative achievement of the Kennedy Administration, had expired only days after President Johnson signed the epochal trade agreement which this legislation had made possible. Without an extension of the Act, the President lacked meaningful negotiating authority to make tariff adjustments which from time to time become necessary. New legislation was also

needed to ease the apparently too rigid criteria in the 1962 statute for justifying "adjustment assistance" to firms and workers claiming injury from import competition. Our ability to follow the path of genuinely freer world trade would be greatly affected by whether or not this adjustment assistance program could be made workable. Legislation was also needed to implement certain Kennedy Round concessions the United States had made without Congressional authority. In addition, there was the question of what to do about the host of trade barriers the Kennedy Round did not touch, many of which could seriously offset the liberalizing concessions on which agreement had been reached. And beyond all this was the need for the United States to continue to play its unique role in pointing the way to new horizons of world trade expansion, an objective demanding sustained attention for a host of economic and foreign-policy reasons. In a word, all this added up to the need for *momentum*.

To repeated warnings that if we lost momentum we would also lose ground, the Administration made repeated genuflections to "freer trade", which it correctly regarded as essential to our highest priority goals at home and abroad. As to when and how major new efforts to liberalize world trade would be made, at what pace, and with what attempts to secure indispensable Congressional cooperation, it said only that we need a breathing spell, time to digest the results of the Kennedy Round, study our international trade position, and assess new alternatives, before embarking on new initiatives along this rocky road. The subject would be explored with American industry, agriculture, and labor, with members of Congress, and with foreign governments.

A formal study would first be prepared by the Executive agencies following extensive public hearings and close consultation with an advisory committee broadly representative of American industry, agriculture, and labor. Then would come discussions with Congress and foreign governments, to be followed supposedly by a bill delegating negotiating authority to the President to take the next major step in international trade policy.

While this study was under way, President Johnson sent a Trade Expansion Act extension bill to Congress. The bill's main provisions consisted of (a) extending for two years the unused portion of the negotiating authority enacted in 1962, thus providing the "housekeeping" authority needed for occasional tariff adjustments that might become necessary, (b) implementing the concession the Administration had made in the Kennedy Round without specific Congressional authorization, and (c) easing the injury test for adjustment assistance. In addition to these concrete objectives, there were two important dimensions of our overall trade-policy posture that would be affected significantly by the fate of this bill: the general credibility of U.S. commitments in international trade negotiations, and the durability of America's avowed interest in seeking genuinely freer world trade. Once more that ubiquitous question of "image."

Hearings were held last summer on this bill and on future U.S. trade policy in general, but only in the House of Representatives. Since no action was taken by the House Ways and Means Committee, the bill died in the House; and since the House must constitutionally be the originator of such measures in Congress, there was no opportunity for action by the Senate, which had little interest in the proposal anyway. The major hang-up was the very controversial request for Congressional implementation of the major concession the U.S. negotiators had made on benzenoid chemicals. A more politically astute handling of this issue in the presentation to Congress might have moved the bill further toward enactment.

At any rate, the bill is now no bill at all since the 90th Congress has expired. The Johnson Administration should have sent it up again as soon as the 91st Congress convened. But for some reason this was not done. Whether and how the Nixon Administration will attempt to achieve these legislative objectives will be the first major test of President Nixon's intentions in this policy area. Whatever he decides to do regarding these issues, there is still the crucial and highly controversial question of long-range trade policy. The extent to which we have clear and dependable plans for the long term—and the nature of these plans—will affect substantially the effectiveness of whatever ad hoc maneuvering the new Administration may attempt in the next year or two with respect to this or that trade barrier. It will also affect materially the Administration's effectiveness in dealing with a host of other policy goals from fighting inflation to fostering international cooperation. Without a *free-trade* strategy, raising the sights of the major trading nations to the highest objectives, our efforts to cope with the nitty gritty of particularly troublesome trade barriers, possibly with a few exceptions, will founder in fruitless bickering. And efforts to cope with the other policy issues that may now seem to far outrank trade policy in priority will lack the steam they need for the kind of success that is already nothing short of urgent.

Despite the many policy imperatives that underscore the need for immediate action with respect to long-range trade policy, and despite also the considerable understanding and expertness the Government already has in this policy area, long-range strategy will apparently have to wait the outcome of a new study of the whole issue by the Nixon Administration, to be followed by exploratory talks with Congressional leaders at home and foreign governments abroad. The Administration's vision and vigor in this policy area will set the sights and the tone of these political consultations. The course it will follow is very much in doubt.

The Johnson Administration's appraisal of future trade-policy needs was completed in January 1969. The report assesses a wide array of U.S. trade probelms and emphasizes the need to cope with them as quickly as possible. "Freer trade" is the theme and the goal, as it has been in all trade-policy studies sponsored by the Executive Branch for the past three decades. However, a clear, definitive, comprehensive initiative is not advocated, one that can deal adequately with the multitude of trade issues confronting the United States and the world economy. In any event, the Nixon Administration is not likely to accept this lame-duck report as a basis for its own planning in this field, just as the Eisenhower Administration shelved the so-called Bell Report on trade policy prepared in the closing months of the Truman Administration and undertook its own study via the Randall Commission (its chairman was Clarence Randall, retired steel executive and Eisenhower's special assistant for international economic affairs). The new Administration may be expected to do something not very different.

President Nixon may think he has enough prbolems on his hands at home and abroad without proposing a major new trade-policy initiative. Trade policy is always very controversial. He will probably reason that to propose a new major step toward freer trade would compound his already monumental problems in other policy areas. Trade policy could certainly not be neglected. Nor would it be. Since we have much to complain about in the barriers other countries impose against U.S. exports and in the subsidization of foreign exports to the U.S. market, the Administration could make a show of concern with trade policy by concentrating on these issues. It could be expected to cloak this activity in the garb of U.S. insistence on something called "fair competition." "Getting tough" with foreign governments, and doing some patchwork negotiating on this or that trade barrier, will probably be the emphasis of Nixon's trade policy at least for the first two years of his Administration, a period in which his own "Randall Commission" study might be prepared on what to do next. It might be just the kind of approach he thinks he needs to establish himself as a supporter of "freer trade" and at the same time cultivate the support of legislators, business executives, and union leaders who not only oppose new freer-trade initiatives but are advocating import controls. He is supposed to be a political pragmatist, and all this sounds quite pragmatic—politically, that is. What it could do to our other policy goals, and to the President's political stake in furthering them, is something else.

Freer-trade momentum was lost in the last two years of the Johnson Administration. The Administration wasn't even ready with a contingency plan if the always teetering Kennedy Round failed. The Nixon Administration seems at least equally unprepared to cope with the trade issues it found upon assuming office and that will grow more serious unless tackled vigorously and quickly. The Republican Party platform on this subject provides poor guidance. It would move the nation backward not forward, advocating import controls in the interest of something called "fair competition."

Studies and discussions are certainly vital ingredients of sound policy-making. Insistence that other governments carry out their commitments and stick to the international rules of the road in their commercial policies is essential. But these steps do not add up to a meaningful policy, even when punctuated by ad hoc negotiations on one or another trade barrier, and all to the accompaniment of pious declarations about abstract national goals and intentions. Such declarations may be expected in abundance from the White House and the various Executive agencies, just as much in the future as in the past. But the substance and intent of U.S. trade policy will be very much in doubt.

To be worthy of the name, trade policy must be more than posture, much more. It should have motion, dynamism, and determination, reflecting confidence in the merits of the end that is sought and the means of achieving it. It should involve domestic as well as foreign economic policy. It should define the national interest, not only in terms of the needs of the nation as a whole, but also in terms of the welfare of each State and the contribution each can make to maximizing the collective benefits for all fifty. To gain the indispensable cooperation of Congress, the Administration must show by deed as well as intent that it *cares* about the local economic problems that inspire protectionist opposition to freer foreign access to the U.S. market. It must show a sincere interest in seeking the cooperation of legislators, governors, and mayors, as well as business and labor, in the search for constructive, enduring solutions to problems that may be caused or seriously aggravated by rising imports.

Until the Executive Branch articulates trade policy in these terms, freer trade on a sustained, consistent basis—and this means seeking the ultimate dismantling of all barriers to legitimate international commerce by the economically advanced countries—will be an idle dream.

Such a trade policy in the national interest not only does not now exist. It is not on the drawing board, and probably will not be attempted until a crisis situation impels us to raise our sights to this level, much as the freer-trade policy of the past 3½ decades was created in the crucible of one world crisis (the economic depression of the early 1930's) and strengthened in the crucible of another (the postwar reconstruction crisis of the late 1940's). The void will be costly to the nation

and hence politically costly to the Administration presiding over the resulting national slippage in economic strength, political credibility, and policy leverage.

Without sustained progress toward freer trade, and consistant domestic economic policies effectively facilitating adjustment to rising foreign competition and to the many other challenges of change, protectionism (meaning pressures for one form or another of import control) will rise at home and abroad, leading to antagonisms bearing many of the earmarks of trade warfare. While the U.S. economy digests the Kennedy Round and the Government decides what to do next, this highly touted Geneva pact may get tattered and torn by trade restrictions sought by many businessmen and labor unions in most if not all the countries that negotiated the agreement. By the time the United States recognizes the need for a new comprehensive initiative in trade liberalization and a new request for Congressional authority to negotiate it, trade barriers and popular sentiment behind such restrictions—in the United States and abroad—may have increased to the extent of opening a huge gap in the credibility of U.S. trade policy declarations, and a huge moat for the next round of trade negotiations to cross.

A trade policy of wait-and-see—a breathing spell, or call it a state of suspended animation—is tantamount to a vacuum. Protectionist pressures may be natural, but, unlike nature, protectionists do not abhor a vacuum. They adore a vacuum, the better to deploy their formidable forces and direct their political firepower against the introspective and indecisive phalanxes of the so-called "free traders." The protectionists have been doing their homework, not on economic adjustment and the imperatives of the national interest, but on the rudiments of American politics. They have been pumping up the pressure on their representatives in Congress, demanding support and getting it for bills to restrict imports and for demands on the President to get foreign governments "voluntarily" to reduce their exports to us. Any success they can achieve in these demands—even a little success would be as incapable of extension to a wider range of products as being a little bit pregnant—would tarnish the reliability of U.S. trade-policy declarations and damage our leverage at every international conference table. Our economic objectives at home and abroad—including the need to control inflation, stimulate competition, expand exports, and strengthen world confidence in the dollar—would be impaired.

In this field as in many others, you either move ahead or you fall back. "It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place," the Queen said to Alice, "If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast." At this stage in the development of America's substantial stake (economic, diplomatic, and security) in expanding world trade, we cannot afford to sit back to contemplate our policy achievements and objectives. As Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote over 100 years ago:

"I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand,
As in what direction we are moving . . .
We must sail sometimes with the wind and sometimes against it,
But we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at anchor."

At this late date, we ought to know where we want to go and how best to get there. If momentum is lost, uncertainty grows at home and abroad about the purposefulness and pace of U.S. trade policy and, in turn, about the wisdom and dependability of our other policies.

Protestations about being for "freer trade" will not do any longer. The term has increasingly lost meaning. Thirty-four years ago when Cordell Hull launched his imaginative trade agreements program "freer trade" marked a new departure in U.S. trade policy. Great strides have been made under this banner since World War II. Today, however, it has become an abstraction subject to a wide range of interpretations, some of them 180 degrees apart. There is probably not a member of the 91st Congress who will not identify himself with it—naturally his own definition. He will have no difficulty reconciling "freer trade" with his special pleas for restricting imports that some of his constituents may be complaining about.

The Executive Branch itself has not been without blemishes in its pledge to "freer trade." It has yielded too many times to pressure for trade restrictions of one kind or another, regarding these, sometimes pridefully, as tactical political ploys, expedient compromises to keep the ship of state on the general, long-term course of trade liberalization. Abhorring legislated import quotas, it has at times urged foreign countries to "voluntarily" restrict their exports to our market as a device to neutralize domestic pressures for import-quota legislation. The Eisenhower Administration successfully urged the Japanese to restrict shipments of cotton textiles to the United States. The Kennedy Administration negotiated a multilateral international agreement on cotton textiles. The Johnson Administration persuaded foreign suppliers to restrict shipments of meat and steel to the U.S. market, and negotiated a three-year extension of the cotton-textiles arrangement. The Nixon Administration is seeking a similar agreement on other textiles, something its predecessors could not achieve. Whatever the domestic political success of these tactics in the short run (in terms of temporarily holding off pressures for import quotas), their longer-run implications are harmful. The Administration that follows this route (a) seems in effect to agree that the industry demanding such controls needs government help, even without an objective government finding justifying such assistance, (b) may too often find itself in the trap of political inability to phase out such restrictive arrangements and reject domestic pressures for new ones, and (c) shows itself before the world to be unable to stick to the trade-policy principles it extols so eloquently as standards for other countries to follow. More than that, it has no control over the price policies of U.S. companies that benefit from such protection against foreign competition.

Backing and filling may in some cases be necessary on the always choppy waters of trade relations with the rest of the world. But these tactics always involve a cost, and usually a net loss, to our overall national goals. This is so, particularly when import controls (direct or indirect) are not (and they never are) the short-term measures they should be—measures to buy time for a balanced package of adjustment remedies to deal constructively with the causes of the problem. Major examples of how trade restrictions persist without end are those on petroleum, cotton textiles, and agricultural products.

This is not to say that America's continuing advocacy of freer world trade is just rhetoric. There is some noticeable and useful motion. We are urging other governments to abstain from additional import barriers and from unfair methods of export promotion. We are interested in tackling the whole sticky problem of non-tariff barriers, which loom larger as tariffs are reduced. We are exploring ways of giving the less-developed countries freer access to the markets of the industrialized countries, hence a better opportunity to earn their own way in the world, less dependent on outside financial aid. But the Johnson Administration did not design a comprehensive, coherent way to relate these and the other dimensions of our trade policy goals, nor the kind of international negotiation in which these issues might most effectively be resolved. The Nixon Administration seems unready to do any better.

The reason for this lack of preparedness is refusal, for philosophical and political reasons, to urge *free trade* as the trade-policy goal of the economically advanced countries, and a new and early initiative to achieve it. The United States shies away from such a policy, even though it is essential to significant progress in our efforts (i) to expand world trade, (ii) to help the developing countries, (iii) to stimulate European unity on terms not harmful to our need for expanding access to these markets, (iv) to combat inflation, (v) to strengthen our international payments position, and (vi) to encourage our free enterprise system to go all out to innovate, generate jobs, and increase our overall productivity and rate of economic growth.

A free-trade arrangement would have to be more than a timetable for dismantling trade barriers. It would have to be a charter. Codes of fair international competition would be necessary to defend against predatory dumping and other unfair business practices, and to prohibit or at least limit government policies that give locally produced goods an unfair advantage over foreign competition at home and in foreign markets. The timetable would involve different phasing for countries on significantly different rungs on the ladder of economic development—generally more rapid for the United States than for, say, Australia. Trade barriers would be removed more rapidly for some products than others—more rapidly for items like machinery and chemicals and least rapidly for items like textiles and certain agricultural products. The "developing countries" would be allowed to benefit indiscriminately from the removal of trade barriers by the "free trade" contracting parties without having to provide equivalent reciprocity. They should, however, be asked to make broad, even if unenforceable, policy commitments regarding the gradual lowering of their own trade barriers.

There is no better, more effective way to get rid of the heavy thicket of nontariff barriers (NTB's)—those we know of and those that may sprout unless an effective anti-NTB toxin is applied—than to negotiate their removal through a free-trade commitment with the Free World's other industrialized countries. There is no better way to negotiate on some or all of these trade restrictions than to deal with al. tariff and nontariff barriers in a single negotiation. There is no better way to make certain the achievement of full reciprocity for all the participating countries. Such a negotiating objective adds up to free trade. Why not recognize it? Why not "say it like it is?"

However, the United States shows a readiness and a capability to do little more about the NTB thicket in the next few years than identify the various species and tackle them in patch-quilt fashion. And with what authority to commit the United States? None where any change in U.S. statutory law is concerned. Nor, in general, is it feasible politically or sound conceptually to request negotiating authority from Congress regarding specific nontariff barriers. (What about the others?, Congress might and ought to ask, and don't our negotiators need flexibility to maneuver effectively in this NTB thicket?) Without delegated authority from Congress, the Administration (in cases where U.S. statutory law is involved) would have to ask Congress to pass special legislation implementing the U.S. commitments agreed to. Uncertainty as to how Congress would respond to such requests would seriously impair the negotiations themselves.

Some experts in this field propose a "sense of Congress" resolution urging U.S. initiative

in negotiating the diminution or removal of nontariff barriers. Aside from the possible protectionist qualifications Congress might append to such a resolution, it is certain that the Administration would use the resolution as the basis for negotiating agreements on nontariff barriers, then confront Congress with *baits accomplis* and requests for their implementation. Congressional resistance would be attacked as damaging to the U.S. image and future negotiating leverage. The "sense of Congress" resolution would turn out to be a kind of Gulf of Tonkin resolution in the field of trade policy. Congress might ex post facto authorize U.S. participation in one or two such agreements, but it is likely to balk at automatically approving more of these patch-quilt pacts. Sooner or later we shall have to insist upon a more coherent approach to trade-barrier negotiations, one that ensures full reciprocity across the board of all tariff and nontariff restrictions. The patch-quilt approach ensures adequate reciprocity in neither the individual agreements negotiated nor those to be concluded in the future. It involves the risk of being left with insufficient leverage for future negotiations.

A comprehensive negotiation embracing all trade barriers is by far the most productive alternative, and free trade is the only meaningful objective of such a negotiation—particularly since the only way to deal with most nontariff barriers is to negotiate their complete removal (for the others, standards to govern their administration), and the logic of tariff cutting surely leads to zero duties.

If the Administration showed it was ready for an early and determined effort to negotiate such a free-trade charter, it conceivably could get support from quarters now either neutral or urging import restrictions. It might get the support (at least neutralize the opposition) of many of the industries that opposed the recent trade negotiations because of the tariff disparities and the host of NTB's that would remain. Many of these industries have since been urging Congress to legislate import controls. It might get the support of organized labor if there were a credible adjustment-assistance backstop to the free-trade initiative, and if the free-trade arrangement included an international code of objectives on labor standards. Indeed, the best chance for negotiating codes on labor standards, business practices, government procurement policies and other controversial aspects of contemporary international economic life is a free-trade charter that makes all these other agreements not just *desirable* as adjuncts of free trade but *indispensable* to making free trade a meaningful, practical goal.

There is no better, more effective way to open up and expand stable world markets for the whole range of goods the less-developed countries (LDC's) can produce than for the economically advanced countries to move to completely free trade. But the chief and only new proposal on the U.S. agenda to improve the trade position of the LDC's is a declared readiness to explore preferential tariff treatment for the goods of developing countries. This is not all that it seems, for there is no determination to phase out existing quota restrictions on textiles and other shipments from these areas and to avoid new restraints of this kind. Nor is it clear how this trade policy toward the LDC's meshes with our trade-policy goals vis-a-vis the rest of the world. Or how a proposal to grant preferential treatment to imports from the world's lowest-wage countries can be made politically palatable in Congress when there are no major plans for achieving freer access to the higher-wage, economically advanced countries, the best foreign markets for the goods in which we excel, produced on the whole by our highest-paid workers. Nor is any reference made to the policy commitments on trade and development we should seek from the LDC's.

When our Government says it will consider tariff preferences for the economically backward nations—a rather recent departure from previously firm resistance to such an idea—it is only resorting to a gimmick which the less-developed countries have been urging on us with mounting vigor. In the absence of dependable determination to really open our market to the goods of countries at all levels of economic development, we have no other alternative to saying "no" and thus risking serious damage to our overall policy objectives in the world's southern hemisphere. Yet we are running this very risk in our current trade-policy offerings to the developing countries. At best, we are unwittingly fooling them and fooling ourselves, too.

There is no better, more effective way to stimulate the American free-enterprise system to go the limit in enterprise and innovation than to set free trade by the industrialized countries as a definitive goal of U.S. policy. "Freer trade" would itself achieve a degree of credibility and dependability it has not possessed for a long time. Businessmen with an important stake in accurately assessing the prospects for freer foreign access to our market and freer U.S. access to markets abroad would have a precise premise to plug into their decisions on investment, prices, designs, and sales promotion. The nation is counting heavily on U.S. producers to expand job opportunities at home and U.S. export earnings abroad at a greatly accelerated pace. But their government is not providing them with the most productive of trade-policy guidelines. In fact, the delay in doing so tends to retard the productivity of our economy; it also contributes to decisions that may not be able to withstand the growing impact of international competition.

A wait-and-see trade policy, one that has lost its momentum toward genuinely freer trade, reflects a failure to grasp the realities of today's world. Business at home and abroad will not stand still waiting for the United States Government to make up its mind. Judgments will continually have to be made, come what may, on how and when money will be invested, how products will be designed and priced, and so forth. The best possible reading on the prospects for import competition and export opportunity is an important prerequisite for sound business decisions across the board. Visibility, however, becomes murky if uncertainty clouds our trade policy. The road ahead is made particularly perilous by the fact that the Administration's uncertain trumpet in effect sounds "charge" to those forces at home and abroad bent on raising, not razing, trade restrictions.

Business decisions made in this kind of policy atmosphere may turn out to have been poor calculations when confronted with growing world competition and the more definitive trade policy that will eventually have to be adopted. This policy will most probably be toward freer trade, but when, how fast, and after how much back-sliding in the intervening years is anyone's guess and hardly anything to bank on. Many producers at home and abroad will in the meantime have developed a vested interest in past decisions. They will strongly oppose significantly freer foreign access to the U.S. market, for it might, they would fear, place in jeopardy the products and investments stemming from the whole array of earlier commitments.

Distortions would also creep into the economic development programs of Federal, state, and local governments. There would be no urgency to insist upon industrial and agricultural projects (and labor retraining programs) able to cope effectively with unrestricted foreign competition. Too many uneconomic ventures could result, involving not only the unwise spending of taxpayers' money, but the fostering of a vested business, labor, and community interest in preserving types of production no longer fully consonant with our country's position in a rapidly changing world economy. Distortions, and corresponding vested interests in the consequences, would also occur abroad as businessmen make investments, and governments make trade and development decisions, that cannot be held in abeyance waiting for genuinely and consistently freer world trade to become a reality.

The old and new Administrations have been greatly and rightly concerned over the balance of payments and the sharp decline in our gold reserves. At the very heart of our balance-of-payments position is the state of world confidence in the U.S. dollar. That's the name of the game. If there is uncertainty about the dependability of America's avowed commitment to freer trade, there will be rising uncertainty, indeed apprehension, over U.S. policies in general and over the future strength of the dollar, adding up to the best way to weaken our balance-of-payments position. Yet the Government seems to be saying that these risks are outweighed by the need for a "breather" and by fear of how Congress would react if the Administration expressed clearly and forthrightly a determination to achieve truly freer trade, meaning ultimate free trade.

If properly orchestrated, with appropriate emphasis on the domestic as well as the foreign-policy aspects of the program, a free-trade policy would strengthen the dollar immeasurably. Taking careful account of the implications of free trade for import competition and export opportunity, business decisions will tend to promote a much more efficient use of human, technological, and financial resources than could conceivably evolve under any other kind of trade policy. The purchasing power of the dollar would be strengthened. The decision to seek free trade would itself dramatize the vitality of the American economy and the health of the American dollar. Movement toward free trade in accordance with a negotiated timetable would test the fixed exchange rate of the dollar. Is it overvalued, as some economists contend? Maybe it will turn out to be undervalued. The overall consequences of a free-trade initiative—the changes stimulated and the disciplines imposed—could set the stage for replacing the fixed-exchange-rate system with a "floating rate" system at least as far as the world's major currencies are concerned.

Our bankrupt trade policy also handicaps our effort to help the United Kingdom, our closest ally, and the pound sterling, in which perhaps a third of the world's business is transacted. If a U.S. free-trade initiative could help open the way for Britain to acquire free access to a large international market (in a way that protects U.S. interests), then the trade policy best calculated to strengthen the dollar would go a long way to strengthen the pound, the other "key currency" in the world's money system.

We are not prepared to offer Britain an alternative if the European Common Market persists in rejecting London's application to join the European Community. All members of the European Free Trade Association, as well as Canada and other industrialized countries, need free access to a much larger market than their own national or regional borders provide. The only sound solution, economic and political, would be a free-trade arrangement embracing all the industrialized countries. This would ipso facto heal the breach in Western Europe. The West European countries would still require regional economic and political institutions to strengthen both their ability to accelerate economic progress and their cohesiveness at international conference tables.

U.S. policy should not divert the attention of Britain and the other members of the European Free Trade Association from the need to establish a very close association with the Continent. A U.S. free-trade initia-

tive soundly conceived and articulated would not make that mistake. Exploration of free-trade possibilities with any industrialized countries interested in the idea suggests the possibility that a free-trade arrangement with some but not all of these areas might be attempted. This could happen. It would have many drawbacks, economic and political. It should not be sought except as an alternative of last resort. What is much more likely is that an astutely expressed U.S. interest in free trade will dramatically raise the sights of all these countries and lead to a free-trade charter embracing them all.[1]

It is conceivable that the countries now comprising the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association might get together without a new U.S. trade initiative. There are centripetal as well as centrifugal forces at work in Western Europe. The United States would then be confronted with a new and more formidable economic force across the Atlantic, one that could pose new protectionist obstacles to U.S. exports and those of other outside suppliers. On the other hand, this united Western Europe might seek U.S. cooperation in achieving free trade on the part of all economically advanced countries. The United States must be ready with a very flexible negotiating position to respond to either contingency, and hopefully to influence the choice of options. There is today nothing in our trade policy that raises the sights and strengthens the hand and the resolve of those in Western Europe and elsewhere who seek the end of economic nationalism in the world's economically advanced countries—regional "nationalism" as well as that of the nation-state variety.

It looks as if the United States will flounder in these policy inconsistencies at least until 1970, and most likely beyond that. The major reasons for this delay may be summarized as follows:

The new Administration's assessment of trade policy should not be expected to be completed before the end of 1969. As explained earlier, the only initiative it can propose that would be meaningful in terms of all the policy goals significantly affected by what is decided in trade policy is negotiation of a free-trade time-table in cooperation with the other economically advanced countries of the Free World. To negotiate such an agreement, the White House will need the broadest, most flexible delegation of Congressional authority. This would essentially be authority "to negotiate trade agreements in the national interest", within the framework of policy goals such as the need to accelerate U.S. economic growth, promote international cooperation, help the less-developed countries, protect our national security, and facilitate adequate adjustment to the challenges of increasingly freer international competition.

The political battle to get this legislation enacted will make previous trade-policy engagements on Capitol Hill seem like a Sunday picnic. Supporters of this new initiative—a logical extension of the policy of the past 3½ decades—will have to mount the most extensive effort yet undertaken to develop a national consensus behind a "liberal trade policy." The issue will be so controversial, and the political effort so gigantic, that at least a full year of public education will be necessary before Congressional majorities can muster sufficient courage to pass such legislation. Doubts about its political practicality in an election year could keep it from a vote until 1971. A President looking ahead to a re-election drive in 1972 might shy away from such an explosive issue, particularly one that many millions of Americans are not likely to regard as urgent. This might rule out 1972. By 1973, so much ground may have been lost to the protectionists around the world that patch-quilt repairs may be the only practical course of action, rather than the far-sighted new initiatives that are already so necessary.

On the other hand, the problem of U.S. trade relations with the rest of the world may have become so serious by that time as to provide the stimulus for a dramatic new initiative to dismantle the trade barriers of the economically advanced countries. Better late than never, but the price the American economy and the world economy may in the interim have to pay for the delay could be considerable. The huge price we are paying for government neglect going back many decades in so many policy areas should be a most sobering lesson. The bills for policy neglect fall due with much greater speed these days than ever before.

The nation is caught in this mire of policy immobility—to a large extent the result of protectionist pressures and the fear of more—despite the fact that protectionism has been discredited time and again. The costly consequences of record-high tariffs enacted in 1922, and the still higher tariffs imposed by the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, aroused almost universal determination to reject such options outright and always. The economic expansion recorded at home and abroad over the past third of a century—in step with and assisted by progress toward freer trade—strengthened this resolve. Yet protectionism persists in rising from the ashes.

The businessmen, workers, legislators and community leaders who keep it alive seem as fearful of a changing world as once the Luddites of early 19th century England feared the Industrial Revolution. They prefer seriously out-dated road maps that would divert the nation's attention from the higher and more efficient production, improved and more attractively priced products—toward which it should be resolutely headed. These so-called protectionists, and this means anyone who does not believe in consistent, sustained progress toward free trade, take a myopic view of their own enlightened self-interest and that of their country. What is bad for the nation cannot turn out to be good for them.

They see industrial development abroad as a threat, not as the market opportunity it really is in addition to stimulating better performance from our own producers. Our exports go mainly to countries that are the most advanced industrially and the most resourceful in their ability to compete. The protectionists keep harping on the gap between U.S. labor standards and the lower wages abroad. Even using improved machinery, much of it as good as ours and sometimes better, foreign producers generally are still at the lower end of a productivity gap that shows the American economy producing much more per man per hour than any other country. American producers complaining about foreign producers having the most modern equipment in addition to lower wage standards usually fail to recognize, at least publicly, that the American economy has not reached the limit of its ability to develop and install new equipment unsurpassed anywhere in the world. There is no limit to the new production frontiers inviting the ingenuity of the American type of free enterprise system. The day the United States decides that such a limit has been reached is the day it should decide to fold its tent and cease to exist as a nation.

The protectionists zero-in on imports, but do little if anything to help find constructive, lasting answers to the real problems that beset the complaining companies and workers—their difficulty in keeping in step with the pressures of a rapidly changing and highly competitive economy here at home.

As if the confrontation with protectionism didn't pose enough problems, the very few Americans who actively seek free trade cannot even count on the energies of the so-called "free traders." The "free traders" also have fears. Nearly all of them are afraid to urge "free trade." Not that they don't believe in it. They fear the political flack such proposals are certain to attract; they haven't figured out how to make such an initiative politically palatable. Only a handful of brave souls with a fistful of courage and a head of steam—all of them not only idealists but veterans in the politics of this issue—today carry the "free trade" standard. Thus the bankruptcy in foreign-trade policy isn't just a government malaise. It is practically nationwide.

A free-trade timetable? For an initiative in dire need of drama, what more dramatic target for completing the dismantling of trade barriers by the world's most advanced nations—far enough away to be practical—than the year 2000? Only 31 years to go. The next third of a century, starting from today's high economic and technological plateau, ought to be a much easier course of trade liberalization than the last, which began in the trough of the Great Depression and on the way up had to endure hot wars and cold wars and crises at the brink of nuclear holocaust. Among the things making it easier are the confidence bred of past achievement, a growing impatience with unachieved ideals, a "revolution of rising expectations" not only in distant lands but right here at home, and improved economic, political and social techniques for solving whatever problems we face. The free-trade objective would probably be reached well before the end of the century.

President Kennedy spoke of new frontiers, and in one of the major achievements of his short tenure persuaded Congress to enact trade legislation that included a substantial amount of authority to negotiate free trade. Most of this authority was not used in the Kennedy Round because of circumstances beyond our control. Britain's failure to join the European Economic Community made virtually inoperative the major component of the free-trade authorization, which hinged on the condition that the U.S.-plus-EEC share of world trade in the particular product had to be at least 80 percent. But success in getting this much free-trade authority enacted was a major accomplishment. It should be a source of encouragement to those who seek newer frontiers.

President Johnson envisioned a Great Society. A commitment to free trade, with backstop domestic policies to make sure we stay the course, would go a long way to make a truly great society a reality. At one time or another, Johnson spoke rhetorically of such a trade objective and, in a different context, of the kind of spirit and determination necessary to achieve it:

In 1964: "Somehow, we must ignite a fire in the breast of this land, a flaming spirit of adventure that soars beyond the ordinary and the contented, and really demands greatness from our society, and demands achievement in our Government."

In 1966: Our goal is to free the trade of the world—to free it from arbitrary and artificial constraints."

This is the goal, and the spirit needed to achieve it. President Nixon's "Forward Together" will probably point in the same direction, and in words that match Johnson's rhetoric. How much substance will be given to this lofty prose, and when, are steeped in considerable doubt.

[1] Those who currently advocate a free trade area consisting of the United States and as many other industrialized countries as want to join at this time (Britain and Canada are usually mentioned as part of the nucleus) have moved directly to advocacy of a precise arrangement. This is politically unrealistic, domestically and internationally. Much to be preferred is a carefully composed orchestration of the free-trade theme, beginning with an overture.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S REVIEW OF THE 1970 BUDGET

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, for general information and reference purposes of Members and others who may be interested, I am inserting herewith the report summarizing the results of the review of the 1970 budget, released yesterday by the Executive Office of the President.

It is only a summary, but supplies in capsule form the proposed and projected changes in the budgets for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 submitted by President Johnson in January of this year. In summary, President Nixon proposes or projects:

For the current fiscal year 1969, budget receipts of $186.1 billion; budget outlays, expenditures, and net lending—of $184.9 billion, an updating of $1.2 billion from the January projection; and a projected budget surplus of $1.2 billion as against the $2.4 billion surplus projection for 1969 in the January budget.

It should be noted that while the review—and this is true for both fiscal years 1969 and 1970—reflects the new administration's recommendations for changes in proposals and projections as to new appropriations and budget outlays, it does not reflect any change in the revenue assumptions used in President Johnson's budget. Thus the revised projected surplus figure for 1969 of $1.2 billion and the currently projected surplus of $5.8 billion for fiscal 1970 are subject to qualification on that count. And it is pertinent to recall that about $12 billion of the 1970 revenue projection assumes legislative extension of the 10 percent surtax and certain excise taxes, enactment of social security taxes effective in fiscal 1970, and adoption of certain user charges. A postal rate increase is also proposed.

For the forthcoming fiscal year 1970 which begins on July 1 next, unrevised budget receipts are shown at the Johnson budget figure of $198.7 billion; revised budget outlays are projected at $192.9 billion, a net reduction of $2.4 billion from the January budget figure; and a currently projected surplus for 1970 of $5.8 billion, a net increase of $2.4 billion over the $3.4 billion projected in the January budget of President Johnson.

Requests for new budget authority—mostly appropriations—for 1970 are stated at $205.9 billion on the unified budget basis, a net reduction of $4.2 billion from the January budget of President Johnson.

GROSS AND NET CUTBACKS

The review supplies some detail on the point, but in respect to the reductions proposed as a result of the new administration's review, on the projected expenditure—outlay—side for 1970, the gross cutback is listed at $4 billion. But this is partially offset by net "corrections'" of $1.6 billion updating certain projections in the January budget, thus resulting in a net cutback of $2.4 billion in projected budget outlays for 1970.

Similarly, on the requests for new budget authority—mostly appropriations—the gross cutbacks from the January requests are listed at $5.5 billion, partially offset by net "corrections" of $1.3 billion updating certain estimates in the January budget, thus resulting in net cutbacks of $4.2 billion in proposed new budget authority.

RELATION TO FISCAL 1969

In total, President Nixon's review now projects total budget outlays for 1970 to be $8 billion above the corresponding fiscal 1969 total. It proposes, for 1970, total new budget authority $10.2 billion above the corresponding fiscal 1969 figure.

Mr. Speaker, some of the details of the proposed appropriation cutbacks and changes were submitted by the President yesterday. They are in House Documents Nos. 91–98, 99, and 100. Others, involving further appropriation changes and new legislation, are scheduled to follow later.

The complete text of the new administration's review of the 1970 budget follows:

REVIEW OF THE 1970 BUDGET

The Nixon Administration has completed its current review of the fiscal year 1970 budget submitted to the Congress last January by the prior administration. This report summarizes the results of the review.

THE SETTING

Persistent inflation, which has serious consequences for the American people today and if continued would have serious consequences later, makes restraint our only responsible fiscal policy now. As part of this policy of restraint, President Nixon recently requested extension for another year of the temporary income tax surcharge. In addition, he urged postponement of scheduled reductions in the telephone and passenger car excise taxes, and enactment of user charges equal in revenue to those proposed in the January budget. These tax policies were recommended because of the need to maintain Federal revenues and to restrain the growth of private consumption and investment in an already overheated economy.

At the same time, the President recognized—as he had earlier—that Federal spending has been a major cause of the inflation and that expenditure control is an essential part of both sound fiscal policy and responsible management of the Government's affairs. When recommending the revenue measures, therefore, he pledged budget revisions that would reduce Federal spending in 1970 significantly below the amount recommended in the January budget. This pledge was possible because, immediately after taking office in January, the President directed his department and agency heads to undertake a thorough review of the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 budget requests sent to the Congress in January by the outgoing administration.

The President's objectives were threefold:

To make the expenditure cuts that are a necessary part of efforts to combat inflation,

To bring Federal outlays under control, and

To begin redirecting ongoing Federal programs toward his Administration's goals.

BUDGET TOTALS

As shown in Table 1, fiscal year 1969 outlays were estimated at $183.7 billion in the January budget of the outgoing administration. Correction to take into account the effect on estimated outlays of factors beyond the control of the present Administration raise the total by $1.2 billion, to $184.9 billion.

Fiscal year 1970 outlays were estimated at $195.3 billion in the budget of the outgoing administration. Corrections for such uncontrollable changes as interest on the debt and farm price supports raise them by $1.6 billion, to $196.9 billion. Reductions of $4.0 billion were made during the recent review, lowering the total to $192.9 billion.

The Treasury Department has not yet revised its estimate of receipts for either year. These estimates will be revised and made available after the tax returns filed through April 15 have been analyzed.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET TOTALS, FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus
Fiscal year 1969:			
January 1969 budget	186.1	183.7	2.4
Corrections in January estimates		+1.2	−1.2
Corrected budget	186.1	184.9	1.2
Fiscal year 1970:			
January 1969 budget	198.7	195.3	3.4
Corrections in January estimates		+1.6	−1.6
Corrected budget	198.7	196.9	1.8
Changes resulting from budget review		−4.0	+4.0
Revised budget	198.7	192.9	5.8

Because the receipts estimates are the same as those shown in the January budget, all of the changes in budget surplus shown in Table 1 result from revisions in estimated outlays. The 1969 surplus is halved, from $2.4 billion to $1.2 billion, while the 1970 surplus is increased from $3.4 billion to $5.8 billion.

Table 2 summarizes the estimates of budget authority (mainly appropriations), for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

TABLE 2.—BUDGET AUTHORITY TOTALS FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

[In billions of dollars]

Description	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
January 1969 budget	194.6	210.1
Corrections in January estimate	1.1	1.3
Corrected budget	195.7	211.4
Changes resulting from budget review		−5.5
Revised budget	195.7	205.9

Corrections in the fiscal year 1969 estimate of budget authority published in the January budget raise the total by $1.1 billion, from $194.6 billion to $195.7 billion.

Corrections in the original fiscal year 1970 budget authority estimate raise it by $1.3 billion, to $211.4 billion. Decreases proposed by this Administration total $5.5 billion, over $3.0 billion of which is in military programs.

FISCAL YEAR 1969

The revised budget published by the prior administration in January underestimated the cost of some programs and has since been affected by increases in uncontrollable items. As a result, the present Administration inherited a budget which realistically implied $184.9 billion of outlays, rather than the $183.7 billion published in January. The factors accounting for the $1.2 billion adjustment in the January budget estimates are summarized in Table 3. As can be seen from the listing, the adjustments were caused by factors beyond the control of this Administration.

TABLE 3.—*Adjustments in fiscal year 1969 budget outlay estimates*

[In billions]

Effect on higher interest rates on interest on public debt	$0.3
Farm price supports:	
Higher crop yields and/or less consumption (including effect of dock strike)	.6
Retention of advance feed grain payments because of lack of adequate notice to farmers of proposed deferral	.2
Decline in offshore oil lease receipts	.4
Effect on outlays of prior commitments for highway grants	.2
Lower unemployment insurance benefits	−.2
Revised estimates of credits for farm credit agencies	−.1
Other, smaller items, net	−.2
Total	1.2

As Table 4 indicates, the corrections in both budget outlays and budget authority were in nonmilitary programs.

Seven months had passed in fiscal year 1969 before this Administration assumed office and could begin its review. The shortness of time remaining in the fiscal year and the strong momentum of ongoing Federal programs left no opportunity to cut significantly the disbursements to be made before June 30. Nonetheless, every effort is still being made to pare the corrected budget estimates. In order to do so, department and agency heads have been instructed to keep a very tight rein on spending during the remaining weeks of the fiscal year.

TABLE 4.—BUDGET OUTLAYS AND BUDGET AUTHORITY FISCAL YEAR 1969

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget	January budget corrected	Change
Outlays:			
Military [1]	78.4	78.4	----------
Other	105.3	106.5	+1.2
Total	183.7	184.9	+1.2
Budget authority:			
Military [1]	77.0	77.0	----------
Other	117.6	118.7	+1.1
Total	194.6	195.7	+1.1

[1] Department of Defense military functions and military assistance.

SUMMARY OF EFFECT OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT OF 1968

The Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (hereafter referred to as P.L. 90–364) established limitations on 1969 budget authority and outlays that reduced by $10 billion and $6 billion, respectively, the amounts in the 1969 budget sent to the Congress in January 1968. However, in setting the limitations on budget authority and outlays, the Congress excepted certain programs from the required reductions and subsequently added other exceptions. These exceptions amount in total to more than one-half of the revised budget estimate.

The Congress last year made reductions in budget authority significantly greater than required by Section 203 of Public Law 90–364. Total budget authority for 1969 is now estimated at $195.7 billion, which is $1.1 billion more than in the January budget document. Most of this increase is in programs excepted from the statutory limitation, and the total is still well within the legal ceiling.

The current situation with respect to budget outlays is shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5.—BUDGET OUTLAYS FOR 1969—SUMMARY OF EFFECT OF PUBLIC LAW 90–364

[In billions of dollars]

	January 1968 estimate	Current estimate	Change
Programs excepted from Public Law 90–364 limitation:			
Special support of Vietnam:			
Defense	25.8	28.8	+3.0
Economic assistance	.5	.4	−.1
Subtotal	26.3	29.2	+2.9
Interest	14.4	15.5	+1.1
Veterans benefits and services	7.3	7.7	+.4
Social Security Act trust funds	36.0	36.2	+.2
OASI	(24.6)	(24.6)	(+.1)
Disability insurance	(2.6)	(2.6)	(1)
Health insurance	(5.8)	(6.2)	(+.5)
Unemployment insurance	(3.1)	(2.7)	(−.3)
TVA—power proceeds and borrowing	.1	.1	(1)
CCC—price support and related programs	2.8	[2] 3.7	[3] +.9
Public assistance	5.7	[2] 6.2	[3] +.6
Impacted areas (special 1968 supplemental)	----------	.1	+.1
Subtotal	92.6	98.7	+6.1
Remainder—covered by Public Law 90–364 limitation	93.5	86.2	−7.3
Total	186.1	184.9	−1.2

[1] Less than $50,000,000.

[2] Excludes amounts not excepted from Public Law 90–364 outlay limitation.

[3] The exception for farm price supports is limited to $907,000,000 and that for public assistance to $560,000,000 above the January 1968 estimates.

For that portion of the budget covered by the limitation in P.L. 90–364, the current estimate of outlays indicates a reduction of almost $7.3 billion below the January 1968 budget estimate. This compares with $8.8 billion in the printed budget of January 1969; it is nearly $1.3 billion more than the reduction required by P.L. 90–364.

Section 201 of P.L. 90–364 limits—with certain exceptions—the hiring of full-time permanent civilian employees by agencies of the executive branch to 75% of separations, and the hiring of temporary and part-time employees during any month to the number of such employees during the corresponding month of 1967. These limitations are being enforced. A further discussion of Federal employment follows later in this statement.

FISCAL YEAR 1970

As was true of the revised budget for 1969, estimates published in January have since been affected by increases in many of the same uncontrollable items that cause the 1969 budget outlays to be higher. Correction of the January budget to reflect these factors raises estimated outlays from the printed total of $195.3 billion to $196.9 billion and budget authority from $210.1 billion to $211.4 billion. Table 6 identifies the factors accounting for the increase in outlays. The higher estimates for fiscal year 1970 reflect realistically the budget the present Administration faced when it came into office, and are therefore the proper amounts against which to measure the results of this budget review.

TABLE 6.—*Adjustments in fiscal year 1970 budget outlay estimates*

[In billions]

Effect of higher interest rates on interest on public debt	$0.5
Effect of higher interest rates on housing programs, including planned asset sales	.2
Farm price support:	
Higher crop yields and/or less consumption	.2
Retention of advance feed grain payments in fiscal 1969 because of lack of adequate notice to farmers	−.2
Change in accounting for CCC certificates of interest	.5
Decline in offshore oil lease receipts	.4
Unbudgeted claims and judgments	.2
Lower unemployment insurance benefits	−.2
Other, smaller items, net	.1
Total	1.6

NOTE.—Detail does not add to total because of rounding.

Table 7 summarizes the changes resulting from the current budget review; Tables 8 and 9 (attached) show changes in budget outlays and budget authority, respectively, by major agency.

TABLE 7.—BUDGET OUTLAYS AND BUDGET AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1970

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget	January budget corrected	Revised budget	Changes from— January budget	Changes from— January budget corrected
Outlays:					
Military [1]	79.0	79.0	77.9	−1.1	−1.1
Other	116.3	117.9	115.0	−1.3	−2.9
Total	195.3	196.9	192.9	−2.4	−4.0
Budget authority:					
Military [1]	80.6	80.6	77.6	−3.0	−3.0
Other	129.5	130.8	128.3	−1.2	−2.5
Total	210.1	211.4	205.9	−4.2	−5.5

[1] Department of Defense, military functions, and military assistance.

As these tables indicate:

Outlays were reduced $4.0 billion from the corrected January budget.

Budget authority was cut $5.5 billion, thereby shaving the carryover of unspent budget authority which leads to higher future outlays.

Military and military assistance programs account for $1.1 billion (27%) of the $4.0 billion 1970 outlay reduction and $3.0 billion (55%) of the cut in 1970 budget authority, largely—as the Secretary of Defense explained—because of—

Lower consumption of ammunition in Vietnam.

Reorientation of the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile program to the new Safeguard system, and

Modification in plans for procuring short range attack missiles.

Another $1 billion (26%) of the outlay reduction is attributable to modifications in

the proposed legislation to increase social security benefits. The legislative proposal included in the January budget was not transmitted to the Congress by the outgoing administration.

The remaining cuts in budget outlays from the recommendations of the preceding administration affect a wide range of Federal programs.

About $185 million are in international programs, mainly lending activities of the Export-Import Bank and slower disbursement of foreign economic assistance.

Atomic Energy Commission and space program outlays are $140 million lower.

Various agricultural and natural resource programs are reduced by a total of $345 million.

Post Office and transportation program outlay reductions account for most of a $420 million cut in commerce and transportation activities.

Reductions in human resources programs other than the proposed social security legislation (referred to above) amount to $390 million, less than 10% of the total cut although about 30% of Federal outlays are made through these programs.

Veterans program outlays are down $245 million, mostly as a result of sales of assets, comprising 6% of the total reduction.

Outlays for all other programs are $150 million lower.

These reductions are a vital part of the effort to bring inflation and Federal spending under control. But the revised 1970 budget also provides large additional resources for the work that needs to be done in our society. Proposed outlays of $192.9 in fiscal year 1970 will be $8 billion higher than those for fiscal year 1969. The priority given by this Administration to meeting the Nation's urgent domestic civilian needs is evident in the following comparisons of the outlays proposed for fiscal year 1970 with estimated outlays in fiscal year 1969:

Programs to improve our human resources will increase by $5.8 billion, or 10%.

Federal aid to State and local governments will be $3.5 billion—nearly 17%—higher.

The urban share of Federal aid to State and local governments will increase $2.8 billion—or by one-fifth.

Priority has been placed on rebuilding the riot-scarred neighborhoods of our major cities. This $.2 billion effort will be financed from funds already available.

Federal aid to the poor will increase from $24.4 billion to $26.9 billion—over 10%.

About $38 million, including $11 million of District of Columbia funds, has been added to the budget to intensify efforts to combat crime, increasing these funds by about 36%.

Outlays for commerce and transportation and agricultural and natural resource programs will rise by about 6% each.

Spending for space exploration will decline by 8%.

Moreover, this Administration is determined to produce a better return for taxpayers' dollars through a more efficient use of available resources and by redirecting resources into more effective uses. For example—

Reorganization of the Manpower Administration has resulted in the creation of a Federal training and employment service which combines for the first time in one organization responsibility for work, training and placement programs.

A new program for experimental schools is proposed to try out a broad range of alternative methods of teaching children under experimental conditions.

New legislation has been proposed to establish a program of guaranteed loans for construction of hospitals and other health facilities and grants for needed new facilities to help restrain fast-rising medical care costs.

An increase in social security benefits which recognizes the increased cost of living is included in the Administration's proposed 1970 budget.

Postponement of the freeze on welfare aid to families with dependent children will be proposed, and $307 million has been included in the revised budget outlays for this purpose.

A new grant program will be initiated to permit States to participate in directing, coordinating, and improving the effectiveness of manpower training programs.

An office of Minority Business Enterprise has been established in the Department of Commerce to—

assist the establishment of new minority enterprises in the expansion of existing ones, and

concentrate Federal Government resources and involve the business community and others in providing assistance to minority business.

The adjustments needed to finance these and other new programs will not be painless—no reductions could be—and real dedication to expenditure control by both the Congress and the executive branch will be essential to achieving them. In fact, almost 85% of the recommended decreases require congressional concurrence, either as new legislation or in the form of approval of reduced appropriations requests. The other decreases will result from administrative actions taken in accordance with the President's directions.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

As part of the budget review, President Nixon directed that a substantial reduction be made in the level of Federal employment recommended by the preceding administration. As a result, full-time civilian employment in the executive branch on June 30, 1970 will be 47,800 below that recommended in the January budget. The extent to which these reductions will affect specific agencies is shown in Table 10 (attached).

The reductions are being made selectively, in accordance with the priorities of this Administration. Manpower for such vital needs as crime control must and will be increased.

Consistent with the employment limitation objectives, the President is asking the Congress to repeal Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, which imposes restrictions on hiring in the executive branch. This Administration is in full agreement with the objective of Section 201, but experience administering the arbitrary formula it imposes provides ample evidence that it is an inappropriate tool for achieving its objective. The Section 201 limitation imposes especially harsh penalties on agencies with high turnover rates. And it takes insufficient account of the urgency or priorities of public services or of the manpower requirements of programs the Congress has approved since 1966.

CONCLUSION

The current review of the budget is a necessary prerequisite to accomplishing three of this Administration's major objectives.

It is a crucial part of the fiscal restraint made imperative by continuing inflation.

It is the first step in establishing control over Federal spending.

It marks the beginning of a major effort to redirect the course of Federal programs in domestic affairs.

In the last of these areas, the principal objectives of the review were to establish and enforce firm priorities, to move toward basic program reform, and to develop needed new initiatives in solving the social problems of the Nation. These are difficult tasks which cannot be completed in the course of one review. But a solid beginning has been made.

Our work is far from finished. Conditions affecting the Federal budget change constantly. We will, as we must, be alert to potential changes and exert every bit of ingenuity at our command to avoid increases and to take advantages of opportunities for further reductions.

TABLE 8.—BUDGET OUTLAYS, 1969 AND 1970

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	1969 current estimate	1970 January budget corrected	1970 Revised budget	1970 Difference
Agriculture	8,409	7,460	7,197	−263
CCC	(5,492)	(4,620)	(4,482)	(−138)
Commerce	872	1,123	1,079	−44
Defense-military and military assistance	78,400	79,000	77,903	−1,097
Corps of Engineers	1,192	1,200	1,159	−41
Health, Education, and Welfare	46,259	51,779	50,551	−1,228
Trust funds	(32,981)	(36,373)	(35,324)	(−1,049)
Housing and Urban Development	2,017	2,897	2,823	−74
Interior	889	898	830	−68
Justice	517	714	730	+16
Labor	3,503	3,707	3,690	−16
Unemployment trust funds	(2,749)	(2,877)	(2,866)	(−10)
Post Office	929	553	412	−140
State	434	434	428	−5
Transportation	6,211	6,991	6,753	−238
Treasury	16,603	17,566	17,559	−7
Interest on the public debt	(16,300)	(17,300)	(17,300)	(----)
Atomic Energy Commission	2,451	2,594	2,504	−90
General Services Administration	413	415	407	−8
NASA	4,247	3,947	3,897	−50
Veterans' Administration	7,719	7,799	7,554	−245
All other:				
Foreign economic assistance	1,925	1,839	1,760	−79
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,880	1,989	1,870	−119
Other agencies	5,136	6,612	6,538	−74
Allowances for:				
Civilian and military pay increases		2,800	2,800	----
Contingencies		350	200	−150
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions	−5,105	−5,745	−5,745	----
Total	184,901	196,921	192,899	−4,020

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

TABLE 9.—BUDGET AUTHORITY, 1969 AND 1970

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	1969 current estimate	1970 January budget corrected	1970 Revised budget	1970 Difference
Agriculture	8,818	7,797	7,558	−239
CCC	(5,789)	(4,811)	(4,708)	(−103)
Commerce	978	1,061	999	−62
Defense-military and military assistance	76,998	80,646	77,598	−3,048
Corps of Engineers	1,215	1,155	1,012	−143
Health, Education, and Welfare	51,837	59,024	58,415	−609
Trust funds	(38,393)	(43,557)	(43,557)	( )
Housing and Urban Development	3,243	2,978	2,811	−166
Interior	844	834	764	−70
Justice	541	825	841	+17
Labor	4,536	5,103	4,872	−231
Unemployment trust fund	(3,770)	(4,092)	(3,874)	(−218)
Post Office	1,036	750	610	−140
State	422	431	426	−5
Transportation	7,431	7,953	7,765	−188
Treasury	16,588	17,569	17,563	−7
Interest on the public debt	(16,300)	(17,300)	(17,300)	( )
Atomic Energy Commission	2,571	2,468	2,359	−109
General Services Administration	318	300	302	+2
NASA	3,992	3,757	3,712	−45
Veterans' Administration	7,489	8,011	7,881	−130
All other:				
Foreign economic assistance	1,217	2,211	2,175	−36
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,949	2,179	2,048	−131
Other agencies	8,791	8,805	8,786	−19
Allowances for:				
Civilian and military pay increases		2,800	2,800	
Contingencies		500	350	−150
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions	−5,105	−5,745	−5,745	
Total	195,707	211,412	205,901	−5,509

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

TABLE 10. FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AS OF END OF JUNE

[In thousands]

Agency	1968 actual	1969 estimate	Fiscal year 1970 January budget	Fiscal year 1970 Revised budget	Fiscal year 1970 Difference
Department of Defense, military and military assistance	1,256.1	1,235.6	1,235.0	1,215.0	−20.0
Post Office	549.6	564.5	575.7	569.0	−6.7
Subtotal	1,805.7	1,800.1	1,810.7	1,784.0	−26.7
Agriculture	85.4	83.0	86.4	82.7	−3.7
Commerce	26.2	25.4	26.0	25.5	−.5
Department of Defense, civil	32.1	31.3	31.4	31.3	−.1
HEW	106.8	102.6	106.7	102.6	−4.1
HUD	15.0	14.8	16.8	15.3	−1.5
Interior	61.2	59.6	60.9	59.7	−1.2
Justice	34.4	35.6	36.6	38.2	+1.6
Labor	9.8	9.6	9.7	9.6	−.1
State	25.8	25.1	24.6	24.2	−.4
Transportation	58.0	60.4	65.4	63.7	−.7
Treasury	82.1	80.2	85.1	83.4	−1.7
AEC	7.2	7.0	7.3	7.0	−.3
GSA	37.5	36.9	38.1	36.3	−1.8
NASA	32.5	31.7	31.5	31.5	
Veterans	151.0	147.6	152.3	147.6	−4.7
Other agencies:					
AID	17.6	16.6	15.9	15.7	−.2
OEO	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.9	
Selective Service	7.0	6.7	7.0	6.9	−.1
SBA	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	
TVA	12.0	12.4	12.6	12.5	−.1
Panama Canal	14.9	14.8	15.2	15.1	−.1
USIA	11.3	11.0	11.0	10.8	−.2
Miscellaneous agencies	32.2	31.2	32.8	32.6	−.2
Subtotal	867.4	850.6	880.3	859.2	−21.1
Allowance for contingencies			2.5	2.5	
Total	2,673.1	2,650.7	2,693.5	2,645.7	−47.8

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

FORMER CABINET MEMBER SPEAKS OF "IKE"

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, tributes to the late Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower will continue to be paid for a long time—as the impact of his passing penetrates our consciousness. Each day brings to our attention a new and expressive acknowledgment of the integrity of this great leader. Only today I noted a guest editorial in the Lake Forester-Lake Bluff Review, a weekly publication circulated widely in the 12th Illinois Congressional District. This editorial is from the pen of the Honorable James H. Douglas, a resident of Lake Forest, who served as Secretary of the Air Force and Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower. I offer it to my colleagues for their respectful consideration:

A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

(By James H. Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force and Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower)

It is an honor to join with you in expressing our respect and affection for President Eisenhower, our gratitude for his leadership, and our sense of loss in his death. He was a warm and friendly man, whose life was simple in its complete dedication to the service of his country. He had a quality of straightforward integrity which gave confidence to all those who served under him and knew him. GIs knew he was interested in them as individuals, and commanders and staff officers had unflagging trust in his judgment. Difficult problems of disagreement at high levels of authority were sometimes solved—as I have seen—by his asking a single question and quietly stating his decision.

Sometimes in a press conference President Eisenhower would produce a perplexing non sentence, which seemed to please his critics, but his sincerity and persistence in expressing his purpose left no doubt as to his position.

As a nation we were fortunate when General George Marshall selected the Chief of the War Plans Division of the War Department, Major General Eisenhower, to command United States forces in the European theatre. The war had gone badly for England, France and Russia, and few soldiers ever faced and mastered more complicated problems of command. I remember a tribute to Marshall of the Royal Air Force Lord Tedder, Deputy Supreme Commander, who wrote "There was little cheerful about the last stages of the war except the wonderful spirit which existed throughout the allied team, and for which we should be eternally grateful to General Eisenhower."

When he became President in 1953 his first concern was to bring the Korean War to a close. This goal was achieved six months after his inauguration.

His command of great military forces, his understanding of war, and what nuclear war could be, led him to declare that there is no alternative to peace.

I think he would like to have us remember that when he made his "Atoms for Peace" proposal to the United Nations General Assembly, he was seeking the cooperation of the Soviet Union in peaceful uses of atomic energy, and to begin to turn nuclear science from destructive to peaceful purposes.

In his account of the White House years he says that underlying his atoms for peace effort was "the clear conviction that the world was courting disaster in the armaments race, and that something must be done to put on a brake."

Then at Geneva in 1955 President Eisenhower proposed the plan which was called "Open Skies"—for international arms control—under which nations would deliver to each other maps and descriptions of all military installations and permit inspection by air reconnaissance by crews including representatives of the country inspected.

And he would want us also to keep in mind problems inherent in what he called "the conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry"—something new in American experience. He expressed concern "that our scholars not be dominated by federal employment, project allocations and the power of money," and also that "public policy should not become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

General Eisenhower was always concerned with protecting and building the dignity of the individual, regardless of race or creed, in the armed services and in all of American

life. He left us a great example. He greatly loved his country, and there is undying mutual respect and trust between him and his countrymen. We shall miss him.

WASTE DISPOSAL

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have advised my colleagues of the progress made by Government and industry in the many attempts to solve various phases of the waste disposal problem.

I was pleased when the Secretary of the Interior announced in October 1965 that the Bureau of Mines was undertaking a study of how to deal with auto graveyards and to conserve the valuable metals that are a part of every car. To me, the report on that study, which was published in March 1967, was an excellent publication and valuable enough to be given the widest distribution.

To what extent that report was circulated I am not aware, but it occurs to me that somewhere we are falling down in the vital area of communications with respect to what is being done toward resolving the problem of solid waste disposal. In consequence, some municipalities may be putting money into machines and methods that are already obsolete. They are absorbing costs that could be avoided if updated technical information were at hand, for they may be investing in equipment and systems that are as outdated as the model T.

Perhaps the Office of Solid Waste Disposal has in its few years of life accumulated enough information to ascertain whether there is in fact a knowledge gap that can be narrowed through a clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of progress reports throughout the field of waste disposal. It is for this reason that I am asking that Office for recommendations to broaden exchange of information among Federal, State, and local governments as well as with affected industries.

I am also interested in knowing whether it would be possible to determine if a part of the effort aimed at solving the disposal problem may actually be moving counter to the Nation's long-range interest. I have always opposed proposals to get rid of used cars by dumping them in the ocean deep or burying them in stripped-out areas or anywhere else, for I am convinced that the day will come when we will need the steel scrap and other salvageable items that represent utilization of natural resources. In this connection I was pleased to note this remark by Mr. William S. Story, executive vice president of the Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, as quoted in the New York Times of last January 26:

Something is going to have to be done about the failure of the nation to keep up with the rate of discard of metallic products. It is a profligate waste of our natural resources to permit old automobiles, refrigerators, stoves and the like to molder in our fields and clutter our streets while we mine increasing amounts of natural resource, iron ore, and rely heavily on imported iron ore to help meet our needs.

I have had correspondence in the past from Mr. Story, whose theory is that no economy can profit from waste nor can a nation in our position rely heavily on foreign sources of raw materials. Yet America has been guilty of these practices for a long, long time.

On March 7 of last year the Johnstown Pa., Tribune-Democrat published an Associated Press account of a refuse disposal demonstration at the University of Pennsylvania in which the trash collector would be dispensed with through the use of equipment that would grind up cans, garbage, newspapers, and other materials into minute particles that could be washed away into pipelines and dumped into land-fill projects. While there is no question but that the idea would have multiple benefits, the day may not be far away when we will discover that we cannot afford to dispose of all trash in this manner.

How long, for instance, can we tolerate the burning of newspapers? Or grinding them up? A Pennsylvania waste paper executive has said that if it were not for his industry—whose product goes back into the manufacture of paper and paper products—the forest resources of this country would have been depleted long ago.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Mines is engaged in research to find ways of recovering iron, aluminum, zinc, copper, lead, and tin from the burnt waste residues of municipal incinerators. In Japan, a large press reduces garbage to 5-ton blocks which are then encased in concrete and dipped in asphalt baths. The blocks are used as building materials or as land fill. The Bureau of Mines has also reported on a project through which lightweight concrete building blocks moulded around compacted automobile scrap show promise as desirable material for use in light commercial buildings, bridge abutments and piers, foundations, and retaining walls.

In view of such developments, everyone engaged in any phase of waste disposal technology and application should certainly be apprised of whatever is taking place in government or elsewhere. Otherwise, there are certain to be costly projects at cross-purpose with the national view.

The disagreement over the plan to dump Philadelphia garbage in abandoned anthracite surface mines has become as ugly as the strip pits themselves. In Pennsylvania and whatever other States use or contemplate this method of waste disposal, all available technology must be applied to determine where landfills would create air, water, or soil contamination.

For the RECORD, I should like to quote the following paragraph from Outdoor Recreation Action published by the Department of the Interior in January 1968:

In a cooperative venture, the city of Chicago, the American Public Works Association, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the New York Central Railroad have started a three-year, $468,800 experiment of removing trash and garbage from urban areas to rural areas for disposal. Trash is compressed into 40-foot containers, then delivered by flatcars to land reclamation areas where bulldozers cover the trash with dirt from mining operations.

Since like methods are presumably in use or under consideration elsewhere, some of us may wonder whether an Intratrash Commerce Commission will eventually be required to regulate the transfer of waste materials.

What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is whether there is proper communication among those searching for facts to make this plan workable. I trust that the Office of Solid Waste Disposal is keeping up with all such developments and making the information available to all interested parties.

We are certainly not going too fast in our attack on the problem, but we may be overlooking important, vital steps that have already been put to use along the road to scientific progress. Unless we keep abreast of what is happening nationally, and internationally too, there is certain to be duplication and waste of funds as well as waste of natural assets. I am hoping that the Office of Solid Waste Disposal can get us on the right road if indeed there has been, as I suspect, a tendency to go off in all directions.

VIETNAM WAR SPURS INFLATION

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress on April 14 President Nixon stressed two issues among the many currently competing for the attention of the Federal Government. Those issues are the war in Vietnam and inflation.

The costs of the war in Vietnam—in both men and resources—have been pointed out on numerous occasions by many Members of Congress, including myself. Last week American combat dead moved past 33,000, a total greater than the aggregate number of American servicemen lost in the entire Korean war. These grim figures are not the end, however, for the fighting continues to claim dozens of American lives each day, and countless numbers of Vietnamese, and the Paris negotiations continue to flounder on procedural issues. The Vietnam war is now the fourth costliest war in the history of the United States, exceeded only by the cost of American involvement in the two World Wars and the Civil War. How much greater will the cost have to be before Congress will exercise its power to end this war by refusing to vote funds to support it?

The economic consequences of the Vietnamese war—although they are less clearly understood—are nevertheless also extremely serious. Perhaps the most significant aspect of those economic consequences is the relationship between the escalation of the war and the increasing

inflation in our economy that has accompanied that escalation.

An article by John O'Riley in the April 14 Wall Street Journal dramatically points out the way in which the Vietnam war has stimulated the inflationary spiral that is now of such concern to economic thinkers and strategists. By requiring massive military expenditures, and by diverting badly needed manpower into the military effort in both the factory and the field, the article argues that the war will continue to frustrate efforts to reduce inflation through either reduced Federal expenditures or increased taxes. As Mr. O'Riley additionally points out:

What happens with regard to (the war's) continuance or termination will have a far greater impact on the domestic economy than any moves by the monetary authorities.

I hope President Nixon will heed Mr. O'Riley's advice; for if he is truly committed to securing peace in Vietnam and curbing inflation in our economy, he must realize that the most expeditious way of both saving lives and reversing inflationary pressures is to speedily end the war in Vietnam. Congress must also realize that it can end the war by refusing to vote further appropriations for its prosecution. I insert the following article in the RECORD and urge that my colleagues give the arguments advanced by John O'Riley their closest consideration:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1969]

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By John O'Riley)

American combat deaths in the Vietnam war have moved well above the 33,000 level. The total is greater than for all the Korean War. It is more than 60% as many men as were lost by the U.S. in World War I. The grim figures underscore a point often forgotten in homefront talk of controlling inflation. And that point is this: The conflict is well out of the "little war" stage, and what happens with regard to its continuance or termination will have a far greater impact on the domestic economy than any moves by the monetary authorities.

This country's involvement in Vietnam goes back a long way. A refresher reference to the record shows President Truman sent a 35-man military advisory team to the new state as far back as 1950. But things moved slowly for a long time. As late as 1960, President Eisenhower was increasing the number of military advisers from 327 to 685. And even as recently as the end of 1964, the U.S. force in Vietnam was only about 23,000.

But what's happened since then is a different story. In mid-1965 President Johnson authorized an increase in the U.S. force from 75,000 men to 125,000. And the total has since jumped to about 540,000.

The nation's longest economic upswing, beginning early in 1961, spans the 1960s. The big military escalation, starting at mid-decade, thus cuts the boom in half. The first half was a period of relative stability. The second has not been. The beginning of today's spotlighted economic problems—the brisk inflation, the manpower squeeze, the soaring interest rates—coincided very neatly with the war's rather sudden enlargement. And there is little real reason to expect an abatement of these problems as long as the war continues at its present or a hotter pace.

The difference between the first half of the current "boom" and the latter half is often overlooked or forgotten. The period is viewed as a single stretch of humming economic activity, but it should be looked upon as two pretty distinct periods—the first ending in 1965 and the second covering the years since then.

It isn't hard to document the difference. Without going into heavy detail, a glance at a few key figures tells the story. The table below sketches what happened between 1961 and 1965 and also the trend pattern between 1965 and the present. Defense figures represent annual spending rates. The wholesale price index and unemployment rates are those prepared by the Labor Department. And the bond yield figures are averages on high grade corporate bonds computed by Barron's magazine.

	1961	1965	1969
Defense (billion dollars)	47.4	49.6	81.0
Prices (wholesale)	100	103	111
Bond (yields percent)	4.36	4.44	6.88
Unemployment (percent)	6.7	4.5	3.4

Note the defense spending figures. Americans are accustomed to big defense outlays, of course. Such spending has been on a vast scale since the start of World War II. Its magnitude didn't change too much, however, between 1961 and 1965. Since then has come the great leap of more than $30 billion to the $81 billion stratosphere.

How much money is $81 billion? One way to measure it would be to compare it to a year's expenditure on all types of construction ($84 billion last year) in this country. Add up the money spent in a full year on building all the new homes, all the apartment buildings, all the factories, the warehouses, the shopping centers, the motels, the schools, the bridges, the highways—the whole works from Maine to California—and you have only slightly more than is spent on defense in a year.

This kind of gigantic spending, even in the huge American economy, carries an inflationary punch of tremendous force. As long as it continues, price restraint is not going to be easy.

Both prices and interest rates, as reflected in bond yields, it will be noted, also held relatively steady in the first half of the decade. The big upturn has come since 1965.

The unemployment rate, a barometer of the manpower pinch, has declined steadily all through the decade—but a drop from 6.7% to 4.5% is not the same as a decline from 4.5% down to 3.4%. Today's unemployment rate is extremely low by historical standards. In fact it is a rate peculiar to war periods. We have it now, we had it in the Korean War, we had it in World War II—and these are the only times we have had it in the past forty years.

It is hard to measure precisely the direct impact of the war effort on the country's manpower. But it is possible to get a pretty clear idea by noting the growth since 1964 in (1) the number of defense industry workers, (2) the number of men in the military service, and (3) the number of Defense Department civilian employes. In the table below, figures represent millions.

	1964	*1969*
Defense manpower	1.2	1.6
Military manpower	2.6	3.4
Department of Defense civilians	1.0	1.3

The defense workers are those employed by defense product industries as compiled by the Government, and, while the workers and their employers also make some civilian products, their number is considered a good measure of defense work employment.

Thus a rough tabulation indicates that something like 1.5 million men have been taken out of the civilian labor force for military-related effort since 1964. This may not seem like many people in a big country like this one. But it is far more than are employed making all the automobiles and auto equipment (about 910,000) in the United States. It is more than the 1.3 million employed by all the primary metal industries—steel, copper, aluminum, etc.—combined.

The Far Eastern conflict, then, fuels the inflationary fire in two ways. It demands massive military spending. It also, in a time when manpower is already short, adds to the pinch by diverting men to military effort both in the factory and in the field—thus stimulating labor cost increases that are outrunning productivity.

SP4C. GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the membership of the House the following material concerning Sp4c. George J. Gottwald, Jr., who gave his life for his country in Vietnam. Four veterans posts and the Boston Fire Department Band participated in an inspirational ceremony honoring George J. Gottwald, Jr. Over 1,200 people in the Boston area attended the public dedication and some 300 guests and participants attended a buffet honoring the Gottwald family by the Cecil W. Fogg Legion Post of Hyde Park, Mass.

WBZ–TV did a 6-minute news special pictorial review of the dedication ceremonies, also attended by Specialist Four Gottwald's younger brother, Frederick Gottwald, who performed the unveiling of the sign portion of the affair. A scholarship fund in the name of George J. Gottwald, Jr., has been started by the Roslindale High School student body.

I did not want this occasion to pass without national recognition of the supreme sacrifice made by this fine young man who exemplified all that is good in American youth:

SP4C. GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR.

Born: Boston, Mass.
Educated: Boston Public Schools.
Parish: St. John Chrysostom.
Enlisted: U.S. Army, October 1966.
Parents: George J. and Caroline Gottwald, 6 Metropolitan Avenue, Roslindale.

Specialist Fourth Class George J. Gottwald, Jr., volunteered to lead his Platoon on a hazardous mission in Viet Nam and was intercepted, intermittenly, by enemy machine gun fire, while crawling to the aid of a wounded Medic.

Wounded three times by enemy machine gun fire, he remained undaunted—and fell mortally wounded under heavy concentrated enemy fire in his fourth attempt to reach the side of his Comrade.

Posthumously awarded the Silver Star by direction of the President of the United States, March 8, 1968.

This Memoriam Tribute published by his Brothers and Sisters: Frederick, William, Richard, Thomas, Edward, Caroline, Jean and Denise Gottwald and distributed in commemoration of the: George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square.

Dedication: Sunday, March 23, 1969, 2 p.m. at the intersection of Washington Street and Metropolitan Avenue, by the Cecil W. Fogg American Legion Post and Affiliates.

GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR., 1948–1968, "WHO DIED IN THE SERVICE OF HIS COUNTRY"

A Soldier who falls in the line of duty, deserves our humble respect and profound gratitude.

George J. Gottwald, Junior, was such a soldier.

His Spirit and Courage, His Dedication to duty, place him among the hallowed ranks of Patriotic Americans whose unfailing Love of Country and Loyalty to their Comrades in Arms; have since the birth of our Country, secured the blessings of Liberty for all Americans.

Specialist Fourth Class George Gottwald never planned great battles nor did he lead an Army in the field. He did more than that: He gave his life for his Country.

There is no greater Sacrifice.

There can be no honor paid to his Memory that can fully express how much we revere it. Yet, the Cecil W. Fogg Post of the American Legion, of Hyde Park, Massachusetts, and their Affiliates; is doing what it can by Dedicating the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square, to the memory of this brave boy.

The Legion's National Commander William C. Doyle has said of the Patriotism exemplified by George J. Gottwald, Jr:

"It is a Respect for the Rights of our Fellow Man. It is a Concern for Freedom of Man, as our God given Rights; but a recognition also that every Right carries with it an accompanying Responsibility."

George Gottwald did not shirk that Responsibility.

By his heroic act he has upheld the Honor and Tradition of the Military Services of the United States of America.

May every Bostonian, as he passes through the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square, remember the Man for whom it is named and Soldiers like him who have Sacrificed in order that others can enjoy the blessings of Democracy and Freedom.

My heart goes out to Family and Friends assembled at this Dedication.

I salute the Cecil W. Fogg Post and their Affiliates the V.F.W. All Boston Post of Roslindale, the William Doyle and Irving K. Adams Post of the Legion and the Boston Fire Department Band for their participation at this worthy, patriotic ceremony.

It is my prayer that this fine American will not have died in vain—that through his heroism we have been brought a little closer to a just and lasting peace.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U. S. House of Representatives.

(Read by Master of Ceremonies Peter L. Caparell at the opening of the Dedication Ceremonies at the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square., Sunday, March 23rd at 2:15 p.m.)

A PIECE OF AMERICA

(By Peter L. Caparell)

George J. Gottwald, Junior, was reared and educated in Roslindale.

Roslindale was his corner of America.

It was here—knitted within the social fabric of this ethnic community—that he developed the moral and the spiritual values that was to be put to the *supreme test* in a primitive jungle—some 8,000 miles from this intersection.

I said that Roslindale is an ethnic community. By that, I mean, George Gottwald grew up with, sat in classrooms with, mingled with and worked elbow to elbow with decent Americans of Irish, German, Italian, Greek and Lebanese extraction.

Right here on this little dead end strip of Metropolitan Avenue, where he lived and romped as a youngster: where there are no less than eleven homes—do we find the ethnic composition of families of which I just spoke. More than that, we find represented in those eleven houses, Veterans of World War I, II, Korea and now Vietnam.

His next door neighbor was a World War II Combat Medic. A neighbor who depended on George as a youngster to do many chores for him—and who sat for hours on the porch telling George stories of World War II.

Is it ironic then, that George Gottwald, Junior, died in the service of his country by crawling to the rescue of a wounded Medic?

This is the typical American story of a large or small community, whether it be Roslindale—or Sweetwater, Texas, and George Gottwald, Junior, was the typical American boy, who hung out at the corner drug store, lounged in the coffee shop, raised cain in the playground and pumped gas for his neighbors at the filling station just up the street.

Only, what he did in Vietnam—was not typical.

No one—who forfeits his life—in an effort to save the life of a wounded comrade—can be classified anything—but *extraordinary*.

And so, we are assembled here today, on a holy sabbath, to pay tribute to the memory of an outstanding, religious and dedicated young American, who left his home on this dead end strip as a boy and died as a hero on a remote jungle strip.

It is this greatness of young Americans like the George Gottwalds, that *keep* America Great.

As his neighbor and adult friend, I salute his memory with this sentiment:

The drum beats have rolled. The rifles have barked. The bugle has sounded, and in George Gottwald, Junior, a *Piece of America* has left us.

A Piece of America—a chip—of the fibre of Plymouth Rock; has drifted like a twinkling star into the vastness of Eternity.

George J. Gottwald, Junior, has returned to his maker—Maker of all men.

(Recited by City Councilor Patrick F. McDonough, Father of the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square at the Dedication Ceremonies at the intersection of Metropolitan Avenue and Washington Street, Roslindale, on March 23rd at 2:30 p.m. as the Principal Speaker.)

BY DIRECTION OF THE PRESIDENT THE SILVER STAR IS AWARDED FOR GALLANTRY IN ACTION AGAINST A HOSTILE FORCE TO SP4C. GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR.

On this date (2 February 1968), Specialist Gottwald was leading a five man reconnaissance patrol west of the village of An-Wy. He had volunteered to lead the patrol into an area where large Viet Cong forces were known to be operating. As the small patrol was moving through the thick underbrush, they were suddenly engaged by a large, well concealed Viet Cong force. The initial burst of fire wounded the medic and the patrol was forced to move back. Specialist Gottwald quickly positioned the other men and advanced under their cover power to his wounded medic. With complete disregard for his personal safety, Specialist Gottwald crawled across 35 meters of open rice paddy. Ignoring the heavy enemy fire, his only concern was the welfare of his wounded comrade. His advance was met by a hail of Viet Cong small arm fire and he was wounded twice but continued to crawl on. Finally, he fell mortally wounded to the concentrated enemy fire. Specialist Gottwald gave his life in an effort to save a fellow soldier. Specialist Four Gottwald's unquestionable valor in close combat against numerically superior hostile forces is in keeping with the finest traditions of the military service and reflects great credit upon himself, the 1st Infantry Division, and the United States Army.

Authority: By direction of the President, as established by an Act of Congress, 9 July 1918 and USARV Message 16695, dated 1 July 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Headquarters 1st Infantry Division,
APO San Francisco.

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined my colleagues in the House to commemorate the 51st anniversary of independence for Byelorussia, a nation which has been subjugated to Soviet occupation almost since its birth.

On March 23, 1969, the friends of Byelorussia met at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City in a commemorative assembly to observe this anniversary and to pledge their continued support to free Byelorussia from its oppressors. A resolution was adopted by the assembly outlining the plight of the Byelorussians and urging the help of all free nations to see that the injustice suffered by these fine people is brought to an end.

At this time I would like to place the resolution in the RECORD, so that all may know what conditions exist in Byelorussia. To my Byelorussian friends and neighbors, I once again state my unceasing and enthusiastic support in the struggle to see their homeland once more independent.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COMMEMORATIVE ASSEMBLY, CELEBRATING THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC IN MINSK, CAPITAL OF BYELORUSSIA, ON MARCH 25, 1918

Whereas within the territorial limits of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian people are being deprived of their natural rights and liberties to which they are entitled as free men, and which rights had been granted and guaranteed to them by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in 1918—namely, those freedoms of conscience, worship, speech, press, assembly, petition, and the right to democratic government and elections;

Whereas the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, administered as a colony from the Kremlin, persists in its barbarous policies of exploiting workers, demoralizing intellectuals, and subjecting the rural population to the dehumanizing feudal system of the collective farms;

Whereas Soviet Russia, with the aid and collaboration of her puppet regime in the BSSR, relentlessly continues to plunder the national resources of Byelorussia, to exploit the labor of her people by forced production quotas, and to retard and undermine the economic development of the nation;

Whereas Soviet Russia continues to implement a genocidal policy of mass deportations of the Byelorussian population, especially its youth, to forced settlement and russification in the arid and frozen wastes of Siberia and other uninhabitable areas of the Soviet Empire;

Whereas Soviet Russia continues to follow

a calculated policy of national genocide against the Byelorussian people within the frontiers of the BSSR by the conscious russification of its schools, literature, press, radio, institutions of higher learning, and the complete cultural milieu of the people;

Whereas the commuist party of the BSSR, under the tutelage of Moscow, attempts to conceal from the peoples of the world the political oppression, social exploitation, moral terror, colonial pillage, and the genocidal russification of the Byelorussian people behind an elaborate screen of falacious propaganda which expounds the "prosperity" that the Byelorussian people supposedly attained under the communist system. This dissemination of propaganda is especially intense this year which marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Bolshevik proclamation of the Byelorussian Socialist Republic on January 1, 1919 in Smolensk, as a prelude to the Red aggression against the new Byelorussian Democratic Republic to quench the spark of freedom before it engulfed the yet unstable communist empire.

Whereas the Byelorussian people have valiantly persisted in their fifty-year struggle against an alien form of despotism imposed upon them by Soviet Russia at a sacrifice of millions of lives felled before innumerable firing squads and lost to starvation and disease in the concentration camps of Siberia;

Now therefore, we, the participants of this Commemorative Assembly observing today, on the 23rd of March 1969 in the City of New York, at the Hotel Biltmore, the Fifty-First Anniversary of the Proclamation of Byelorussian Independence on March 25, 1918, do hereby unanimously indict before the peoples and nations of the world, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its colonial puppets in the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic of perpetrating the universally condemned crime of genocide against the Byelorussian people by consciously pursuing policies which are calculated ultimately to result in the total ethnic annihilation of the Byelorussian people; furthermore—

We appeal to the Byelorussian people not to lose hope and to continue their arduous opposition to Soviet attempts to destroy Byelorussia as a nation; and we hereby pledge our support of their struggle for self-preservation by all possible means within our power;

We appeal to all peoples who value the principles of freedom, justice and democratic government to utilize all possible means to aid the Byelorussian people in their difficult and unequal struggle with the tenacious communist despotism emanating from the Kremlin;

We appeal to all the free nations of the world to speak in the United Nations in behalf of the Byelorussian people and to protest against Moscow's genocidal policies directed at the ethnic annihilation of Byelorussia, and to demand from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to return to all the captive nations of the Soviet Empire, among them Byelorussia, their freedom which was wrenched from the young nations half a century ago by the "liberating" Bolshevik armies. We appeal to the free nations of the world because, although the BSSR has a seat in the United Nations, the Byelorussian people are not represented by a delegate who speaks out in their defense, but by a servile traitor whose only function at the international assembly is to parrot the Kremlin's destructive directives.

We earnestly hope and pray that, with God's help and the help of people of good will in the United States of America and around the globe, it will be possible in the near future for the Byelorussian people to rise up from their servile condition imposed upon them by Soviet Russia, and for Byelorussia to regain her rightful place within a community of independent and sovereign states.

VLAD KURYLO,
Chairman.

HI-SHEAR CORP. CHOSEN SUPPLIER OF THE YEAR

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Hi-Shear Corp. of Torrance, Calif., which has just been chosen "Supplier of the Year" by the Martin Marietta Corp. This is the highest award the Martin Co. has for superior supplier performance.

Hi-Shear Corp. was chosen for its outstanding performance in supplying Martin Marietta with explosively actuated separation nuts on the Titan III space launch vehicle which was built in Denver for the U.S. Air Force.

The Torrance company was selected for this top award from thousands of firms supplying goods and services to Martin Marietta. The award is part of the firm's continuing zero defects program encouraging defect-free craftsmanship and performances.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Hi-Shear Corp. for this outstanding award and for its continued exemplary contribution to our Nation's aerospace effort.

Since the beginning of our space program, Hi-Shear has provided fastening systems and separation devices for nearly every space probe, including the Mariner fly-by of Mars and the Surveyor series of moon landings.

This dynamic company has moved forward for 25 years of continued progress and contribution to the aero-space program under the able leadership of its President, Mr. George S. Wing.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to salute this outstanding company on the occasion of its selection as "Supplier of the Year." I would like to include in the RECORD a review of Hi-Shear's operations over the past year:

REVIEW OF OPERATIONS

MARKETING

The expanding market for Hi-Shear products gained momentum in fiscal 1967–1968. The increased acceptance of Hi-Shear fastener systems throughout the aerospace industry, particularly in large jet transport design, both military and commercial, resulted in net sales of $23,326,260. At fiscal year-end the company's backlog stood at an all time high of approximately $15 million.

Hi-Shear Corporation's products are marketed by its own technical sales organization throughout the United States and in Europe, Australia and the Far East. Our customers include all of the major aerospace companies and many of their subcontractors. Hi-Shear products are also used by jet engine manufacturers, the shipbuilding industry, and the electronic industry.

Throughout the company's 25 years of service to the designers and builders of aerospace machines, Hi-Shear Corporation has been able to offer a distinguished and growing line of proprietary products. These products are protected by approximately seventy-five United States patents and a greater number of foreign patents.

Today's total aerospace fastener market is estimated to be two hundred million dollars annually. Hi-Shear's fiscal 1967–1968 sales represent approximately 12 per cent of this market. Our increased marketing efforts lead us to believe that our products will become a greater part of this growing market.

Significant representative domestic aerospace programs using Hi-Shear products are the commercial jet airliners, i.e., Boeing series 707, 727, 737, and the Jumbo 747 SST; Douglas DC–8, standard and stretched versions, DC–9 plus the newly-designed DC–10 and Lockheed L1011 which is in the design stage. Also, Lockheed's huge military logistic transport, the C5A, is a large user of Hi-Shear fastening systems. Smaller commercial aircraft are also assembled with Hi-Shear products. For instance, the Grumman Gulf Stream II is literally held together with "Hi-Lok" fasteners.

The company is directing a concerted sales effort toward penetration of the precision bolt market through its Six-Wing bolt line. The sale of engine bolts is increasing.

All military aircraft produced today use Hi-Shear products. Helicopters as well as certain military land vehicles are now taking advantage of the improved assembly techniques realized by using Hi-Shear fasteners.

The increased activity in the design and construction of more sophisticated Navy vessels, such as the DE, by Todd Shipyards, is creating an increased demand for our products in that industry. Hi-Shear's explosively actuated devices and other ordnance products continue to be important to the space achievements of this country.

Hi-Shear Corporation's marketing activity includes extensive domestic and foreign advertising, as well as participation in major trade shows in the United States and foreign markets.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Sales of Hi-Shear products continue to expand in foreign markets. As U.S. jet airliners continue to be purchased by foreign carriers and U.S. airlines extend their overseas routes, the need for our company's products at service points throughout the world increases also. Hi-Shear products are used extensively in the Concorde Supersonic Transport and are being designed into aircraft in England, Europe and Japan. Wherever foreign aircraft are being designed among the friendly nations, Hi-Shear products are marketed by our company.

ENGINEERING

For the past twenty-five years, Hi-Shear has emphasized the engineering aspect of its operations. Our reputation for technical competence stems from our ability to anticipate our customers' needs in the improvement of existing products and the development of new ones.

The exacting demands of the aerospace industry have been met by a corresponding specialization in the organization of Hi-Shear's Engineering department. The past year witnessed the emergence of two separate and distinct departments—Production Engineering and Development Engineering.

Production Engineering expanded its manpower last year and successfully maintained the company's existing product lines to satisfy customers' requirements. Development of specialized installation tools is a prime function of Production Engineering and it is in this area that Hi-Shear continues to lead the entire fastener industry.

Again reflecting the company's emphasis on product development, Development Engineering manpower was increased substantially. The shop attached to this department was moved into new, expanded quarters and new machinery was assigned to exclusively

serve this area. The significance of these changes during the past year is that the development of new products can now be accomplished entirely within the Engineering Department, thus eliminating costly interruptions in Manufacturing schedules and reducing the time necessary to prove a product before it goes into production. The ultimate beneficiaries of all this are the company's customers who gain a better product in less time at reduced cost.

Hi-Shear's constant search for better ways to serve its customers has earned its valued reputation for technical competence and engineering know how.

ORDNANCE DIVISION

During the past fiscal year, Ordnance completed its first full year as a separate operating division of the company and made notable strides in the development of Electro Explosive devices. In the chronicle of the company's history "from Mustang to the Moon," this division contributed significantly to the success of the Surveyor series of moon landings.

Additionally, in NASA's Mariner III space project, the Hi-Shear Ordnance Division's power cartridges were commanded to function after nearly three years in deep space. The cartridges performed perfectly to reactuate the course correction system.

Other achievements of the Ordnance Division during the year are highlighted as follows: Development of a highly efficient compact Laser Initiated Ordnance System which uses a laser beam to ignite explosives; selection by NASA from a large field of competitors to develop the Standard Exploding Bridgewire Initiator; development of an incendiary destruct package for protecting classified information and equipment in aircraft from capture; advances in techniques for the metalizing and bonding capability of ceramics; development of a complete line of underwater release systems urgently needed in underseas exploration programs; plus numerous other projects of a highly-classified nature.

MANUFACTURING

The flexibility of this important area of operations in meeting sharply increased production volume during fiscal 1967–68 is evidence of management's ability to plan ahead.

During the past year, the company's facilities were again expanded with the acquisition of 64,000 square feet of space which is a substantial increase when added to the 50,000 square feet of new plant space constructed during the previous year. Plant expansions of this magnitude have stepped up Manufacturing's capacity to produce and deliver Hi-Shear products in the tradition of excellence which has prevailed for the past quarter of a century.

High-lighting Manufacturing's greatly expanded capabilities are other important factors such as the following:

Capital equipment—For the third consecutive year, expenditures in excess of one million dollars were authorized by management for new production machinery. Furthermore, a capital investment of a like amount is scheduled for the current fiscal year.

Personnel—While investments in plant and machinery are obviously vital to the success of any manufacturing operation, an equally important factor involves the human element. From the very beginning back in 1943, Hi-Shear's management has placed top priority on programs concerned with the welfare and training of company personnel. This investment in people has enabled the company to draw from its own ranks to fill the sharply increased demand for skilled manpower. Thus a substantial expansion in production personnel during the past year was accomplished with a minimum of outside recruiting for skilled workers.

Automation and cost reduction—For many years, the company has conducted extensive effort in this area. The evaluation of manpower efficiency and machine utilization is a never-ending process. The results more than justify the effort. The gains in efficiency and improved production methods are largely responsible for the company's ability to maintain its competitive edge in the industry.

QUALITY ASSURANCE RELIABILITY

With the step up in operations, Quality Assurance moved into expanded and thoroughly modernized quarters during the past year. The personnel complement increased and the finest equipment available was place at their disposal.

All this is vital to the success of the company's effort to maintain and improve product quality and integrity. Consequently, Hi-Shear's product rejection rate is among the lowest in the industry and has resulted in awards for quality by many distinguished customers.

Space age complexities continue to impose more exacting and stringent requirements on the company's existing products as well as on new products under development. Such requirements include greatly expanded performance parameters for spacecraft which is our training ground for modern commercial aircraft.

In the vitally important area of materials development, a new titanium alloy was introduced last year which is now in quantity production for the Lockheed Company's C–5A airplane. Also, a high-strength stainless steel introduced recently is now rapidly replacing non-stainless steels. Such items serve to expand Hi-Shear's product line and, of course, its sales volume.

The essential function of assuring the quality and integrity of its products has been well recognized by Hi-Shear's management. Such recognition has contributed in no small measure to the company's long-standing reputation for the technical excellence of its entire product line.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Employment—From a mere handful of people back in 1943, Hi-Shear now provides jobs for over 1200 people.

Personnel turnover during the past year continued to reflect a lower than average rate compared with the surrounding Southern California Labor Market. Contributing to the successful recruiting and retention of highly-skilled production employees is the fact that earnings of Hi-Shear employees are substantially higher than those reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for U.S. manufacturing in general.

Continuing progress has been made under the company's Equal Employment Opportunity program in the hiring and promotion of minority group members in all job categories.

Employee benefits.—Hi-Shear employees enjoy an outstanding company-sponsored benefit program which compares very favorably with programs offered by other major industrial employers in the Southern California area. During fiscal 1967–68 company contributions to employee benefit programs amounted to over one million dollars. The major share of this expenditure was directed to the Hi-Shear Profit Sharing Plan to which the company contributed a total of $472,500, of which amount, $447,500 went to employees other than company officers. Employee benefit programs are continually reviewed to assure their adequacy in fulfilling company objectives and to assure alignment with contemporary industry trends.

Employee activities—Hi-Shear-sponsored employee activity programs are designed to include a full range of individual and family events. These include the Annual Summer Picnic and Children's Christmas Party plus team competition in golf, bowling and darts.

Safety—During the year, the company continued to implement extensive employee-oriented safety programs. These programs have been very successful in maintaining high industrial safety standards and in minimizing the number of job-related accidents. Last year the company again received awards from the Los Angeles Chapter of the National Safety Council for its outstanding employee safety record.

Training—During the past fiscal year, the company continued to expand its employee training programs. Both on-the-job and supervisory training programs have been conducted which have helped to increase the skill level of production employees and first line supervision.

Future employee training plans contemplate additional programs that will enable Hi-Shear to continue its growth in a fast-moving and highly-competitive technical industry.

PLAYING IT BOTH WAYS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post carried an important editorial on the performance of the Nixon administration in the area of civil rights. Those of us in and out of Congress who have followed the activities of the administration in this area are well aware that the record is spotty at best and in many respects very discouraging.

I have been deeply concerned about the action—or in some cases, inaction—of this administration in the contract compliance and school desegregation programs. The cavalier treatment accorded the very able Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mr. Clifford Alexander, was most unfortunate. One would hope that the civil rights record of the Nixon administration in the less than 3 months it has been in office—as discouraging as it has been—can be attributed to insensitivity and not design. If it is insensitive to the needs of minority citizens, then perhaps editorials such as that in yesterday's Washington Post will help to show the administration the error of its ways.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Post editorial of Sunday, April 13, to any of our colleagues who may have missed it and include it as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1969]

THE PRESIDENT AND CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

"The laws have caught up with our conscience," President Nixon said in his inaugural address. "What remains is to give life to what is in the law: to ensure at last that as all are born equal in dignity before God, all are born equal in dignity before man." Giving "life to what is in the law"—the formulation was an excellent one, clear and to the point. But Administration execution of the President's inaugural dictum has been something else again, an uneven performance and seemingly a directionless one, marked by rude, unsettling swings back and forth between upholding the law and temporizing about it.

To the extent that this can be called a policy, it is a policy of ambiguity, one which can only produce losers and not just among the black Americans whose rights and opportunities are at stake. For it is hard to see how the Administration can bring anything but trouble to itself—discontent and disappointment on all sides—by failing to give out a clear and unambiguous signal in this matter.

The latest in the series of troubling episodes concerns the resignation of Clifford L. Alexander Jr. as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Mr. Alexander, a Negro and a Democratic Administration appointee, pointed out the implications that must be drawn from the fact that the White House had announced its intention to replace him the day after he had been the object of a vicious attack by Senator Dirksen for his efforts to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Senator Dirksen having also suggested that he would talk to the right person in the Administration and see to it that the likes of Mr. Alexander would be fired. Mr. Alexander, in his resignation remarks, also charged the Administration with having omitted from its goals the vigorous enforcement of the "laws on employment discrimination."

President Nixon, it should be noted, had no obligation to retain Mr. Alexander in the chairman's post. But to have so entirely failed to support Mr. Alexander at a moment when he was under this kind of attack is another matter. Like so many other aspects of the Administration's mixed performance in this field, the best construction one can put on it is that nothing more sinister than inadvertence and insensitivity underlay it. That was the best that could have been said, for instance, of the Defense Department's cavalier approach to the letting of contracts to three Southern firms which were out of compliance with civil rights standards. That situation has now been in large measure retrieved, but it shook confidence sufficiently to have prompted a lawsuit on the part of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund which will seek to have the contracts revoked.

The one place where there has been evidence of firmness is at HEW where Secretary Finch has moved ahead on fund cut-offs from Southern school districts that disregard the provisions of the law and has made some irreproachable appointments to the offices charged with carrying out civil rights policy. But even at HEW, there has been a slow infusion of appointees (with or without the Secretary's unequivocal blessing is not clear) whose presence suggests that the Administration is trying to have it both ways and to please its unpleasable constituents in the South.

The point is that the Administration cannot afford an inadvertent or insensitive approach to these questions—much less an artfully misleading one. President Nixon still has much to do to gain the confidence of those citizens who will be most profoundly affected by any undermining of the laws and regulations on the books. Moreover, lacking as he does in present circumstances the funds to affirm his commitment to their well-being by moving ahead with the substantive domestic programs legislated in the past several years, he has a special obligation to affirm that commitment by way of uncompromised and unequivocal support of the laws that define and protect their rights.

Finally, there is the plain fact that by playing it both ways or even suggesting the possibility of a weakness of resolve, Mr. Nixon can only excite hopes he will ultimately be unable to fulfill on the part of those communities, corporations and public institutions that are still resisting implementation of our civil rights laws.

It will be tough politics, but good politics, when the Administration decides that its business is precisely what the President said: giving life to what is in the law.

PLAN TO CLOSE JOB CENTER DIMS SELF-BETTERMENT HOPE

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days an order has been issued to close 57 Job Corps centers throughout the Nation. Bearing the brunt of these closings are the conservation centers, three of which are located in the Second Congressional District which I represent.

When I first learned of the proposal to close these centers I immediately appealed to President Nixon commenting:

It is tragic that this program should be crippled now that it has proven itself by combining education with good hard work to provide young men with an opportunity to become self-respecting, self-supporting, contributing members of society.

Bearing with my concern are the feelings of the communities, the center personnel, and the Job Corpsmen themselves. This feeling has been captured extremely well by Mr. Julian Fein of the McClatchy Newspapers Service in Sonora, Calif., which is located close to one of the centers, Five Mile Camp, operated by the Forest Service with a training program instituted by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD this fine article which appeared in the Modesto Bee of April 11, 1969:

SONORA.—Part of the American dream is the hope for self-betterment and such a concept yesterday was badly shaken for young men of the Five Mile Job Corps Conservation Center upon learning their facility will be closed down.

For the hope of getting ahead recently had come to the corpsmen who a few months ago were deep in the misery of bleak city slums or half-starving in rural pockets of poverty.

With the help of counselors and teachers who have been charting brave new horizons in instructing the supposedly unteachable, corpsmen had started to believe they could become part of the "establishment," instead of living outside of it.

Both staff and corpsmen alike were stunned at news media reports saying the Five Mile Center was included in the facilities across the nation that would be closed as part of President Richard Nixon's economy drive.

EXPLAINS NEWS

Dick Broderick, a corpsmen supervisor and on first name terms with most of his men, gently told the corpsmen gathered under the tall pine trees what the news media were saying.

"The United States government usually does not conduct its business like this," Broderick said by way of explaining that no official word had come on the closedown.

And Robert Royer, center director, also was saying much the same thing to the center staff of 46 employes.

Corpsmen who have been at the center for several months came up with almost a standard reaction. They said "there are going to be a lot of kids roaming around in the streets, getting into trouble. These kids are going to end up in prison or on welfare and it's going to cost money to keep them there. The money should be spent here to keep them out of trouble and teach them how to live."

But for the newcomers, there was almost no reaction at all, almost a passive resignation that still another good thing in life was going to slip by them.

HARD TO BELIEVE

Staff members found it hard to believe that authorities could turn a deaf ear to the needs of the children of the poor.

They feel the job corps has done an excellent job for the young men of providing the specialized help, starting with developing a positive attitude and ending with vocational instruction leading to jobs.

Counselors and teachers repeatedly pointed out that by using new techniques, there is not much point in starting vocational training. Standard teaching methods used in public schools have failed with the corpsmen who are all school dropouts.

Robert Royer who has been center director since the facility started three and one half years ago says the Job Corps program has been "successful in making productive citizens out of what otherwise would be liabilities."

"These kids," Royer adds, "are deprived socially as well as economically. They come from families so deprived socially they don't know how to get out of the rut.

"Unless they can get some advantages, these youngsters will be carried on welfare or end up in prison."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Royer lists the accomplishments of the center. More than 1,000 youngsters have completed the program, 800 of these have jobs.

A new carpentry program under union supervision has graduated to jobs 11 youngsters before they completed the one year program and 25 more are expected to finish.

The center, located in the Stanislaus National Forest, has put in $400,000 worth of improvements in the forest. With forest budget limitations, the work would not have been possible without the Job Corps, Forest Supervisor Harry Grace says.

The Five Mile Center spends $700,000 a year, mostly in Tuolumne County and the corpsmen unload a good part of their $4,500 monthly spending money in the county.

Typical of corpsmen reaction after finding out the center was slated to close was this from an 18-year old Los Angeles lad: "I've got it made now, have just finished the carpenter course and will be going home to work. I feel like a new man. But the others, they still need help."

DON'T CLOSE DOWN

A 17-year old Richmond boy who dropped out of school at 10th grade said: "I need a new start, I want to get into something so I can make a living. Don't close us down."

An 18-year old Red Bluff boy who quit school at the 11th grade. "I'm learning how to be a cook here. Other kids need a break too. If you don't help them, they are going to steal and rob to live."

From a 16-year old South Carolina boy who quit school at the ninth grade: "I was walking the streets and getting into trouble until I came here. I hope to get in with the forestry fire fighters after finishing training. Many kids need this center. Keep it open."

The corpsmen agreed that they did not get along at public school. "Teachers tried to cram it down our throats, couldn't get along with the teachers, the teachers did not care, never could get on to reading fast enough," are typical comments.

Royer says the Job Corps is taking over the rejects of the public school system—a system that does not have the time, the money and even sometimes lacks the desire to create the special programs needed.

PRAISE CORPS

The youngsters praised the Job Corps system of teaching which is based on the ability of each student to progress at his own rate of speed.

Richard Jeffs, principal of the school at the center, says a good part of developing these youngsters is to show them society cares. "And we do care," says Jeffs.

Many of our students, Jeffs explains, "have felt unwanted since they were 6 or 7 years old. Unwanted at home, unwanted at school, they find companionship and trouble roaming the streets.

"Looking at this just from an economic point of view—and there is a lot more to life than economics—consider the cost of supporting these kids on welfare the rest of their life or the cost of keeping them in prison. The Job Corps is a bargain when you compare it to the alternatives.

"But let's look at this from the moral point of view. Do we have the right to bypass the 25 per cent of our nation who are deprived? Do we have the right not to make assets out of these people."

CITES SUCCESS

Cornell Harvell, who left a teaching job in a slum to instruct at the Five Mile Center, summed it up this way:

"The Job Corps has been a success. If the centers are closed down with nothing to replace them, it will be the most disgusting thing that has ever happened."

Maurice Marsolais, a counselor and former correctional officer and former probation officer, says it is more difficult to work with men in prison. "Reaching a person already confined is so much harder because society has slapped him down, there are just more obstacles to be overcome."

Royer, a former assistant superintendent at a facility of the California Youth Authority, says corpsmen are far more responsive than the wards of CYA.

Howard Comstock, who has nothing to do with the Job Corps, is in full agreement with Royer and Marsolais.

Comstock is superintendent of the Sierra Conservation Center near Jamestown operated by the State Department of Corrections.

Comstock says, "I believe in the Job Corps. Get those kids off the streets, get them out of their environment, give them the training and education to give them a better chance in life.

"They will have less chance of being correctly oriented if you wait until they are in a corrective institution to begin their training."

As a 17-year-old corpsman from Kentucky said, "Why do they spend billions of dollars on airplanes and guns. We need it more here at home. I can't figure it out."

VERMONT REPUBLICANS HONOR JEFFERSON'S BIRTHDAY

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, April 13, marked the 226th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest of all Americans, Thomas Jefferson. While most Americans pay annual respects to the memory of Washington and Lincoln, only rarely does Mr. Jefferson get the commemoration he so deserves.

Thus, it was a special pleasure for me to be present last Wednesday night at an extraordinary dinner honoring Mr. Jefferson's birth. It was extraordinary for two reasons: it was held in my State of Vermont, far from Jefferson's Virginia, and it was sponsored by the Vermont Republican State Committee.

The Governor of Vermont and other distinguished speakers there observed how the spirit of Jefferson formed so fundamental a part of the belief and platform of the Republican Party of the 1850's whose first Presidential platform pledged the restoration of the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson.

Perhaps the commemoration of Jefferson's birthday once again by Republicans in my small State of Vermont will herald a rebirth of interest in his principles among Republicans everywhere.

Congratulatory telegrams were received from Republican National Chairman Ray C. Bliss and from President Nixon. Speakers included Gov. Dean Davis and State representative John McLaughry of Kirby.

YOU HAVE A CHOICE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1969, was Senior Government Day for Newaygo County, Mich. Chris Johnson, a senior at Freemont High School, spoke briefly to his fellow schoolmates. His main interests are political science, forensics, and military history. Chris plans to study law and engage in governmental work. Chris has received several awards for outstanding achievement in his school work and activities.

Because of the vitally important nature of Senior Government Day, I ask unanimous consent that remarks by Chris be printed in the RECORD.

YOU HAVE A CHOICE

I think it is obvious to almost everyone these days that the fate of America truly rests in our hands—the youth of America. Her destiny is our destiny; the challenges that will be disclosed here today are those we will have to contend with. And we can solve this fate, this destiny, this challenge in one of three ways: apathy, totalitarianism, or democracy.

If we become apathetic we are going to wind up with a corrupt, inefficient, tyrannical government—with a populace which just does not care. If we take totalitarianism we are going to wind up with a corrupt, inefficient tyrannical government—with people condoning, yea, supporting it! But if we choose democracy, then the doctrines and truths of ancient Greece will again be the rules by which all men live.

There are many today who dislike government, decrying it as being all politics. These people, apparently, are unaware of the fact that government touches all life today; if one takes no part in government one takes no part in life. So, what are your interests? The armed forces? There is a discussion group on that here today. Politics? So, too, a group on that. Health? Education? Welfare? You name it; today, too, you may discuss it.

In fact, for better or worse, government, today controls our destiny—we no longer do so directly. If you want to control your destiny then you had better control your government. But just as government determines our fate, we control that of the government, and we can control it apathetically, totalitarianistically, or democratically. To borrow a phrase coined by Gerald Ford on behalf of our generation: "Give us the tools we will build tomorrow."

Today, February 19, 1969, Senior Government Day for Newaygo County, is a day when we find out just how much of a tomorrow we are capable of building.

I thank you!

EMPLOYMENT DISRUPTION INSURANCE

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would authorize Federal credit unions to provide employment disruption insurance to their member-borrowers.

Purchase of this insurance would be entirely voluntary on the part of a credit union borrower and would provide for the payment of the borrower's obligations to the credit union in the event of the disruption of his employment due to personal disability. The cost of such insurance, at the option of the member, could be paid in cash, by share withdrawal, or could be included in the borrower's loan repayment schedule.

State-chartered credit unions in Michigan and many other States are authorized to facilitate their members' purchases of such insurance, but the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has ruled that Federal credit unions do not have this authority and has opposed, or failed to recognize the benefit of, this type of insurance. Yet the desirability of this insurance which will permit a borrower to protect in advance against a hardship of unemployment caused by personal disability seems obvious to me. At a time when Government is considering extending its disability plans through social security, it is no time for Government to prohibit or impede the workingman from anticipating a "rainy day" and protecting himself through a private insurance plan against a loss of earnings due to disability. Government should not discourage but should encourage individuals to help themselves and should engage the private sector whenever and wherever possible.

The fact, too, that some Federal credit unions have already, or may decide to, become State-chartered credit unions in order to avail themselves of this insurance, is proof of its benefits and of the desires of many credit union members. The Federal bureaucracy should not stand in the way of the workingman who is thoughtful enough to protect himself against personal financial hardship.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of my bill successfully passed the House of Representatives as an amendment to the complex Federal credit union legislation we considered at the end of the 90th Congress. The Senate bill, however, contained no comparable provision, and the amendment was deleted in conference. The merits of this proposal deserve to be considered as separate legislation, and I am hopeful that the majority of my col-

leagues will join me and support this voluntary, but most desirable, insurance plan.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this year 1969 marks the 50th anniversary of the American Legion. I am proud to be a member of this fine organization that exemplifies the best values in America, patriotism and service to the community and their fellowman. I am equally proud to be the son of one of the founding members of the American Legion and the author of the Preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion.

The Lafayette Post of the American Legion held a celebration of the 50th anniversary on Tuesday evening, March 11, 1969. The speaker that evening was my father, the Honorable Hamilton Fish, Sr., who many of my colleagues will remember from their service with him during his long service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great amount of pleasure to insert his speech at this point in the RECORD:

SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH AT THE LAFAYETTE POST CELEBRATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION IN POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., MARCH 11, 1969

I am greatly honored in being invited to join the Lafayette Post of Poughkeepsie in celebrating the golden anniversary of the American Legion. As one of its founders, I have seen it grow from a small acorn into a mighty oak of power, influence and as a steadfast bulwark of our Constitutional and representative government and for the principles of freedom, justice, democracy, patriotism and Americanism. It is, with its 1,700 Posts and 3 million members, the greatest organization in the United States, if not in the world, composed of war veterans who have returned to civilian life.

It might interest members of the Legion in Dutchess County and the public, to know something about the origin of the Legion and the formation of its time-tested and time-honored Preamble.

The Legion birth took place in Paris on March 15, 1919 when representatives of the various military units met to consider the formation of a veteran organization. The meeting, consisting of several hundred, decided on the name of The American Legion, and wrote a temporary Declaration of Principles and formed temporary committees to organize a meeting of World I veterans on a large scale in the United States within the next few months. Like all organizations, it was in the beginning small, but showed great wisdom not only in the choice of a name, but in its appointment of temporary committees which successfully organized the great meeting held in St. Louis on May 8, 9, and 10th in 1919.

Those who are interested in the details of the Paris Conference, should read the March edition of the American Legion Magazine. The origin and formation of the Preamble which is the very foundation and life-blood of every American Legion Post took place at St. Louis and not in Paris or elsewhere.

I was a delegate to the St. Louis Caucus from the Putnam-Dutchess District and was appointed to the Committee on the Constitution. The Chairman of that committee, Mr. Haines of Maine, for some reason I never knew, appointed me Chairman of the Subcommittee to write the Preamble and authorized me to appoint the two other members. I appointed Col. John Greenway of Arizona, who served in the Roosevelt Rough Riders and was a Colonel in World War I. He was a Yale athlete and one of the foremost mining engineers in Arizona. His statue today stands in World War I uniform in Statuary Hall in the Capital at Washington as one of the two representatives of the State of Arizona. The other was Judge Davis of Oregon who was then living in Delaware. The three of us wrote the Preamble that is known to every Legionnaire. I was a very great admirer of Theodore Roosevelt, one of our most courageous and greatest American Presidents. I knew that Greenway and Davis were also admirers of President Theodore Roosevelt and would help write a dynamic, forward-looking American Preamble.

It has been customary to give most of the credit to the Chairman of a committee, but I have always tried to give credit to both Jack Greenway and George Davis for their contribution in writing the Preamble. It was the brainchild of all three of us and all contributed important parts of it.

When it was finally perfected, I gave it to the Chairman of the Committee on the Constitution, Mr. Haines and his committee suggested a minor amendment which was acceptable to me, and then Mr. Haine presented it to the delegates of the convention for their approval, which was given unanimously. There never has been any change since that day in the Preamble, except to add an "s" to war. An effort was made by Eric Fisher Wood who was Secretary of the Paris Conference to substitute a new Preamble written by Elihu Root, former Secretary of State and a very eminent lawyer. This substitute was presented to the Resolutions Committee. I told the entire story about the creation of the Legion Preamble and the meaning of its various paragraphs and when the vote was taken, the only vote cast for the substitute Preamble by Mr. Root was by Eric Fisher Wood. President Truman and General Pershing have both publicly stated that the American Legion Preamble was one of our greatest American charters, and others have referred to it as one of the finest examples of American literature.

Many Legionnaires have claimed directly and indirectly to having something to do with the writing of the Preamble, but as Chairman of the Committee of three, I want to make it clear that no one else participated in any way in writing the Preamble.

The Preamble today represents the views, sentiments and the policies of all Legionnaires, no matter what party they belong to and regardless of race, color or creed. The Preamble has become almost immortal and is today part and parcel of the Legion, and as long as freedom prevails, the Preamble and the Legion will survive. But if freedom falls, then the Legion and the Preamble will cease to exist. The Legion is dedicated to the preservation of freedom and democracy and I mean by freedom, free speech, free press, freedom of religion, freedom to travel, freedom from fear of concentration and slave labor camps and tyrannical totalitarian Communist Governments. The only thing that Communism fears besides armed force is the spread of freedom. That is the reason that Moscow sent the Communist armies into Czechoslovakia. They knew that if freedom succeeded there, that Communism was doomed in all the satellite nations and eventually in Soviet Russia.

I am opposed to any nuclear war except in defense, but firmly urge that we support a massive freedom barrage not only in the United States, but throughout the satellite nations, Soviet Russia and China. If Soviet Russia and the satellite nations removed their iron curtains, a large part of their population would leave to live in free nations, which support civil rights and freedom.

Sirhan Sirhan, the murderer of Senator Robert F. Kennedy wrote in his notebook, "I firmly support the Communist cause and its people whether Russian, Chinese, Albanian, Hungarian or whoever." Workers of the world unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains." This is an absolute falsehood under Communist tyranny. The wage earners and workers everywhere have everything to lose under Soviet Communism. All their freedoms would be liquidated. American labor does not want to be Communized or enslaved. The preservation of freedom is the greatest issue in the world; greater than the Republican or Democratic Parties, or both combined. Freedom is the one thing that Soviet Russia fears as Communism cannot exist wherever freedom prevails.

I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Legion pioneers in the Lafayette Post with whom I was closely associated 50 years ago: Honorable Fred Close, Honorable John Schwartz, Harold Joseph, Rubin Von Vlack, Bill Duggan, Philip Mylord, Ely Gellert, Joseph Conte, Stephen Stec, Lewis Katz, and Frederick A. Smith of Wappingers, Honorable Griswell Webb of Hyde Park, Honorable Gordon Flannery, Roy Gillano and Thomas MacFarland of Beacon, Honorable Leonard Supple of Fishkill, Thomas J. Boyce and Stanley Vincent of Dover Plains, and John Broderick of Amenia. They were the real founders of the American Legion.

In honoring the Legion on its 50th anniversary I also want to pay tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of which I have been a member for 50 years who also have fought for the same principles of patriotism, Americanism and for the preservation of freedom.

If there is any country worth living in, any country worth defending, fighting for, or dying for, it is the United States of America. This, together with the Preamble, is the credo of the American Legion. God bless freedom, the American Legion and the United States.

ALVIN M. BENTLEY

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of my longtime friend, Alvin Bentley, who served with distinction as a Member of the House during the Eisenhower years. I first met Al Bentley when he was a freshman Congressman and I was a senator in the Michigan Legislature. It was my privilege to campaign with him for statewide office in 1960, and to serve with him in the Michigan Constitutional Convention during 1961–62. In 1962 Michigan elected a Congressman-at-large, and Al was the Republican nominee. At that time, when the people of my State could vote for two Members of this body, one at-large and one by district, I was proud to campaign with him in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Alvin Bentley distinguished himself as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. In Michigan he served with outstanding ability as the chairman of the education committee of our State constitutional convention. Always interested in education, he estab-

lished the Bentley Foundation which is aiding many deserving youngsters in furthering their education. At his untimely passing, he was serving as a member of the board of regents of the University of Michigan.

Mrs. Hutchinson joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Bentley and the members of the family.

THE FEDERAL-STATE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Federal-State Education Act of 1969. This measure has been developed by the distinguished Governor of the State of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller, and I am introducing it at his request. Similar legislation has already been submitted in the other body by Senator GOODELL.

The major intent of this measure is to share a portion of the growth dividend of the national economy with the States for the purpose of improving education within the States. A certain portion of the funds available would be distributed to the States on the basis of percentages of the total maximum grants made under title I of ESEA, the Higher Education Act and the Vocational Education Act. The remainder of the funds would be apportioned on the basis of State and local tax effort, preschool age population, and need expressed in terms of per capita income.

States would submit a plan of proposed expenditures of these moneys to the Secretary of HEW for approval, subject to the basic conditions that 20 percent be spent to the purposes of title I of ESEA, 15 percent for higher education, and 10 percent for vocational education, and consistent with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The remaining 55 percent could be used for these or other educational purposes.

I am pleased that the Governor has taken the initiative in developing the basic elements of a plan for the sharing of Federal revenues with the States, and I am particularly glad that he is focusing the initial thrust of such a plan on helping the States meet the rapidly rising cost of education. In a word, we need a program that reflects the magnitude of the problem.

This proposal, it seems to me, is one element in an overall national approach to the problems of educational financing. Clearly, the first priorities must be full funding of existing programs and implementation of the relevant recommendations on the year-old Riot Commission Report. ESEA title I, for example, is funded in the 1970 budget request at $1.6 billion less than the authorization—a shortfall of 59 percent. The President's newly revised budget cuts moneys for title III of the same act by $56 million and reduces funds for library books and equipment by $71 million. These reductions in education appropriations are serious and should not stand.

When these cuts have been restored and there is full funding of existing authorizations, we can move on to consider new approaches, such as the one that Governor Rockefeller is putting forth to encourage greater State efforts with Federal seed money. With property taxes becoming increasingly inadequate as the financial basis for public school systems and with ordinary operating expenses becoming so high that some systems cannot afford to remain open for the regular school year, it is quite clear that we need a new departure in the financing of education in this country. But I cannot overemphasize the fact that new approaches are not a substitute for the full funding of existing programs.

I would caution, however, in the development of legislation to share Federal revenues with the States for education, that there are a number of potentially troublesome areas that must be dealt with very carefully if we are to establish a genuinely sound program. For example, the proposed allotment formula must be examined with the utmost care, because formulas once enacted have the tendency to perpetuate forever undisturbed. Further, I have added certain language to the Governor's legislation to make crystal clear our commitment to upholding the school desegregation guidelines which call for an end to all dual school systems by September 1969, and to guard against reopening the church-state controversy.

While any legislation in the area of education or any other form of Federal assistance, is, of course, subject to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which requires nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs, I think that this matter is so vitally important that an explicit statement of compliance with this provision should be a part of any program under which funds go to the States for general education purposes. The subterfuges to avoid compliance with the school desegregation guidelines and to subvert the intention of the Supreme Court in invalidating freedom of choice plans are legion, and I believe that from the very beginning a new departure in educational financing must make it crystal clear that its funds are not to be used in the pursuit of any activities which are not in strict compliance with the law of the land.

The church-state language would provide equitable access to funds under this legislation for children in nonpublic schools, provide a bypass mechanism where a State legally cannot provide such aid, and require that title to all property acquired with these funds remain in a public agency and that the public agency will administer the funds. Opportunity for judicial review is also included. As the Congress considers this kind of proposal, I think it would be well to bear in mind the warning of the Task Force on Education appointed by President Nixon prior to his inauguration and headed by Alan Pifer of the Carnegie Corp. The task force states that the church-state issue could become "once again a lively area of controversy" if there is "an unsophisticated effort to rearrange the methods through which Federal aid is channeled to the support of education, either through some general aid plan, a badly designed bloc grant or a clumsy scheme for the consolidation of legislation. Such an effort could easily upset the present delicate church-state accommodation: Politically, by granting the public school such broad benefits that the competitive position of the private schools would be simultaneously undermined; legally, by permitting private schools to obtain a range of services—that is, payment of general teachers' salaries or ownership of real property—which would result in litigation testing the legislation's constitutionality."

Finally, the legislation provides that 55 percent of a State's allotment may be used for virtually any educational purpose. I believe that some limits, still broadly defined, are necessary to insure that a State is spending its money on the most urgent educational problems of its communities, particularly aid to the disadvantaged. For example, while the training of museum aides or National Guardsmen is technically "education," I do not conceive—nor do I believe that the Governor conceives—of these as appropriate activities for the expenditure of funds from this act. The intention of this legislation is to help States and localities close the gap between rising educational costs and their own revenues; generally these will involve expenditures for traditional education costs, such as construction and equipment, and for innovative purposes, such as enrichment and remedial programs for the disadvantaged and large-scale attacks on the special problems of urban education.

No doubt there will be other refinements that the Congress will want to include as it considers this legislation. These may include provision for advance funding, which is so important to meaningful educational planning, and for recovery and reallocation of unused funds.

I hope that the Congress will take a hard look not only at the salutary financial effects of a program of revenue sharing but as well at the delicate problem areas involved in an approach of this sort. A block grant is not a simple matter of handing money to a State with few strings attached; as representatives of the American people we are also charged with insuring that this money, as much as any other public funds, is used for its intended purpose.

HITTING THE "PUSHERS" OF DRUGS

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the narcotics problem in the United States certainly deserves close scrutiny by the 91st Congress, and, I think, demands some reevaluation of the tactics used to combat drug abuse. An all-out war must be declared against the trafficking of

dope to prevent further spread of dangerous drug usage by thousands of citizens, particularly young people.

Before the narcotics problem became so widespread in our Nation, a philosophy developed within law-enforcement agencies to concentrate primarily on getting to the ultimate source of drug traffic. In other words, police efforts were not aimed so much at the common "pusher," but at the "big wheels" behind the massive dope distribution network. This philosophy continues to transcend our present policies regarding enforcement of anti-drug statutes. Even in the face of mounting statistics showing ever-increasing usage of addictive narcotics, we have continued to play down the crime committed by the person who actually puts the drugs in the hands of the user in hopes of tracing the product sold back to its wholesale marketer. Obviously, this policy has not curtailed narcotics traffic and may have even encouraged people to believe that it is relatively safe to engage in pushing drugs at the local level.

Congress should evaluate our drug attack with an eye toward reversing the priorities. We should encourage and support policies and programs which seek to dry up all manifestations of the trafficking of drugs. In particular, we must begin to apprehend and prosecute the "pushers" who daily make their living by leading others toward addiction and thus dependency. In effect, we must toughen our attitudes and actions toward the lower echelons of the dope distribution network.

I have talked to law-enforcement officials who admit that they know who some of the "pushers" are in various localities, but who say that they have tended to ignore these arrest possibilities in hopes of being led to a bigger prize. In cases where exact identification of "pushers" is not known to the officials, the information could be readily obtained since a vast range of drug users and nonusers among our youth know where to go and whom to contact if dope is desired. Yet, the "pushers" often go on with their activity relatively untouched by our legal system because they are considered to be mere lackeys in the narcotics problem. In addition, the rather astounding argument has been advanced that we should not curtail the sale of drugs by the "amateurs" because this will encourage more participation in distribution by the "professionals," usually defined as the criminal underworld, who prefer the sale of hard drugs with the resultant bigger profits, to the sale of so-called mild drugs.

If I may be permitted to draw an analogy, our battle against dope distribution is somewhat akin to a rather grotesque military strategy. It would be unimaginable for a battlefield commander to instruct his troops not to fire upon the soldiers on the other side but take aim only when an enemy general came into view. However, the drug attack has been waged utilizing almost precisely that kind of reasoning. It is high time that we recognize that the generals in drug traffic are only as effective as their troops in the field.

I do not mean to imply that we should reduce our efforts to weed out for prosecution the persons back of the national trafficking of dope. This would seem to be a matter of concentration by Federal narcotics agents since organized crime enters the picture substantially and control of the activities of professional crime syndicates is certainly beyond the scope of most local police departments. However, it seems to me that we must also deal forcefully with those who represent the immediate source of narcotics for the growing numbers of dope users. Programs have to be developed that will provide the law-enforcement agencies in States, cities, and rural areas the direction they need to eliminate the pushers that plague many areas throughout the Nation.

It is fine to talk of solving problems by eliminating their root causes, but responsible action often must be directed toward meeting immediate needs. The drug abuse problem now gripping the country demands dealing with some very fundamental and obvious factors. Foremost, the problem cries out for strict enforcement of the laws relating to the selling of narcotics and stiff sentences for persons convicted of supplying those goods that lead toward drug addiction. My argument finds backing in an editorial published in the Lancaster New Era of Lancaster, Pa., on April 1, 1969. I include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

HITTING THE "PUSHERS" OF DRUGS

Dr. James Z. Appel, of Lancaster, a past president of the American Medical Association, put his finger on elemental factors in the campus drug symposium made up mainly of educators Monday at Hershey.

Dr. Appel called for strengthening the laws against the sellers of the drugs—the "pushers" who make a living by encouraging others to take drugs.

The "pushers," whom Dr. Appel called the "dregs of society," do best financially with those to whom drug use becomes habitual.

The "pusher" commits crime himself, and leads to commission of crimes by the habitual users, who will steal or rob to get the cash to buy the drugs.

A start can be made on Dr. Appel's proposal in the Legislature of our own Commonwealth. Lawmakers and police can review the present laws to see how they can be made tougher.

A national review is also highly timely, since organized crime operates across state borders and "pushers" are often merely at the end of a long syndicate line.

Dr. Appel made a number of pertinent points in his speech. To educators, he entrusted the mission of finding out why students use drugs, and what the schools can do to get at the roots of the problem.

No sector of society can stay aloof from seeking solutions. If there is to be any improvement, everyone interested in youth, and in the future of the nation, should become involved in the battle.

STANFORD SCIENTISTS AGAINST ABM DEPLOYMENT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 at a convention on science in society in the Stanford Memorial Church, 342 Stanford area scientists and engineers signed a statement expressing deep concern over the pending deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system.

The petition was signed primarily by scientists and engineers as indicated by the following breakdown of signatures:

Physics	88
Biology	62
Chemistry	23
Engineering	48
Mathematics and computer sciences	18
Medical science	17

These figures include 104 faculty members and postdoctoral fellows, 109 graduate students, and 54 industrial engineers and scientists. It is my opinion that this expression of public and professional concern should be taken into careful consideration and it is for this reason I include the following petition in the RECORD:

We, the undersigned members of the Palo Alto-Stanford scientific community, are extremely concerned about the use of limited resources in unproductive and unnecessary military expenditures.

In particular, we stand strongly against the deployment of the Sentinel Antiballistic system.

Deployment of Sentinel will most certainly lead to a drastic acceleration of the arms race.

Deployment of Sentinel will waste billions of dollars which are sorely needed elsewhere.

Deployment of Sentinel is questionable on purely technical grounds.

The problems of society—over-population, pollution, education, hunger and urban redevelopment—should be given greater priority at this time than the construction of the Sentinel system.

We urge you to direct your energies against the deployment of the Sentinel Antiballistic Missile System.

INVOCATION OFFERED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CHAPLAIN C. J. OLANDER, AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON MARCH 15, 1969, AT THE SHERATON-PARK HOTEL

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the 50th anniversary celebration of the American Legion on March 15, 1969, at which time I heard the national chaplain, Rev. C. J. Olander, of Tchula, Miss., deliver the invocation. I would like to share this timely and eloquent prayer with my colleagues at this time:

INVOCATION OFFERED BY THE NATIONAL CHAPLAIN, REVEREND C. J. OLANDER, OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Almighty God, Our Heavenly Father we are grateful to Thee for the men and women whose love for Freedom and Justice, whose vision of a nation of free men, and whose willingness to sacrifice themselves and all they possessed to bring into existence "a nation of the people, for the people and by the people." Their faith in Thee and in the principles of Truth and Righteousness has

made the United States of America the greatest nation in the history of the world.

We thank Thee for those of each succeeding generation who have paid the installment due to preserve for posterity the freedom they inherited. We would not forget our sons and daughters who are now on foreign soil in defense of Freedom's Cause.

We pray, this evening, for all who are entrusted with the responsibility of leading this nation. Give a double portion of Thy wisdom and understanding and power to President Nixon, to Vice-President Agnew, and to all who work with them in administering the affairs of state, to the members of the Congress of the United States who make our laws; to the Judges of the Supreme Court who interpret the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted; and to all who serve in offices of lesser importance.

Today, Our Father, there is uneasiness at home and abroad. The war in South Vietnam is of great concern to our people. In our homeland there is misunderstanding, confusion, prejudice, and hatred which multiply our problems. Some of our people are afraid and are ready to succumb to the enemies of Freedom.

Help us to know that our nation has always had problems. Help us also, to know that those who preceded us on the scene of action accepted their problems as challenges calling for their best thought and effort in making the United States of America a better and greater nation. Give courage and strength to the last one of us in this hour of testing.

We give thanks to Thee for the American Legion, the largest and most effective Veterans organization on earth. For her fifty years of 100% Americanism we are humbly proud. Forgive her if she has failed Thee. Help her this evening to begin the next fifty years in Thy name and for Thy glory in "Service to God and Country."

Throughout our history the United States has given consideration to her veterans. For twenty-five years, now, our nation has endeavored as never before to show her appreciation to the veterans, their widows and orphans. This could not have been done but for the Congress of the United States. For this great service we are truly grateful.

We are here to honor this the greatest legislative body in the world's history with this banquet given by our aggressive and effective National Commander Doyle.

Long live the United States of America and the American Legion.

In the name of Him who loves us and inspires us to greater "service to God and country we pray, Amen.

LABOR COURTS: A RECIPE FOR DELAY AND DENIAL OF JUSTICE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House knows of the concerted drive to replace the National Labor Relations Board with so-called labor courts. I think that everyone should know that this campaign is being conducted and financed by some of the Nation's biggest corporations, the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I seriously doubt that a combine like that can really hope to be believable as the protector and defender of worker's rights. Their basic aim, I believe, is to weaken and restrict the right of workers to join unions—and to bargain collectively on wages, hours, and working conditions with their employers. Anyone who thinks otherwise should read "Labor Courts: A Recipe for Delay and Denial of Justice," an article appearing recently in the Advance, the official newspaper of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO. The article is as follows:

LABOR COURTS: A RECIPE FOR DELAY AND DENIAL OF JUSTICE

(NOTE.—The idea sounds reasonable, but it's filled with booby traps—so unions oppose it.)

The nation's labor laws spell out the policy of acceptable conduct in labor-management relations. The National Labor Relations Board interprets these rules and decides whether unions and employers are complying with them.

If they are not, the board seeks to remedy the situation either through an agreement between the parties or through its decisions which are enforceable in the federal courts.

The board is now under a concerted attack by groups of employers who want to abolish it. These employers are unhappy with some of the decisions the board has been making—and propose that the five-member board be replaced by a permanent United States Labor Court.

On the surface, this seems to have the tinge of reasonableness. Our judiciary is highly respected and such a legal tribunal could be expected to apply fair and reasoned judgments in the settlement of conflicts in the labor-management arena.

But if you pursue the matter further, the real purpose of the management effort and the effect it would have on labor relations show through clearly. The imposition of a labor court over the conduct of unions and employers would only lead to a delay and even denial of justice—particularly for workers and unions.

These employer organizations staging the attack on the board make no secret that this is the broadest combined effort they have ever made.

A BIG BUSINESS DRIVE

It is a joint campaign conducted by the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce and actively supported by many of the nation's biggest corporations. The strategy is being devised by the big public relations firm of Hill & Knowlton, which is seeking to win public support for the labor court proposal.

The campaign is built around the theme that the NLRB has a "pro-union" bias. Under the past two Democratic administrations, the charges claim, the five-member agency has moved to deny management rights" to resist union organizing, bargaining demands, picketing and other areas of potential conflict. It is being deliberately directed at the public to win support for a package of so-called "labor law reform" proposals.

In attacking the board and its decisions, the businessmen and their public relations advisers failed to point out that a great majority (80 percent) of the board's rulings have been upheld by the courts. In those highly controversial cases that have gone all the way to the Supreme Court, the NLRB has been sustained in its judgment in all nine decisions that have been reviewed in the last two terms.

Why, then, do these management groups seek a new legal tribunal to interpret the labor laws?

Presumably, a reasoning judicial body would reach similar conclusions, since its decisions would be made from the same trilogy of labor laws—the 1935 Wagner Act and the two subsequent laws that amended it in some respects, the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act passed in 1959.

The provisions in these laws guiding the behavior of unions and employers are, indeed, highly complex. While they provide guidelines for the board, each specific case that reaches the NLRB has special conditions that require individual examination and interpretation.

The board does not claim its decisions are incontestible, or that its judgments are not sometimes in error.

THE NLRB IS FAIR

But the record of the current NLRB supports its claim of impartial administration of a major federal statute. Indeed, it is an astounding record of accomplishment.

Each year, the NLRB processes over 30,000 unfair labor practice and representation cases. Each one represents a potential labor dispute, but an overwhelming majority of cases are quickly and peacefully resolved by agreement between the parties. Of the 17,000 unfair labor practice cases received by the board each year, over 90 percent are settled without extended controversy.

The rights of employers, unions and workers alike are protected by the board through its procedures.

The board is responsible for administering the canons of labor law which, essentially, protect employees in the right to join unions and bargain collectively—or to refrain from such activities if they choose. The law specifies "unprotected activities" dealing with illegal strikes and other subjects that may become unfair labor practice complaints by an employer.

An employer, in turn, commits an unfair labor practice if he attempts to interfere with or restrain employees in the exercise of their rights, refuses to bargain collectively or attempts to encourage or discourage membership in unions.

In addition to handling complaints of unfair labor practices, the NLRB also conducts approximately 8,200 secret ballot elections each year among employees to determine whether they want to be represented by a union for collective bargaining.

This is an enormous work-load for the labor agency, but it is structured to process the cases as quickly as possible. An independent General Counsel's office determines whether an unfair labor practice charge has sufficient grounds to take it to the board. NLRB trial examiners then process these complaints for ajudication by the five-member board.

In recent years, the agency has made determined efforts to speed up its case handling, with some success. But it still may take two years or more for a decision to be handed down. Court appeals may further delay legal redress.

"Justice delayed is justice denied" is an adage that takes on special pertinence when you consider the years of litigation carried on by employers seeking to frustrate the judgments against their conduct. Some corporations have earned unenviable reputations for such conduct—Rutter-Rex, Kohler Corp., Deering-Milliken and J. P. Stevens are examples.

NEW BURDENS FOR UNIONS

But management's ability to side-step remedies for violations of the labor laws would be greatly enhanced if the NLRB were to be replaced by a labor court.

Under board procedures, when a complainant files an unfair labor practice charge, the case is taken over by the Regional Director, who is part of the General Counsel's office. His office not only investigates the situation, but also carries on the legal case before the board if it is determined that a possible violation has occurred.

But if such a complaint is made before a

labor court, the burden of processing the charge would fall on the employee, the employer or the union. In the case of the individual worker or small local unions, this would inevitably discourage him from pursuing remedies from the court because he would lack the financial resources to hire the legal talent to prosecute the case.

Union, too, would be heavily burdened by such a procedure, lacking both the resources and staff that an employer could provide for the courtroom test. In addition, such an investment in funds and manpower would clearly divert unions from their principal goals of organizing and collective bargaining.

There are other telling arguments that refute the effectiveness of a labor court as an administrator of our labor laws. While the delays in case-handling before the board are too long, these delays would be of short duration compared with the time that case-processing would take before a labor ocurt.

Experience in processing the labor laws through the years would also be lost. Through the extensive handling of unfair labor practice cases at the NLRB, the staff of the General Counsel's office has developed an expertise on the intricacies of the statutes—as well as on the practices of those whose cases appear before the labor agency.

Such experience is invaluable in the processing of cases and could not be matched within any reasonable period by those who would be required to argue their cases before a labor court.

BIG DRIVE THIS YEAR

Despite the judgments of many disinterested experts on the harmful effects that a labor court would have in the labor relations field, supporters of the management campaign are pushing legislation in the 91st Congress to create such a court.

A measure introduced by Sen. Robert P. Griffin (R–Mich.) would establish a United States Labor Court of 15 judges, appointed for a 20-year period. Griffin's 27-page bill sets up procedures to terminate the full range of activities of the NLRB and the General Counsel's office; they would be replaced by the court and an administrator. Labor court decisions could also be appealed through the judicial structure.

Under this legislation, the death-knell of the NLRB would be sounded 180 days after it was approved. As the measure says, "on the effective date of this act, proceedings pending before the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or before the National Labor Relations Board itself shall be suspended and thereafter transferred as expeditiously as possible to the Administrator of the Labor Court . . ."

The National Labor Relations Board has been a notably fair administrator of the labor statutes—for employees, employers and labor unions alike. To abolish the agency in favor of a labor court would be to create a great imbalance against workers and labor unions.

The wheels of justice would grind to a halt.

STOP CENSUS PRIVACY INVASION

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there are many occasions when the responsible elements of the American press are able to comment with great objectivity on controversial issues facing the U.S. Congress.

The issue of compulsory responses to a detailed questionnaire proposed to be circulated by the Census Bureau next year has provided press objectivity in the case of an editorial of the Waukegan News-Sun, of which F. Ward Just is the editor and publisher.

This reputable daily newspaper has produced a logical and meaningful editorial, in which the individual's right of privacy is given priority over the Census Bureau's effort to require a mandatory response to the 120 questions which the Census Bureau proposes to present to more than 200 million Americans next year.

I commend this significant editorial to my colleagues in the Congress:

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun, Apr. 12, 1969]

STOP CENSUS PRIVACY INVASION

In the past few sessions of Congress, numerous bills have been introduced to prevent the U.S. Census Bureau from requiring answers to questions considered to be an invasion of privacy.

The Betts bill (H.R. 3779) has emerged as the best of the lot, and we hope it is speedily approved.

The bill is sponsored by Rep. Jackson Betts, R-Ohio, along with Illinois Republican Robert McClory and others, and would limit required answers to only six of the 120 census questions.

Federal censuses are provided for in the U.S. Constitution, and their main purpose is to guide House reapportionment to reflect the growth of the nation and population movement.

However, they have been slowly expanded over the years, largely at the request of marketing research firms, to include questions ranging far beyond the basic concept of population count.

If the Betts bill is defeated, the 1970 census will require statements of personal income from all sources, property value and rent paid, and marital status, including number of marriages, their dates and divorce information.

It will also require information on household appliances, number of cars, place of parents' birth, and whether you share your bathroom with someone else.

Persons who refuse to answer these questions will expose themselves to a fine of $100 and 60-day imprisonment. The penalty for willfully giving false information is $500 and imprisonment for one year.

Congressmen Betts and McClory have been joined by more than 100 representatives in sponsoring a bill which would allow the Census Bureau to ask anything it wants, but would limit required answers to questions in only six categories:

"1, Name and address. 2, relationship to head of household. 3, sex. 4, date of birth. 5, marital status. 6, visitors in home at the time of census."

The bill would also eliminate the threat of imprisonment, but would leave the fines at $100 and $500.

According to Rep. McClory, marketing research firms which make use of the Bureau's statistical information are opposing the Betts bill. They claim that only 1 per cent of the population would refuse to answer the questions if it were mandatory, whereas 20 per cent would refuse if it were voluntary, thus reducing statistical validity.

As McClory has said, "These arguments are persuasive, but they do little to justify the census taker's invasion of the individual's right of privacy.

"Even assurances that the census information will be kept confidential are not too convincing when it is realized that leaks of confidential information from other governmental agencies have occurred in the past."

We agree, and we add that the government is not, and should not be in the marketing research business. Those who are should not be allowed to get a free ride on the Census Bureau's back.

REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my policy of sending newsletters to my constituents, the following is my newsletter of April 1969 I intend to send to my constituents tomorrow. I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

APRIL 1969.

DEAR FRIEND: New committee assignment—Ways and Means: Shortly after the 91st Congress convened, I was elected by the Democratic members of the House to the one vacant seat on the important Ways and Means Committee. Since all tax legislation must originate in the House of Representatives, this committee, through its jurisdiction over tax matters, is considered to be one of the most responsible committees in the Congress.

Ways and Means is also responsible for a broad range of legislation affecting most citizens including social security, medicare, tariffs, international trade agreements, welfare, and the national debt ceiling. The Democratic members of the committee have an especially important role in the organization of Congress as they select all other Democrats for their committee assignments.

The Ways and Means Committee is a good assignment and I look forward to working on tax reform and other vital matters before the committee.

Ways and Means Committee working on tax reform: The inequities and unfair preferences in our Federal Income Tax laws become more noticeable each day. Congress has delayed tax reform too long. Glaring tax loopholes enable many high income people and organizations to avoid paying any income tax. In 1967, 155 people filed tax returns on adjusted gross incomes of more than $200,000 and did not pay one penny of income tax. Included in this group were 21 people with annual incomes in excess of 1 million dollars. One very wealthy widow with annual interest income from tax free bonds of $1,500,000 did not even have to file a tax return while her gardener had to pay $350 income tax on his $5000 wage.

Under existing law, the rate of taxation is supposed to be based primarily on the ability to pay. An individual taxpayer in the lowest tax bracket pays 14 percent of his income in taxes; however, the 22 largest oil refiners with a combined net profit after taxes of $5.179 billion in 1964 paid only 4 percent in taxes. The Atlantic Oil Company had income of over one-half billion dollars from 1962 through 1967, but did not pay one cent of federal income tax.

Tax reform is essential this year.

Fairness and simplicity key to successful tax reform: While there is agreement on the general need for tax reform, there is wide disagreement on precisely what needs to be done. I think the first priority should be given to legislation to more fairly distribute the tax burden. People in approximately the same economic circumstances should pay equal amounts of tax.

There should be a *minimum* tax for all persons with income above a specified amount such as $10,000. Certainly, high in-

come persons should not be allowed a total exemption from taxation through the use of tax loopholes as we have at the present. in establishing a minimum tax rate, it should be graduated on the principle of ability to pay.

As part of a program to achieve tax fairness, we must consider not only those who pay too little in relation to others, but also those who pay too much. A *maximum* tax rate should be established in order that no individual is required to pay more than perhaps 50 percent of his total income in taxes to the federal government.

I also support raising the *allowable standard deduction* from 10 to 14 percent and increasing the dollar limitation from $1000 to $18000. This change would greatly simplify the preparation of many individual returns, eliminate the mass of records that most people have to keep, and reduce the government's cost of processing tax returns. Making the standard deduction more realistic is certainly in the best interest of both the individual taxpayer and the government. If this recommendation is adopted, upward of 80 percent of all taxpayers would use the standard deduction.

I am working on other tax reforms to increase the $600 individual exemption, provide better tax treatment for the elderly, tighten controls over tax-exempt foundations, correct abuses of tax rules by "nonfarmers" claiming farm losses, and several other important changes in our tax laws. Your comments and suggestions will be most welcome.

Congressional questionnaire planned: I have not sent you a questionnaire for the first portion of this Congress because the new Administration has not yet made major legislative recommendations to the Congress. As soon as the Administration's legislative program is disclosed, I will ask for your views on these proposals and other issues of special importance.

The response to all of my previous Congressional Questionnaires has been excellent. I think they serve as a very important communication link that should be kept open.

New congressional office opened in Plant City: I have opened a Congressional Office in Plant City to serve the growing needs of the residents of East Hillsborough County and the nine western precincts of Polk County. The new office is located on the third floor of the Hillsboro Bank Building at 202 West Reynolds Street in Plant City. The telephone number is 754–1266. The office will be open from 9:30 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. each Thursday and other days if needed. I plan to be in the office in Plant City as much as possible when I am not required to be in Washington.

Sincerely,

SAM.

TOWN OF EISENHOWER WOULD HAVE CHALLENGE

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, many excellent newspaper stories have been written about Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and more will be written.

I would like to share one of these stories with my colleagues. This was written by the fine Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis Star, Ben Cole.

Cole recommends that a town be named for Eisenhower but he warns that this town will have to live up to its name.

The article follows:

TOWN OF EISENHOWER WOULD HAVE CHALLENGE

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—It would be a nice thing if somewhere in America there could be a town called Eisenhower.

It would be a far better tribute to the late soldier-President than any other.

Eisenhower, USA, shouldn't be a big, crowded city but a homey town with church spires sticking up through the hardwood trees and a good basketball team the whole town roots for.

Of course, most of the towns in America already have names—and they're proud of them and want to keep them.

When the country was expanding westward and new towns were springing up like mushrooms, finding names for them all was a challenge if not a chore.

Many took their names from some strong men who founded them—hence places like Logansport, Sullivan, Crawfordsville, etc. Some got made-up names like Indianapolis or Minneapolis. A few looked to a classical age—Athens, Ithaca, Syracuse, Cairo, Rome, Carthage.

Others took their names from geographical features—South Bend, Crown Point, Riverside. And the music of foreign language remained to described the features of many—Terre Haute, Buena Vista, Monticello, Champagne.

Many new towns took the names of Presidents out of pride in the new country and the infant government—Washington (every state has one), Adams, Jeffersonville, Madison, Monroe, Van Buren, Jackson, Harrisonburg, Tyler, Polk, Fillmore, Lincoln . . ."

In recent years there have not been many new towns—only a few real estate developments that get named after motivational psychology—Pine Manor, Heather Hills, Cloistered Woods, Colonial Shores, etc.

But if somewhere in America there is a neat and pretty town with an ordinary name that would like to make of itself a living memorial to a beloved soldier and statesman—then it ought to change its name and become Eisenhower. And then live up to it.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER: SOLDIER AND STATESMAN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the text of an article which I wrote for the local newspapers of the Third Congressional District of Indiana:

CONGRESSIONAL CORNER: JOHN BRADEMAS REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

Few Americans have been so genuinely respected and loved not only by their fellow countrymen, but by people all over the world as Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Destiny chose Dwight Eisenhower to play a leading role in the drama of Twentieth Century history both as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in World War II and as President of the United States for eight years. He was always equal to the challenge.

Dwight Eisenhower was a warm and generous human being. To millions of Americans he was also a symbol of the basic strengths and virtues of the American character.

President Eisenhower once said, "I come from the heart of America."

He did, and America took him to its heart.

As we mourn General Eisenhower's passing, let our tribute to his memory be a heightened resolve to continue the quest for peace which dominated his extraordinary career.

As one of the greatest military leaders in history, General Eisenhower was all too familiar with the horrors of war. His experiences made him a passionate advocate of peace. Yet at his final news conference, when asked to indicate what he regarded as the greatest disappointment of his eight years in office, he answered in this way: "The big disappointment I felt is one not of mere incident, it was the fact that we could not in these eight years get to the place where we could say it now looks as if permanent peace with justice is really in sight."

The Eisenhower years were years of cold war, of armed peace. And no one was better situated than the President who was also a general to measure the effects upon the institutions of American democracy of a development which was totally new to American life—the growth of an enormous standing military establishment in a time of peace.

In his famous Farewell Address to the American people on January 17, 1961, President Eisenhower spoke at some length about what he termed the "conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry."

He solemnly warned that "we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications." Here is President Eisenhower's parting advice to the American people:

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

President Eisenhower's statement seems today, eight years later, to have been truly prophetic. For we are only beginning to realize the truth of his words. For example, the American people are now being asked to shoulder the burden of an expensive antiballistic missile system which an extraordinary number of scientists and other experts have criticized as useless or even dangerous; which they warn would increase our security only minimally, if at all; and which nearly everyone agrees will divert funds from vital programs in our own country.

Moreover, this controversy arises at a time when we are learning that the Army has spent $1 billion on developing a tank for which there is no ammunition; that the costs of developing a new Air Force transport have exceeded original estimates by $2 billion; and that contracts awarded by the Department of Defense are effectively exempted from the normal auditing processes of the government.

Could such developments as these be examples of the "disastrous rise of misplaced power" of which President Eisenhower warned us?

Surely all of us want a military defense powerful enough to assure the security of the United States against potential enemies—and so did President Eisenhower.

But surely we must also all take to heart President Eisenhower's admonition to be concerned lest what he described as "the military industrial complex" acquire such "unwarranted influence" as to "endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

President Eisenhower's plea for "an alert and knowledgeable citizenry" that will "take nothing for granted" may come to be regarded in decades ahead as the most significant legacy of wisdom this great man has left us.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there could be nothing more eloquently said about women in Government than the presence of the gracious and capable gentlewomen I see in this Chamber. Their contributions to the deliberations of Government have been exceptional. They accomplish the work of the hardest-working men and add something more than even the most astute of my male colleagues can. Perhaps it is their roles as wives and mothers that gives this added dimension to their work or perhaps it is just that thing known as the "woman's viewpoint." However, I know that I speak for all my colleagues when I say that their contribution is immeasurable and beneficial to the Nation.

The Democratic Women on Wheels of Massachusetts sponsored a competition for a scholarship award. The contest was open to all senior girls in the State Public High Schools. Each girl who entered wrote an essay on the status of women in Government. Miss Barbara Higgins, of the Algonquin Regional High School, Northboro, Mass., was the winner of this year's award. My good friend, Miss Margaret M. Breen, scholarship chairman, brought Miss Higgins' essay to my attention. I have received permission to have it included in the RECORD.

Miss Higgins understands the great need for dedicated women in Government and with great discernment sees how much more they can contribute when they are active in the political arena. It gives me great pleasure to share this essay with my colleagues, and particularly with the gentle ladies of the House who epitomize the best attributes of those women who have taken valuable time in order to serve the Nation.

The essay follows:

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

(By Barbara J. Higgins)

There she sits in a high-backed executive chair; her body is dwarfed by the seat's dimensions. She is arrayed in an ill-fitting tailored shirt with a conservative tie; her shoulders float in a jacket of gray-green tweed. The anomaly is completed by a fluff of smoke floating up from a cigar which is poised in her delicate hand.

She is a ridiculous figure! This is not the role of a woman in government!

As woman at long last escapes the bondage of her own apron-strings to blossom in the world of politics, she must not lose the charm and identity of her sex. She has no need to imitate the man who has dominated politics for so long. Woman herself is endowed with an abundance of vigor, eloquence, and stability. Her amazing vitality has been a mother to generations of men. She is fully capable and prepared to accept a significant role in governing the nation.

In the past man has been jealously reluctant to permit feminine ability to challenge his traditional monopoly on politics. The era of colonial America has passed; women are no longer chained to their doorsteps. They have acquired mobility, education, and employment opportunities comparable to those enjoyed by the male. Women are now educated with men, together made aware of governmental facilities. Men and women are absorbed together into the fascinating surge of political events.

The "emancipated" woman has taken her place in the political world. Now she is a town or county official, a representative, a senator. Now she has passed through the processes of politics. She has campaigned, run, been elected, all in the democratic way.—This woman will still be insecure. She has earned the status of an office holder; the voters have shown their respect. Yet where is the confidence that should go with it? Where is the trust and backing which an office holder deserves? This woman has accepted a status in government so novel to her sex that she has been put on display. Her venture into politics is still so impeded by tradition that she becomes an example. The "woman in government" is placed like a specimen under microscopic view. Her movements may be prodded and analyzed in any political circle. Observers are still curious about the feminine presence in politics. The woman is set up as in a glass case, scrutinized not because she holds an office, but because she is a woman. She exemplifies all women in government. If she fails, all women fail; if she achieves, all women gain an essential bit of respect. This woman must be strong and brave with an enormous love of mankind.

The woman does not have to hold a government office in order to satisfy her political enthusiasm. Her presence is essential in other areas of influence. Her energy might stimulate a campaign or activate a political party. By voting she exercises the most sacred right of a democracy. She is able to study a candidate's qualifications and inform other voters in that regard. As an interested, irate, or satisfied citizen, she may petition and correspond with public officials; senators and congressmen are all too often neglected. Perhaps the greatest role of the woman is that which she comes by most naturally, that is, the role of a wife and mother. From this particular vantage point, she can instill in her family a deep pride in country, a trust in government, and a vibrant belief that every man possesses a unique, sacred personality.

Today the world is trembling, frightened by the shadow of bitterness, prejudice, violence. Devices of destruction now terrify their creators. War destroys the respect of man; lives are shattered, dreams destroyed. Young men lose faith in a country which teaches them to kill. Love is an unknown quantity; peace, an intangible vision. Natural disasters ravage the earth leaving thousands homeless and starving. Beauty and natural resources are squandered and destroyed. Campuses erupt in protest; violence is repaid with violence. Prophets of love and prophets of doom are equally ignored. Nations cry; there is no one to hear the agony of their suffering.

If government is a faltering child, floundering in a sea of turmoil, then swirling amid the turmoil is an abundance of kindness and sincere concern.—Perhaps a woman's outstretched hand would not correct the world, but it may provide sufficient faith to stir new life and hope.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL TAKES STAND ON NATIONAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in their April issue, the American Bar Association Journal cites a number of reasons why Congress and the State legislatures should be cautious in considering the idea of a nationwide Presidential primary.

To call attention to the "serious major objections" which they cite, I insert below the lead editorial from the current issue of the American Bar Association Journal:

A NATIONWIDE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY?

With Congress and the state legislatures in session, we shall be hearing more about state and national Presidential primaries. At present, many states have Presidential primaries, some no more than popularity contests, some with varied effects on nominating convention delegates. These primaries are widely scattered as to dates, entered by candidates only on a limited or selective basis, sometimes avoided altogether, inconclusive, inordinately expensive and available seriously only to those who can command vast campaign funds. Imagine such a primary in each of the fifty states!

Hence there is a revival of discussion about a national Presidential primary for the nomination of the President and Vice President. There is nothing new about the idea. Constitutional amendments to bring about a national primary in varying forms have been before the Congress during all its recent sessions, including the present one. But the idea seems to gain more public attention during and immediately after Presidential election years.

A national Presidential primary is subject to serious major objections. First, there is the virtually prohibitive cost of conducting a coast-to-coast primary campaign. Injecting a nationwide Presidential primary ahead of the general election itself would require candidates to get financial backing of such large proportions that the public might fear, and rightly so, that the candidates would be unduly beholden to their moneyed benefactors. Edward S. Corwin, long-time professor of government at Princeton and considered by many to be the dean of modern political scientists, wrote in *The Presidency Today*: "Indeed, the national primary, instead of being a democratic device, would be antidemocratic, because it would limit candidates to those few who could command the big money required in the campaign."

Second, there is the threat to the health of the candidates. During the 1968 campaign we saw headlines such as: "Humphrey Ordered To Rest" and "Nixon Tired and Resting". Add to these strains the pressures of a national Presidential primary just ahead of the general election campaign, for there could hardly be a let-up between the two events, and there would be a system that might shorten the lives of the candidates. The use of television would not eliminate the burden of innumerable personal appearances throughout the country. The 1968 campaign certainly proved this point.

Third, as stated by Professor Corwin, "equally serious is the prospect that a national primary would have a devastating effect on party cohesion". A national Presidential primary might virtually destroy responsible party government and put an end to our effective two-party system. If one believes that party government, and especially our two-party government, is essential to the preservation of free institutions, then anything that weakens two-party government, as a nationwide Presidential primary might, should be avoided.

If one believes that good government rests on sound principles and policies as espoused broadly by organized political parties, then it becomes plain that "voting for the man" instead of the party's choice of a man tends to weaken party government and ultimately leads to government by individuals, which in the wrong hands could lead to dictatorship.

Good government does rest on sound principles and policies as espoused broadly by

organized political parties. Might it not be said that every qualified voter should have some political convictions and a party affiliation? To be an adherent of a political party, one need not agree with everything that a party espouses at any particular juncture if it generally and preponderantly expresses one's political stance. The least effective producer of good government is the person who ignores political discussions during a campaign and forms his views by the image he prefers on the last day or two before the election by watching television.

Party strength begins at the grassroots—the precinct level. That point of beginning involves thousands of persons in the democratic processes of government. Everyone is free to participate at that level either as a candidate or a voter. One who ignores or shuns this process is hardly in a position to criticize the end results of the process. And one who does participate, but is disappointed with the results, should be willing to accept defeat and resolve to work for victory another day. The two-party system has its faults, but it is the best we have devised so far, and we should resolve to keep it healthy and strong.

The divisive effect of a party's Presidential primary was foreshadowed in the last election. Even though the primaries were mere state affairs, it was hard, after the convention, to enlist for the winner of the nomination the strength of those who had worked hard in the primaries for the loser.

NATIONAL TEACHERS-IN-POLITICS WEEKEND

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the city of Hawthorne for proclaiming the weekend of April 11 to 13 as National Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. This is part of a program urging teachers to become more interested and involved in our political process. It is sponsored by the Association for Better Citizenship, which is a part of the California Teachers Association. I would like to include the proclamation as a part of the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the teachers of Hawthorne, California, members of the California Teachers Association and the National Education Association, to lift the understanding of teachers about the need for teacher involvement in politics, and to inspire them to be involved, have urged adoption of a proclamation for National Teachers-In-Politics Weekend; and

Whereas, it is their wish to attract the attention of the public to the new programs and political awareness on the part of the teachers; and communities will benefit when all educators accept the rights and responsibilities of political citizenship, because in so doing, educators will be contributing that which every citizen owes to self-government; and

Whereas, it is their plan to make organized teacher power visible where it really counts, where the results really get tabulated in the halls of congress, in the state capitols, in city and town council chambers;

Now, therefore, I, Gregory Page, Mayor of the City of Hawthorne, California, do hereby proclaim April 11-13, 1969, "National Teachers-In-Politics Weekend," and do call attention to the new programs of political awareness on the part of teachers and members which lead to individual participation and possible membership in political parties of their choice; and that teachers fulfill one of the best functions of free citizens by supporting, serving, and advocating, and becoming candidates for the political party of their choice.

GREGORY PAGE,
Mayor, City of Hawthorne, Calif.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT EXCHANGE'S CHIEF RETIRES

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for more than a half century an old friend of mine has been active in the fruit packing and shipping industry in the State of California. During the past years, the California Fruit Exchange has become the world's largest deciduous tree fruit and grape marketing organization. Its recent growth and expansion, marked by outstanding service to the agricultural industry of the State of California and to the housewives throughout the Nation, can be attributed directly to the inspiration and dedicated leadership of F. M. "Bud" Small, its general manager for many years.

Bud has now retired. As he leaves an active business career, I feel that recognition should be given to the contributions which this man has made to the industry. No better statement of these contributions can be made than that of Mr. Hamilton L. Hintz, agricultural editor of the McClatchy Newspapers. I would like leave to insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Hintz' report from the March 23, 1969, issue of the Sacramento Bee.

FRUIT EXCHANGE'S CHIEF WILL RETIRE

(By Hamilton L. Hintz)

F. M. "Bud" Small, general manager of the California Fruit Exchange, has revealed he will retire at the end of March after a varied career of 53 years in the fruit business.

His successor in the top spot of what is claimed to be the world's largest deciduous tree fruit and grape marketing organization will be named at the 68th annual meeting of the exchange in the El Dorado Hotel in Sacramento on April 22.

Last fall, due to expanded administrative duties and in anticipation of Small's retirement in 1969, the board of directors named Walter M. Tindell, field department manager, as assistant general manager to work with Small.

STARTED IN 1917

Small, now 69, got his start in the fruit packing and shipping business back in 1917 because of a crop failure on his father's peach and plum ranch at Loomis, Placer County, where he was born.

He was in his second year in the James Lick High School in San Francisco at the time and had to leave school to help his father and support himself. He took a laboring job with the Pioneer Fruit Company at Loomis and after three years became manager of the packing shed.

In the next 38 years Small spent about one-half the time as manager at various times of the Loomis Fruit Growers Association, the Colfax Fruit Growers Association and the Auburn Fruit Exchange, and as an executive for three years of Bercut-Richards Packing Company in Sacramento.

BUSINESS VENTURES

The other one-half of that period was spent in various business ventures—fruit ranching and fruit shipping and brokering, some of which were successes and some of which was not.

Although he had been associated several times with California Fruit Exchange affiliated organizations, he joined the exchange staff in 1958 as manager of the field department.

He was named general manager on April 1, 1963, after the death of Fred W. Read.

"I really have had a varied career in this business but each move was a new challenge," says Small. He lists three things as representing his greatest satisfactions during the six years he has been general manager.

One is the exchange reaching a record volume of $26 million annually. Another is the conversion to computerization of accounting, sales trends and crop projections.

The third is the construction of the new Blue Anchor Building on Howe Avenue and winning the award for "The Finest Commercial Office Building Built in America in 1967" from the American Institute of Building Designers. The building is of Early California design with offices surrounding a landscaped courtyard and with the natural tree and scrub growth maintained on the entire property.

"Times have really changed in the fruit business in my lifetime," says Small. "When I started out the farmer packed his own fruit on the ranch and brought it to the shipping shed by horse and wagon. He was the arbiter of grade, size and quality.

"In 1925 I had charge of the first central packing shed in Loomis where attention was given to grade, size and quality. Now there are federal and state laws and industry regulations governing all these things, and the packing plants operate on a mechanized assembly line basis with skilled equipment operators, graders and packers."

PERIOD OF CHANGE

Small has observed great changes in the marketing of fruit. Up until a few years ago the auction markets in the large eastern cities took 70 per cent of the nation's fruit. Now 87 per cent is sold on an f.o.b. shipping basis to direct buyers. Fifty big buyers, taking about one-half the output, represent the chain stores.

Transportation of fruit has changed from nearly all rail to piggy-back refrigerated units, refrigerated trucks and air cargo.

Exports fairly constantly account for 10 per cent of the crops but shift around the world depending on local economic, political and trouble situations. Right now less is going to Europe and more to the Orient and South America.

VIEW OF FUTURE

How does he view the future?

"I see a continuing expanding situation for the California Fruit Exchange and for California agriculture in general. California has the climate and the soil and the know-how to produce competitively with any other section.

"There is much new land that is being, and can be brought into production to meet increased demands and to offset urban sprawl onto farm lands. Agricultural leaders are working together better to meet common problems of the industry.

"Small farmers are going to have a tough time competing with large corporate or family farms unless they join together to achieve economies and bargaining strength. Labor bargaining, unemployment insurance and other laws favorable to farm labor are sure to come and I am sure the industry will adjust to the new situations."

The exchange has members throughout

California and Arizona and obtains about half of its volume from the San Joaquin Valley where the growth has been such as to justify the establishment of a branch office in Fresno.

GRADE GROUPS

Small has been active in a long list of agricultural trade organizations, including the United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, California Grape & Tree Fruit League, Sacramento Valley Employers Council, California Perishable Agricultural Commodities Corporation, California Tree Fruit Agreement and California Host Committee.

In retirement he plans to travel, look after his ranch property in Sierra County and participate in the People-To-People Program. He and his wife will observe their 49th anniversary in May.

BRAY REPORTS TO CONSTITUENTS: NEWSLETTERS NO. 7 THROUGH NO. 12

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, following are my weekly newsletter reports No. 7 through No. 12:

REPORT NO. 7

Reaction by the Russian Bear to anything the lumbering animal doesn't like ranges, figuratively speaking, from sullen growls (verbose newspaper or magazine broadsides) to a swipe of the claws (moving troops to the frontier of the offending country) to the ultimate and final embrace of the Bear's hairy arms (moving troops across the frontier and taking over the country). Sir Winston Churchill's brief and devastatingly apt description of Russia—"A riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma"—means it is usually impossible to predict with any certainty what the reaction to any given thing will be.

I was somewhat surprised lately to be, personally and by name, on the receiving end of sullen growls. A recent newsletter in which I criticized Sweden for extending diplomatic recognition to Hanoi, the latest move in a series of openly anti-American actions, had the effect (as far as I know to date) of getting more response from Moscow than from Stockholm.

Not in a minor key, either: *Izvestia* ("News") which is the official Soviet Government newspaper, and *Krasnaya Svezda* ("Red Star") the authoritative voice of the Red Army, both attacked me and, in passing, defended Sweden.

In some fashion unknown to me, my newsletter or a comment about it got to Sweden. It was then picked up by a correspondent of *Izvestia* in Stockholm, who in turn sent a story to his paper in Moscow. *Izvestia* printed it on January 28 under the byline of one G. Deynichenko (presumably, the Stockholm correspondent) and *Krasnays Svezda* then followed with an article on January 29, written by V. Berezin. English versions of the articles were made available to me by a Washington source soon after they had appeared.

English to Swedish to Russian and back to English again—something got lost in the various translations along the way, since some statements given by the Soviets as direct quotes from my newsletter only have distant resemblance to what I actually wrote. For instance, the two concluding sentences of my newsletter had read:

"If you try to make friends with a dog, yet he continually snaps and snarls at you, there's probably no reason to kick him for it. But there's no reason to throw him any more bones, either."

In *Krasnaya Evezda*, this came out as:

"The American Legislator compared the object of his dissatisfaction with a dog 'who snaps and growls at those who want to befriend it.' 'Even if it is not worth driving such a dog from the house,' Bray concludes, 'one certainly should not throw it any more bones.' . . .

Soviet propaganda (for that matter, practically all Communist propaganda) is almost invariably incredibly dull, dreary, shapeless and humorless. It plods and lurches its way across the printed page with about as much style and elegance as a drunken elephant hip-deep in a mudhole. I have often thought that more people have probably been driven to defection from Communist countries on account of the dust-dry propaganda than by any other factor. Perhaps, as I said earlier, something is lost in the translation, but such an excuse says very little for the abilities of the translators.

But why could my newsletter have provoked such a response? What, in the vernacular of today, "turned them on"? All I said in my newsletter, as far as suggesting what the U.S. might do, was this:

"There is very little the United States can do about any of this. The new Administration could refrain from appointing a new Ambassador to Stockholm, and leave our embassy there under a chargé d'affaires. . . . We owe such a country absolutely no favors of any sort. And the country in question should not expect—nor have the gall to ask for—anything beyond the most stiffly formal and correct treatment that is required in normal diplomatic interchange. . . ."

I believe the Soviets saw in my newsletter a "trial balloon." To the Kremlin, everything done outside the Communist bloc is a major conspiracy of one sort or another, aimed at thwarting Russian designs. I have no way of knowing, but it well could be that Soviet analysts saw my remarks as originally inspired by the White House itself (which they certainly were not!) to test world reaction in preparation for just such a move. Then, later, go ahead if no one raised too much objection.

The next Soviet assumption, then, might have been that the Swedes would think the same thing and possibly postpone indefinitely or outright cancel, their planned recognition of North Vietnam. Net result: a propaganda defeat of sizeable proportions for both Hanoi and Moscow, which is something to be avoided at all costs.

On balance, this incident has probably been the result of a silly Soviet miscalculation and misreading of one event. I would suggest the Kremlin improve the quality of its U.S. analysts. And while they're at it, they might sharpen up their translators, too. I don't mind in the least being quoted—even by *Izvestia* and *Krasnaya Svezda*—but I do wish it would be quoted as it was written!

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO. 7

(NOTE.—English translation of the two articles appearing in Izvestia and Krasnaya Svezda which are referred to in Report No. 7.)

[From Moscow Izvestia, Jan. 28, 1969]

BRAY HAS BEEN ANGRY

(Article by G. Deynichenko)

STOCKHOLM, January 27.—The Kingdom of Sweden has seriously insulted the Republican, so seriously that he does not even want to know this state. The stern Republican is called William G. Bray. He lives across the ocean and enjoys considerable renown there, because he represents the State of Indiana in the U.S. Congress. William Bray also made his statement about relations with Sweden in this capacity. He proposed that Washington not send an ambassador there any more but that it limit itself to a temporary charge d'affaires.

The Congressman stated: "We are not obliged to do any service whatever for such a country."

Bray timed his statement for the moment when the United States in fact had no ambassador in Sweden. The ambassador finished his term of service and left Stockholm a few days afterwards.

What was it that disturbed Bray? The reader can easily guess—the establishment of diplomatic relations between Sweden and the DRV. The press had already reported that the Swedish decision to establish such relations had caused irritation in American official circles. However, so far nobody had gone as far as Bray. He allowed himself to use diplomatic descriptions and images that were in no way diplomatic.

The Congressman said: If you try to make friends with a dog and it continues to bite you, perhaps it is not worth driving it out but it is also not worth throwing it an extra bone.

Bray is resolutely against the "extra bone," that is, against appointing a new U.S. ambassador to Sweden.

It is not the first time that Sweden has served as the object of crude attack by the American press and even American officials. Washington has tried to exert diplomatic pressure on Sweden, and all this is in connection with the Swedish position over the Vietnam question. It is not yet clear whether Bray's statement is to be interpreted as a flash of temperament or as a sign of new pressure.

[From Moscow Red Star, Jan. 29, 1969]

THERE IS DISSATISFACTION ACROSS THE OCEAN

(Article by V. Berezin)

American Congressman William Bray was extremely incensed and no more than three days ago he gave vent to his wrath in a letter to the electorate. The American Legislator compared the object of his dissatisfaction with a dog who "snaps and growls at those who want to befriend it." "Even if it is not worth driving such a dog from the house," Bray concludes, "one certainly should not throw it any more bones."

The object of this particular irritation and these insulting attacks by the transoceanic Congressman turned out to be Sweden, which a little over two weeks ago recognized the DRV and decided to establish diplomatic relations with it. This realistic step by the Swedish Government was greeted with approval by the world public, since it is clear that such a decision will only contribute to the strengthening of peace in Southeast Asia and to a settlement of the Vietnam problem and, of course, will have a beneficial influence on the Paris talks on Vietnam. And unquestionably, Stockholm's judicious act is still another acknowledgment of the great successes of the heroic Vietnamese people, in a prolonged and just struggle.

In Washington, such a realistic step by a Scandinavian Government elicited evident disapproval. Even earlier Washington had not concealed its displeasure at the fact that Sweden maintains political, economic, and cultural contacts with the DRV. Last year Washington went to the lengths of slamming the door and recalling—allegedly for "consultations"—its Ambassador William Heath.

Sweden's latest action has been used by Swedish ill-wishers to whip up an anti-Swedish campaign in the United States. Strange as it may seem, the U.S. State Department appears to think that "Sweden's decision will not assist the cause of peace in Southeast Asia." Such a step by Stockholm "Vexes Washington," the newspaper "The Washington Post" admits. "The Swedish Government's decision will lead to an-

other crisis in Swedish-U.S. relations," American political observers gloomily predict.

Attempts are being made to exert pressure on Sweden from across the ocean. Unambiguous threats are being resorted to, and we found out that there was no standing on ceremony in the choice of expressions used. In the meantime, sixty-one-year-old Arne Berndt Bjonberg, formerly newspaper commentator, and subsequently Sweden's Ambassador to Guatemala, is preparing to take up his new duties—this time as Swedish Ambassador to the DRV. The capitals of various other western states are now seriously considering the possibility of following Sweden's judicious example.

REPORT NO. 8

"Here dead lie we because we did not choose
To live and shame the land from which we sprung;
Life, to be sure, is nothing much to lose,
But young men think it is, and we were young."

There have been over 30,000 to date—most young, but some not; privates and generals, draftees and Regulars; all creeds, all races; wearing every uniform and holding every rank; from every corner of the American Republic—our Vietnam dead. The last journey of their life was to that far-off country, and their last journey on this earth was to return home—home, for the last time—to the land and the community they had known and loved.

And so loved that they chose to face—and meet—death, rather than live and shame this same land and country.

There have been, to date, other thousands more who made a different choice. All young, all walks of life, all races, all creeds, all social and economic levels and, like their fellow Americans in Vietnam, from every corner of the American Republic. Some put on the uniform of their country and took the oath, but then broke it. Others did not, but fled, to Canada, to Sweden, no one knows how many or where. They live today, beyond reach of the laws of their homeland. Their existence in exile is a collective living sneer at, and defilement of, their country, their people, and, most of all, their 30,000 fellow Americans who have died in Vietnam.

Not to be counted are the approximately 800 young men who openly defied the laws of their country, yet had the stamina to stand and face their fate at the bar of civil justice or of a military court-martial. I think they were wrong—the draft-card burners, the draft resisters, the deserters—who are now serving prison terms—and I cannot join the ranks of maudlin sympathizers who snivel over the fate of "fine young men in prison." Their lives have been interrupted, it is true, but only temporarily. There are more than 30,000 whose lives were ended. But, for those who did choose to face the penalties they knew their behavior would invoke, I must say they did have true courage of their convictions. They did not run away.

For the rest of them, in their self-imposed exile, pressure and propaganda has already begun to seek for them a general amnesty. This amnesty would, it seems, be delivered at some future date, and the suggestion is made that it be in the form of an Executive Order by the President. It would be issued at an appropriate time, and then clear the way for them to return home. To return, no doubt, in what would be an attitude of smirking triumph, to be lauded for their "moral courage" by every slack-jawed, loose principled, meddling busybody whose energies in behalf of these exiles have been constantly geared to the adulation, encouragement, propaganda for and assistance to deeds which were nothing less than treasonous.

I cannot conceive of any action such as this proposed "amnesty" which would more enrage the American people. I know it would not stand the slightest chance of approval by the U.S. Congress if presented as proposed legislation, and I cannot imagine such a step being taken by the Administration.

"If we break faith with us who die
We do not sleep, but still we lie
In Flanders Fields . . ."

McCrae wrote his poem for the dead of World War I but the words apply today. If one chooses to break faith with his country and his fellow-citizens, and flee to alien shores, then let him make, when the time comes, one of the two choices he has left open to himself: exist out his days in exile, or return and face the judgment of those to whom the words "Duty—Honor—Country" have a meaning, and for whom the word "Loyalty" has a connotation going far beyond just taking an oath.

Pericles' famous and moving Funeral Oration, delivered over the Athenian dead in the winter of 431–430 B.C., at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, contained these stirring lines about bravery, and what it means:

". . . the man who can most truly be accounted brave is he who best knows the meaning of what is sweet in life and of what is terrible, and then goes out undeterred to meet what is to come."

The 30,000 dead knew this sweetness of life, the blessings of their homeland, the glory of its heritage and the promise of its future. They also knew what was terrible, but they met it as it came. How could any nation grant amnesty to those whose arrogant posturing and cynical, twisted moralizing blasphemes the memory of brave men? We must not allow the courage of the fallen to be defiled by those who not only reject and mock what their country stands for, but also implicitly reject and mock those who died to preserve it.

REPORT NO. 9

"C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre"—("It is magnificent, but it is not war!")

1854—Balaclava, the Crimea: The French General Bosquet watched as Lord Cardigan's 700-man Light Brigade of cavalry thundered at the gallop down North Valley, straight into the flaming Russian cannon. Tears streaming down his cheeks as he stood on the Fedioukine Hills overlooking the valley, General Bosquet uttered that memorable phrase that has been repeated all through history ever since, when voices have been raised in protest against what has seemed to be useless expenditure of brave men and their raw courage in the face of impossible odds.

Bosquet's words have been used in different form ever since the return of the Pueblo and its crew. As their painful story unfolds, public reaction makes it clear that the American people are saying, in effect, "The crew was magnificent, but what brought this about was not war!"

I have been assigned to what I consider one of the most important duties ever given me since coming to the House of Representatives over 18 years ago: ranking Republican member of a Special Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to investigate all circumstances surrounding the capture of the Pueblo and its crew. My Subcommittee will consider the national security aspects as well as what changes, if any, should be made in existing prisoner of war codes of conduct.

By nature of its assignment, the Subcommittee will be going far beyond the scope of the Navy's Board of Inquiry. Our report, which is due before January 1970, must contain specific recommendations for whatever corrective administrative or legislative action we feel should be taken to prevent this from happening again.

There is, I think, another area of equal importance. The Pueblo affair has raised extremely grave questions in the minds of the citizens of our Republic. It is no exaggeration to say that, coming on top of the "credibility gap" brought about by the Viet Nam War, the Pueblo case has seriously damaged the faith and confidence of our people in the country's top-level military and civilian leaders.

A change of Administration, by itself, is not sufficient to erase this doubt. A public opinion survey indicates that two out of three Americans believe the whole truth will never be known. Such voluntary cessation of trust in their Government by such a large segment of the population is highly disturbing to me. To be sure, due to national security requirements, the whole story about any intelligence operation can never be revealed. But I believe what concerns our citizens goes much deeper than mere curiosity about "James Bond" angles.

I wonder if it may be a sympton of this strange, much-debated and much-discussed abstraction called "alienation of the individual"? Have we reached a point in our country where doubt and mistrust are going to be the main governing factors in the people's relationship to their Government? Do our people really feel the Federal Government is nothing more than a vast, impersonal monstrosity, whose word is worthless, whose deeds are vain, whose promises are hollow, whose judgment is too questionable to be reliable, and whose future, indeed, may be in doubt?

Let me make it clear that I do not ask for blind belief from any one on any thing. And let me also make it clear that I feel the Federal Government has brought much of this upon itself. Protestations by the bureaucracy to the contrary, the Federal Government has all too often let itself seem to be downright callous and ignorant of the human factor in people, and more inclined to view the population as numbers, fit for coding on punch cards or computer tapes, and to be manipulated like does on a graph or symbols in some equation.

In essence, I believe what our people are trying to say about the Pueblo might come to this: "Don't gamble needlessly with human lives. If the risk has to be taken, at least make sure, by all possible steps, that the odds are in our favor as much as possible."

Much has come out of the Pueblo inquiry to date to make people think this was not observed. It makes no difference why—ignorance, carelessness or blind stupidity—but the feeling in the country is fear it may happen again.

Standing beside General Bosquet, watching the Light Brigade in its hour of agony and wondering "the reason why" was Bosquet's fellow country-man, General Brite. Brite's remarks are less well-known but apply as well as do Bosquet's:

"JE SUIS VIEUX, J'AI VU DES BATAILLES, MAIS CECI EST TROP."—("I AM OLD, I HAVE SEEN BATTLES, BUT THIS IS TOO MUCH!")

Our American Republic is not an old country, as countries go, but we have seen many battles and, sadly enough, we may well see more in the course of our national existence. But let the Pueblo be to us as was the Charge of the Light Brigade to Generals Bosquet and Brite: magnificent, for the courage of the men, but caused by nothing to be found in the common-sense rules of warfare or conflict between nations.

And, it *is* too much. It must never happen again.

REPORT NO. 10

The following sentence which appeared in a Washington, D.C., newspaper last week gave me certain wry amusement:

"With all the unspent momentum of the Cold War, Berlin is once again being propelled inexorably into an East-West crisis this week, *but nobody quite knows why.*" (Italics mine.)

The underscored part of the sentence is completely wrong. It is easy and sometimes, for the sake of the reputations of statesmen living and dead, convenient, to forget. There are those who would very much like to forget Teheran, in 1944, and Yalta, in 1945. But it was at those two wartime conferences where the United States sowed the wind of carelessness that means we now reap the whirlwind of crisis, with regard to Berlin and, for that matter, the rest of the world.

Teheran produced very few firm commitments for anything except *Overlord*, the cross-Channel invasion of Europe, and *Anvil*, the invasion of Southern France. The first gave Stalin his "second front" and the second, meaning the U.S. and Britain would bypass the Balkans, gave Stalin eventual control in that area. Conference records (I have the documents and have carefully studied them) are not clear on exactly what Stalin was promised regarding post-war occupancy of Central and Eastern Europe.

British General Lord Ismay, Chief of Staff to the Minister of Defense from 1940 to 1946, and present at the conferences, has noted that ". . . the Anglo-American forces were committed to withdrawing to their respective zones of occupation as soon as Germany surrendered." General Eisenhower, altho not at Teheran, was filled in on what went on by Roosevelt. Eisenhower wrote in 1962, in an article entitled "My Views on Berlin," that ". . . by prior political agreement any territory captured by us within the planned Soviet zone would necessarily be surrendered to the Soviets."

In November 1944 the European Advisory Committee, created at Teheran, agreed to a three-way division of Germany between the U.S., Britain and Russia. Later amended to include France, the agreement had no plan for guaranteed access to Berlin. This was noted at Yalta, in February 1945, where arrangements were made for Berlin to be governed jointly by commandants appointed by respective zone Commanders-in-Chief. But still, no iron-class access to the city was provided.

However, at Yalta, the U.S. Joint Planners did recommend a memo to the British and Soviet General Staffs, pointing out this isolation, and citing the need for regular transit by road, air and rail, and proposing (here I quote from the memo) ". . . that the general principle be accepted of freedom of transit by each nation concerned between the main occupied area and the forces occupying Berlin and similar isolated areas." The British concurred; the Soviets did not. The matter was dropped.

General Lucius Clay, who served for four years first as Deputy Military Governor, then as Military Governor of Germany, said afterwards on the Berlin access question that the U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, one of the members of the EAC, felt ". . . the right to be in Berlin carried with it the right of access and that it would only confuse the issue to raise it in connection with the agreement. . . . He [the Ambassador] believed it possible to develop a mutual friendly understanding [with the Soviets] in which differences would disappear. . . ." Now, this was the Ambassador's opinion in 1945, but in 1950 the Ambassador's Executive Assistant denied this, saying the blame lay with the military and in Washington. But with whom? He never said.

So Berlin is once again tossed into the East-West crisis barrel because the Soviets control access to the city and can close it off whenever they wish. So much for the "why" as to constant crisis, but *why* was this situation allowed to develop?

I am at a loss to understand it and there will very likely never be a complete answer to this question, telling who and for what reasons held off from pressing the Soviets for this access. As I wrote in my book Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev: "No farm boy, even without formal education, would consider purchasing land without having a guaranteed route of access, even though he trusted the owner of the surrounding land."

Treason? I doubt it; why should Stalin have taken the great risk of using traitors when he had what for him was the no doubt pleasant and amusing task of dealing with those whom he considered fools?

Naivete? More like it; in those days we tragically relied on that incredibly wrong-headed cliche that "you make a man trustworthy by trusting him." But the naive, if they pursue that course long enough, soon slide over into being stupid. We struggled so hard to win a war and it seems that we also struggled so hard to lose the peace that followed. The result has been to jeopardize the stability of an entire continent, and the whole world, for no one knows how many years to come.

Whether the ultimate reason is ever found or not, we must never repeat the mistake. Because being taken advantage of once too often may just mean that the one time too often will be the last. And it won't be because we determine not to allow it again; it will be because we will no longer have any say in the matter.

We will, by that one time too often, have placed ourselves in a position where alternatives no longer exist, and acquiescence to our enemies is the only possible road we will be able to follow.

REPORT NO. 11

"MURDER WILL OUT"

First used by Chaucer in Canterbury Tales and later by Cervantés in Don Quixote, this phrase implies that killers will always be known, caught, brought to justice and the case settled to everyone's satisfaction. Well, it just isn't so, as any Prosecutor, Judge, Sheriff, Chief of Police or law enforcement official will tell you.

Even if it seems all the facts are known, sudden and violent deaths of famous men have, all through history, been surrounded by speculation and theories generated by persons who do not believe the "official" reasons. Admittedly, there have been times when the theories were well-founded.

But some certainly have not. For instance, it is claimed even today by some that John Wilkes Booth was really in league with Lincoln's Secretary of War, Stanton, and that Stanton had masterminded a plot to kill Lincoln which involved high officials up to and including General Grant. This of course is totally ridiculous.

Some maintain that Tsar Nicholas II of Russia, last of the Romanov dynasty, was not really murdered with his family but was seen in Paris in 1930. Or, even if the Tsar and most of the family died, his daughter Anastasia survived and is alive to this day.

Since President Kennedy's assassination there has been a virtual flood of accounts telling the "truth" and the end is not yet in sight. Senator Robert Kennedy's killer seems, on the basis of available evidence, to have worked alone, but already there are dark rumblings of a "terrorist plot" and not-too-subtle hints that Sirhan had help from some quarter.

The conclusion last week to the trial of James Earl Ray for the murder of Martin Luther King may have ended a trial but certainly did not write finis to anything else. Five books are coming out on the killing; a Congressional Committee plans an investigation and we may be sure we will hear much more about it for some time.

Just two days after the end of the trial, where Ray pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 99 years in prison, conflicting accounts began to show up. Ray supposedly regrets his guilty plea; he did say in court that he did not agree with the statement that there was no conspiracy. Second, the statement that Mrs. King and officials of the Southern Christian Leadership Council had been consulted in advance, and had approved, of having Ray plead guilty (a questionable move in itself) has now been denied by SCLC.

One point has been made about the King murder that I think is well taken: Ray, supposedly operating alone, managed to be in the right room, in the right city, at the right distance from his intended victim, at the right time and moment when he could frame King in the cross-hairs of a telescopic sight. The mathematical odds against this happening "by chance" are truly incalculable.

Now, it goes without saying that it is impossible to satisfy everyone in such cases. Cranks and crackpots will continue to spin fairy tales that have not the slightest basis in truth. This isn't restricted to murders, either; a prominent English historian recently quite casually (and carelessly, I think) tossed out his own version of George Washington's last and fatal illness. The "explanation" is incredible and had never been alluded to, even remotely, privately or in print, by any of Washington's biographers or any historians of that period. It is also quite defamatory and I do not care to mention it here.

The Department of Justice is being pressed to open its own investigation of the King murder. But Ray is no longer a fugitive and the case against him has been settled in the courts. Justice could become involved only under the authority of a Reconstruction-era civil rights law that outlaws a conspiracy of "two or more persons" to harm or threaten any citizen in exercise of his constitutional rights.

This law was invoked in the case last year, as soon as the FBI had a definite lead on Ray, under his alias of Galt. The fugitive warrant filed at that time stated that the suspect and "an individual . . . alleged to be his brother entered into a conspiracy." Soon after this, Galt was identified by the FBI as Ray, but the earlier conspiracy allegation was never formally dropped.

So this is the only remaining basis for a Federal investigation, and a very tenuous basis at that, for there is no Federal murder statute that would apply. It is understandable why Justice does not want to get involved, because due to the wording of the statute itself this would give the impression that the Federal Government had material on hand that would prove a conspiracy existed.

So what should the American citizen believe? He is quite rightly concerned with seeing justice done and he has every right to know the facts. But the citizen's attempts to decide for himself are going to be confused and made quite difficult by the follow-up to come, some of which will be substantive and serious, but most of which will be frivolous and undertaken by those who have nothing but the basest of motives.

I can only suggest a somewhat negative answer: we should not let any second-guessing on King's murder—or on any other murder, for that matter—by any one, shake our faith in our American Republic and its laws. There very well may be imperfections in our system of government, but our duties as citizens are to help solve them, and not become weakened and divided internally by fighting over them.

REPORT NO. 12

"Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain that they will never be employed." "Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons, acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them, is essential to keeping the peace."

There is no simple answer to any question but these two statements are as good as any and better than most I have seen on the need for arms for our Republic's defense. President

Nixon no doubt had sentiments like these in mind when he decided to go ahead with a limited deployment of the Sentinel antiballistic missile system.

The President's decision, subject to Congressional approval, means placing long-range Spartan missiles, short-range Sprint missiles and radar at 12 sites around the country. Cost is an estimated $6–$7 billion; the entire plan is subject to constant review. For defense of key segments of our second-strike ability (our power to retaliate against an enemy nuclear attack) Sentinel will be at remote missile bases except for one site close to Washington, D.C.

Much heat and little light has been generated by the controversy and the loudest shouting has come from Sentinel's opponents, running from outright unilateral disarmament advocates to those whose reservations are based on less extreme grounds. In many instances, those favoring Sentinel have been placed in a bad light by biased and prejudiced reporting. One such story in a major East Coast newspaper, for example, referred to Sentinel's supporters as "braided dignitaries of the Joint Chiefs of Staff" and "a sprinkling of prominent scientists." The more favorable adjectives were reserved for Sentinel's opponents, who were described as "a politically glamorous clutch of Democrats," "an impressive array of scientists," and "a glittering group of moderate-to-liberal members of Mr. Nixon's own party." Nothing like being objective, is there?

I'd like to discuss briefly the major arguments *against* deployment of Sentinel. I know this is a highly emotional issue to many but some statements I have seen opposing the system have absolutely no factual basis whatsoever.

First, there is the charge that "Sentinel means surrender to 'the military-industrial complex.'" "The military-industrial complex" was first mentioned in Eisenhower's Farewell address in January 1961 and made up a tiny fraction of the topics covered in that speech. However, it was eagerly seized upon and since that time it has been fervently quoted at every turn by those very persons who have absolutely no use for nor good words to say about anything else Eisenhower ever said, thought or did.

I will grant that an uncontrolled, unsupervised "military-industrial complex" could indeed be an evil influence and there are historical examples to bear this out. Krupp, in Germany, and Mitsui-Mitsubishi, in Japan; historians still quarrel over to what extent alliance of these industrial giants with the military in their respective nations ultimately led to war. But in the United States there is an alert, inquisitive Congress, plus public opinion, that acts as a very strong check on such a combination. "Military-industrial complex" has been turned into a vague cliche, faintly suggestive of dark plots in high places. I am getting tired of hearing it, as these inferences have little if any basis in fact.

"Sentinel won't work." It is true that Sentinel has never been tested, because the same test ban treaty so avidly sought by Sentinel's opponents prohibit nuclear warhead testing in the atmosphere. But it certainly won't work if it isn't built; I believe it is preferable to take the chance that it will, if needed. Incidentally, the "won't work" argument was used against the H-bomb by nuclear physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer. Years later he admitted he didn't know if it would or not, but argued it would not *because he did not want it to work!*

"Sentinel antagonizes the Russians." The Russians are antagonized by the very fact of our standing in their path to world domination. Besides, why should we reach for a handkerchief every time the Russian Bear sneezes?

"Sentinel hinders arms-control talks." The Soviets agreed to arms-control talks *after* President Johnson announced Sentinel development plans. The Soviets themselves have an ABM defense system (the Tallinn complex) an estimated 1020 ICBM's and appear to be developing a new multiple-warhead missile that could deliver 10 one-megaton bombs at a time.

"Billions spent for Sentinel should be spent on social problems instead." To answer this, I offer the following from Sir John Slessor's book *Strategy for the West:*

"It is customary in democratic countries to deplore expenditures on armaments as conflicting with the requirements of the social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service that a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free."

"The Sentinel decision should be made by expert scientists, not politicians." In the last analysis, politicians must decide on everything because that is what they alone were elected by the people to do. They must hear all sides, but upon them lies the final, heavy burden of decision. This is basic to our form of government. Some persons who ought to know better than to be periodically reminded of this.

"The President's Sentinel decision means his 'honeymoon' with Congress is over." Those using this argument were just aching for a chance to go for the Presidential jugular vein, anyway, and if it hadn't been on Sentinel, it would have been on something else.

The U.S. now lead in overall missile delivery but the Soviets are working hard to close the gap and are actually ahead in deployment, if not in technology. As President Nixon said, Sentinel is "in the interests of peace throughout the world."

The two statements quoted at the beginning of this newsletter neatly and precisely sum up the very unpleasant but still vitally-essential "why" of it all. The first was made in January 1961 the second in June 1963. The author of both was President John F. Kennedy.

CENSUS REFORM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Trial magazine contained an article which indirectly makes a very strong argument for H.R. 3778, and companion bills relative to census reform. The article deals with the increasing threat to privacy and individualism in our modern world. The article presents an excellent case for enactment of legislation to limit the census questionnaires for the 1970 census. I insert at this point in the RECORD an excellent article by Justice Stanley Mosk in the February–March 1969 issue of Trial magazine:

THE INDIVIDUAL IN A CROWDING WORLD

(By Associate Justice Stanley Mosk, supreme court of California)

Justice William O. Douglas spoke last year at a conference called at San Francisco State College to discuss "Privacy in a Crowding World." It is a problem with which we must be increasingly concerned, as all of us become enveloped by a world population explosion, and by the development of pervasive bigness here in America: big government, big business, big labor.

Man, the unique individual, is being packed into the mold of man, an indistinguishable mass. We are being inexorably reduced as a person to a mere cipher, a telephone number, a social security number, a bank number, an employment number, a credit card number; in general, to a number in a punch-card machine which knows more about each of us than we ourselves know, and certainly more than we want our neighbors or our government to know.

Justice Douglas expressed his fears of the proposed national data center:

"The computer has taken its place alongside the A-bomb to mark the second phenomenal revolution of this generation. An idea can now be transmitted around the world in one-seventh of a second. And so the recurring question is, what ideas will be disseminated? If they concern people, what data will go into the machine, how will people be evaluated, whose names will come out if the subversive button is pressed, the lazy button is pressed, the unreliable button is pressed, and the like? If a centralized data center is established, as proposed, and all the contents of personnel files are poured into it, the privacy in this nation will be drastically diluted."

What is Douglas' objection and mine basically, to computerized data? It is the tendency to seek and to obtain utter conformity and uniformity. The iconoclast will automatically offend even the most tolerant Univac.

Is there basis for fear that liberty is threatened today? There are those, generally on the extremes of the political spectrum, who say it is. If the origin of this frightful prospect is: (a) we have too many laws today; (b) morality has broken down so more restraints are inevitable; (c) all public officials today are crooks or morons or worse; (d) courts are coddling criminals and communists; (e) let's return to the good old days of laissez-faire—meaning freedom for trusts, no labor unions, child labor, no minimum wage or maximum hours—if those elements are believed to indicate we are losing our liberty, then I must vehemently dissent. Under those enumerated theses liberty was never more secure. I reject the atavistic doctrine that modern government is unnecessary, that its services, including education, are a plot against the liberties of the citizens.

THREAT OF BUREAUCRACY

I do believe, however, liberty is endangered from another, less obvious, direction—the evils of conformity, which I prefer to call bureaucracy. By "bureaucracy" I mean the rigid and formal attitude which pervades the levels of both government and business—the bureaucracies of the public and the private sectors.

Let us look at a few facts. Government, in some form, now employs one of every ten active workers. The job classifications vary from those provided for in the Constitution of the United States to the thousands being drawn up every day in the personnel departments of federal, state, and local governments. One million Californians work for government—codified, classified, stratified, and in some instances, stultified.

In the private sector, well over 80 percent of the nonfarm workers are in corporate employment. And some 500 corporations today control two-thirds of the nonfarm economy.

It is not the power situation which concerns me, however. It is the tendency toward the same rigid organizational concept in which the individual is secondary to procedures. Indeed, I have heard speculation that the personnel departments of large corporations and large governments could be switched in toto without any interruption in the process of interviews and personality tests. It goes without saying that the IBM forms would be interchangeable.

A corporation is generally, for its employees, a riskless and seemingly eternal organization which dominates the public and personal lives of thousands of people and institutions. With the best intentions in the world, many managers are still struggling with the anonymity of corporate life. The problem is facelessness. For the first time in

our history self-development has taken a back seat to security, and security has come to be synonymous with the existence of the corporation or the government agency. The corporate organization stresses the individual as a cipher over the individual in his most noble role as a creator.

AFFLUENT AMERICA

This vast machine may be functioning quite well at the moment. We have more electric can openers, color TV's, and garbage disposals than any nation in history. In affluent Beverly Hills there are 13,000 households and 70,000 telephones, and one psychiatrist for every 195 citizens. But the overall trend is bad for America. The democratic liberties, the free enterprise opportunities, and the social conscience of this nation emerged not from stratified entities but rather from the wellspring of individual thought and action. Only after our most cherished concepts were molded by individuals, who originally were neither afraid to try nor afraid to fail, did bureaucracy take over.

And, lest you think bureaucracy threatens only the Great Idea, look around you at current public and private architecture. With a few noteworthy exceptions, our metropolitan office buildings appear to be stark structures the architecture of which can only be described as Early 1984.

The stress today in bureaucracies, both public and private, is to function in a manner that is most often labeled smooth. It is a state of being hard to describe. It bears no apparent relationship to creativity, candidness, articulateness, quickness, or individuality. Obviously, the condition is foreign to controversy. It would appear to be directly related to conformity. "Conformity to what?" you ask. That, too, is hard to define. Techniques and procedures are certainly more evident than an ideology or philosophy. In fact, bureaucracy, both public and private, is characterized by a lack of ideological fervor. The method is the thing. Bureaucracy was taking away men's minds before automation was threatening their jobs.

The bureaucratic attitude invades any area:

in law, it litigates and legislates with more regard for techniques than ultimate accomplishments;

in government, it revels in rule books fashioned by anonymous bureaucrats dedicated to the destruction of the English language;

in labor, it places organizational security over concern for labor's needs;

in business, it regards expansion as preferable to innovation;

in education, it stresses rigidity of program over adaptation to the needs of individual pupils.

CREATIVITY STIFLED

A system can only function well when it is nourished with ideas and strength of spirit. Bureaucracy is being intellectually and spiritually starved today because there is timidity and blind conformity on the part of those who comprise its ranks, both in government and in business. Bureaucracy does not enroll persons for a period of challenging employment; it inters them for the period necessary to qualify for a pension.

And those who comprise its ranks submit to interment all too readily. They happily avoid any opportunity to constructively criticize, to daringly dissent, to courageously experiment.

This suggests that we have failed to inculcate the spirit of the challenging opportunities designed by our magnificent form of government. Oh, yes, we sing the Star Spangled Banner, and we recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. But do we really mean what we say, or do we revere conformity over individualism? Certainly each person has constitutional rights, but a dirty long-haired hippie—?

Many of us have cherished the notion that civil liberties have been under attack by only a few fanatics—that the general public regards our edifice of laws and institutions, designed to safeguard individual liberties, with respect and reverence. While this may be true in the abstract sense, I wonder how many specific elements of freedom the people would fight to retain. Chief Justice Warren said in a speech before the American Bar Association a few years ago that if the Bill of Rights were to be voted on today, he doubted that it would pass. This is a sobering thought, and yet can you believe a majority would vote for the Fifth Amendment?

Or, suppose a nationwide referendum were held asking the American people to vote on the following question: "Should our government permit the publication of newspapers that advocate the recognition of Red China?" Or perhaps this question: "Should the Constitution be amended to prevent an atheist from becoming President of the United States?" Or, "Should an avowed nudist be permitted to serve in Congress?"

I regret to say that I would be afraid of the results of such a poll. The people are often quick to react against what they conceive to be a tangible evil, even at the price of sacrificing such abstractions as law and liberty; Red China is bad, atheism and nudism are also bad—and while the Constitution is good, we may not see the connection between crushing an evil, and crippling with the same blow our fundamental concept of democracy.

CALL FOR INDIVIDUALISM

Our emphasis in this age of bigness must be on individual thought, individual initiative, and on individual courage. I reject the argument that only intellectuals can understand the philosophy of our system of government. The people can understand it, and they must understand it, if our society is to endure.

Does this encourage controversy? Does protecting individual initiative and free speech rock the boat? Of course it does. But in the words of Justice Douglas in the *Terminiello* case:

"[A] function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. Speech is often provocative and challenging. It may strike at prejudices and preconceptions and have profound unsettling effects as it presses for acceptance of an idea. That is why freedom of speech . . . is . . . protected against censorship or punishment, unless shown likely to produce a clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance or unrest. . . . There is no room under our Constitution for a more restrictive view. For the alternative would lead to standardization of ideas either by legislatures, courts, or dominant political or community groups."

COMMEMORATION OF NATIONAL COIN WEEK

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Brian E. Foss, of Westborough, Mass., has brought to my attention, on behalf of the American Numismatic Association and the Mail Order Coin Club that the week of April 19 through April 26, next, has been designated as National Coin Week.

As you know, the field of numismatology has become a very vast and interesting field with many millions of collectors. It is estimated that one in every 40 people collect coins or save them.

This year, the theme of National Coin Week is "Coins—Links in a Chain of Peace," which is being promoted by the American Numismatic Association and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Certainly this theme and every other activity that tends to promote the thought and the cause of peace in this turbulent world is most worthy of the widest public interest, and I, therefore, respectfully urge my colleagues and RECORD readers to take due note of this significant event.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE DOMINICK V. DANIELS ON AMERICAN POLICIES TOWARD EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable renewed interest in the affairs of East-Central Europe since the spring events of Czechoslovakia a year ago, which led to the Russian occupation of that proud nation and threats toward two other countries, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Yet, despite military occupation, the passive resistance of the Czech and Slovak peoples continues and Rumania has, despite token gestures of friendships toward the Soviet Union, preserved its semi-independent line in international politics, and Yugoslavia failed to be intimidated by the menace of a Soviet Russian occupation.

The spirit of reform, at least in the economic sphere, is very much alive in Hungary and unrest extends to Bulgaria where the party leadership has recently undertaken repressive measures against the intellectuals and to Poland where police had to be used to repress university unrest last spring. The forces of nationalism and humanism cannot be destroyed in the region despite the military and economic power of the protecting power, the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the Soviet Union has increasing difficulties with the Red Chinese and the conflict will only increase and not decrease, as Communist China is acquiring the wherewithal of world power: nuclear armaments and soon, also missiles to deliver nuclear warheads. There is therefore, an increasing willingness on the Soviet part for a detente in Europe. Of course, the detente to them would mean that we officially recognize the status quo in East-Central Europe, the satellite status of these countries.

Perhaps some of us would say what are we losing by such an arrangement, we do not control those countries anyway? However, the centrifugal forces in the region have been operating for the last 11 years despite our tacit recognition of the status quo by nonintervention in the Hungarian-Soviet conflict upon the victory of the Hungarian revolution in Hungary.

The forces work despite our silence at the military occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union last August. The seeds of conflicts will not be extinguished by our discreet silence not to mention our moral debasement if we were to become guarantors of the present status quo which means deprivation of these nations of the right of national self-determination. Russian power in the region is, however, manifest and no solution can be attained without Soviet consent and some consideration of the security needs of the Soviet Union.

The need for a new policy therefore, cannot be either a return to liberation policies, nor the continuation of some slightly modified form of bridgebuilding which was a soporific for inaction, the problem complex must be confronted and alternative solutions found and negotiated in the coming talks between the new administration with the Soviet Union.

Such a possible solution has been advanced by the American Hungarian Federation in its memorandum to the President, the National Security Council, and the Departments of State and Defense. It calls for a possible neutralization of already neutral Austria, independent Yugoslavia, and two to four Warsaw Pact nations, particularly Hungary and Czechoslovakia, re-creating a neutral zone roughly corresponding to the old Danubian monarchy as a buffer between NATO and the Soviet Union. I hope that our policymaker will give the important attention to this document which it deserves in view of the originality of its ideas and depth of its analysis.

KILLED IN VIETNAM, 1ST LT. WILLIAM J. TORPIE, U.S. ARMY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that another one of my constituents, 1st Lt. William J. Torpie, U.S. Army, of Hawthorne, N.Y., died in Vietnam last month.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

LIEUTENANT TORPIE IS KILLED IN VIETNAM

HAWTHORNE.—First Lieutenant William J. Torpie, 25, son of Mr. and Mrs. William J. Torpie of 141 Pythian Ave. was killed, March 25 while on patrol with the 9th Infantry Division in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam, his parents learned yesterday afternoon.

A 1961 graduate of Archbishop Stepinac High School, Lt. Torpie was graduated from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1965 with a Bachelor of Science degree. He was a member of Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity at college.

He enlisted in the U.S. Army in January, 1967, and took his basic training at Fort Dix, N.J. He then attended Officers Training School at Fort Benning, Ga. and arrived in Vietnam on Oct. 20, 1968.

Besides his parents, the lieutenant is survived by seven sisters: Mrs. Jacqueline Hubertus of 110 Columbus Ave., Pleasantville; Mrs. Patricia Packowkski of 175 Martling Ave., Tarrytown; and Rosemary, Bernadette, Janice, Claire and Theresa, all of the home address. He also leaves his grandmother, Mrs. Fred Novey of the home address.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this year the American Legion and the Nation celebrate the Legion's 50th anniversary.

Often overlooked in discussions of the Legion's role in veterans' affairs and its concern with national issues and programs is the even more outstanding contribution it has made in exposing several generations of young people to the fundamentals of American democracy. Thousands of young men and women, myself included, have gained their first contact with, and understanding of, our form of government through the American Legion's Boys State and Girls State and Boys Nation and Girls Nation programs.

Each year some 30,000 young men gather in every State in the Union to participate in the Boys State programs, gaining an acquaintance with the fundamentals of government and an interest in participating in government at all levels. They are given the opportunity to learn about government by operating mock courts, legislatures, and city and county governments. They establish their own political parties, conduct elections, hold office, and participate in the daily functioning of representative institutions.

The Boys Nation program has brought thousands of young men to Washington to spend a week meeting with Government figures and acquainting themselves with our Nation's Capital. Together with the auxiliary's companion programs for girls, the Legion programs have given the Nation a generation of young Americans aware of their civic responsibilities and dedicated to careers of public service.

Through its broad education programs, the American Legion has worked effectively to instill in American young people a respect for democratic principles and a desire to pass them on to future generations. Since its inception in 1921, the Legion has been one of the prime sponsors of American Education Week, which gives all citizens the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the achievements, goals, and needs of our schools.

Through its concern with higher education, the Legion has helped deserving students obtain training beyond what would otherwise be available. The Legion has sponsored scholarships, directed deserving students to scholarship sources for which they are eligible, worked with organizations to recruit students for careers where personnel shortages exist, and sought out new scholarship opportunities.

Through the National High School Oratorical Contest, the American Legion has worked effectively to cultivate essential qualities of leadership and citizenship. Over a third of a million students now participate annually. The American Legion School Medal Awards honor students who have shown outstanding scholarship abilities.

Throughout its history the American Legion and the auxiliary have repeatedly demonstrated their dedication to instilling in our young men and women a sense of purpose and responsibility; to the creation of a new generation of Americans whose concern is with the preservation of our Republic and in the dignity and responsibilities of the individual.

I am proud of the work of the Legion in these and other programs and join my colleagues in saluting this organization for its half century of service to God and man.

FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESS

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial "For the Improvement of Congress" in the April 3 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I am pleased to see words of praise here for our former colleague, Senator Monroney. He worked long and effectively for improvement of the Congress as a vital, on-going, and integral force in the shaping of our democracy. All of us owe both him and our former colleague in the House, Congressman Tom Curtis, a debt of gratitude on the issue of congressional reform.

I want to make a further comment on this editorial. I do not know where the Post-Dispatch acquired its measurement of opposition to certain parts of the bill and support for other parts. I have been a careful reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in more than 2 years since the bill passed the Senate, I do not recall seeing one word of opposition to the bill or to any part of the bill. If such opposition exists, I think we ought to be told about it, and that information should be made available to the American people.

We have taken care to acquaint the public with the contents of the bill and the rationale for each of the bill's provisions, along with the history of the legislation and the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and I am heartened by the growing number of writers who are assisting the effort to get information to the people. If there is opposition within

Congress to this bill, it seems to me the people have a right to know what that opposition consists of and who the opponents are.

For myself, I will strongly resist any attempt to pass portions of this bill while deleting others. I realize, as do my colleagues, that amendments will be offered when the bill comes to the floor.

But in an omnibus measure of this kind, one man's spoonful of sugar is another man's paregoric. A considerable number of us feel that we would endanger the enactment of meaningful reform the moment we start to dismantle the bill and pass only those pieces that engender the least opposition.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of generalizing about various sections of the bill, I think it would be a reasonable theory to suggest—if we could measure it—that those parts of the bill to which there is strongest resistance probably are those parts that most need to be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks today, I include below the text of the editorial:

FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESS

Prospects for improvement of the organization of Congress have brightened noticeably with the reported withdrawal of House Speaker McCormack's objections and the emergence of a group of reform-minded Republicans headed by Representative Rumsfeld of Illinois and Senator Mundt of South Dakota.

Speaker McCormack's about-face is reported due to the shaking-up he took when Representative Morris Udall of Arizona challenged him for the House speakership in January—and to his consequent desire to better his standing with his Republican colleagues.

If reorganization is becoming that popular in the House, another major roadblock besides Mr. McCormack may be giving at least a little. For it was in the House that the proposal languished last year after being approved by the Senate—though not in the best shape.

The recommendations laid before Congress year before last were no idle dreams of quixotic and misty-eyed reformers. They were the studied pragmatism of a special joint committee of Congress with Representative Madden of Indiana and Senator Monroney of Oklahoma as co-chairmen.

Senator Monroney in particular has as sharp an eye for the politically possible as he has for the practicably necessary. As co-author of the LaFollette-Monroney reforms in 1946 he is Congress's most knowledgeable member in these matters.

How much can prudently be expected of the Ninety-first Congress in its first session the leaders of the present drive for reform will of course have to decide for themselves. It would be regrettable if some measures on which there is a substantial amount of agreement should be stymied on account of other measures on which there is an even more substantial amount of opposition.

At the very minimum, it seems to us, Congress should be willing to approve these three proposals: (1) Enable Congress to move closer toward equality with the Executive branch in fiscal and budgetary analysis and control; (2) remove the stranglehold of chairmen on committees by enactment of a "committees' bill of rights;" (3) establish a permanent joint committee on the organization of Congress to keep hammering away at improvement of structure and method.

Though both would correct Congress' diminution of stature vis-a-vis the Executive, the first of these proposals has very good support in the House while the second is probably the most hysterically opposed in the whole kit of proposed reforms.

A fight ought to be made for democratizing committees, but if it cannot be carried it should not be allowed to take down with it the means of informing Congress more fully in the facts about what it is doing.

Representatives and Senators will be obliged in the final analysis to give up their moated castles of preferment and power to preserve the equality of their branch in our tripartite form of government. What is good for a committee chairman is not necessarily good for Congress, to say nothing of the country; and House and Senate will be called upon to readjust their organization continuously if they are not to resign themselves to sinking to secondary status in the three branches of government.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SALUTES TELEPHONE PIONEERS OF AMERICA

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, volunteers working in hospitals, collecting eyeglasses for the eyebank, sending books and material to servicemen in Vietnam—this is just a part of the work of the Telephone Pioneers of America.

April 25 has been set aside in New York State as "Telephone Pioneers' Day." It is a day when we can recognize the great spirit and dedication of the men and women in the telephone industry.

Founded in 1911, the association is the largest social-industrial organization of its kind in the world. It is comprised of over 300,000 men and women who have served a minimum of 21 years in the communications industry.

I am pleased that there is a chapter of this organization in my district—the Genesee chapter which consists of 1,210 active and retired employees from Rochester Telephone Corp., Stromberg Carlson, New York Telephone, Western Electric, and American Telephone & Telegraph.

The Genesee chapter is an outstanding example of a Pioneer chapter serving its community. It has the highest membership enrollment among all 75 chapters—99.7 percent. William O'Hagan, chapter president, and John Robertson, chapter vice president, have worked hard on the concept of community service.

The work of the members is diverse and meaningful. Members of the Genesee chapter have collected eyeglasses for the Rochester Eye Bank and Research Center. They have shipped 7,400 books and $2,600 worth of ditty bags to servicemen in Vietnam. They have a volunteer staffing of the poison control center at Strong Memorial Hospital. They have repaired 400 talking book machines for the blind. They have collected and distributed over 550 pounds of used clothing to inner city agencies.

Pioneers on a State and national level perform countless service activities. They volunteer for hospital work, organize libraries for shut-ins, and convert old switchboards for use in training handicapped children.

In conjunction with the "services for the blind" program, Pioneers collect used eyeglasses for "New Eyes for the Needy," and record textbooks which are later transcribed into braille for blind students.

The repair of talking book machines was recognized by the Library of Congress in 1966, when it presented an award to the Pioneers, "in grateful appreciation for support of national library service to blind people."

In all of these activities, Pioneers apply a personal interest and an earnest desire to help those less fortunate. The common bond of fellowship, dedication to community service, and the spirit and vitality of the telephone Pioneers is worthy of the respect and admiration of all Americans. "United to serve others," is most certainly, the true purpose of this organization.

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS BY HON. HAMILTON FISH

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include the following extract from an address by Hon. Hamilton Fish at the 50th anniversary celebration of the American Legion post at Newburgh, N.Y., on Saturday evening, March 29, 1969.

Mr. Fish is a former distinguished Member of the House and an outstanding patriot. His remarks deserve the careful consideration of every American.

The extract follows:

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION POST AT NEWBURGH, N.Y., ON MARCH 29, 1969

I have spoken to you on the origin and formation of the Preamble of the American Legion as the Chairman of the Committee of Three that wrote the Preamble on May 10 at the St. Louis meeting in 1919. I would be derelict as Chairman of the First Congressional Committee to investigate Communism and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives for a quarter of a century, if I did not warn the American people of their potential destruction by the World Communist Conspiracy that seeks to destroy Freedom everywhere.

The paramount reason for the existence of all governments is to provide for the safety of its people and the security of the nation. Some misguided Senators apparently do not realize this and are opposing President Nixon's constructive but limited proposal to safeguard and protect the sites of our transcontinental nuclear missiles. Without such protection within the next few years, Soviet Russia could destroy by a surprise attack, most of our nuclear missiles in a few hours and leave us naked and defenseless against Soviet Russia's newest and powerful nuclear weapons. Thank God the National Executive Committee of the American Legion realizing this awesome menace to all our people, recently adopted a strong resolution in favor of an adequate defensive system to safeguard our missiles sites. As General MacArthur said

a number of years ago, "I do not believe there will be a nuclear war between Soviet Russia and the United States as each will always offset any advance by the other resulting in a stalemate and such a war both know, would be suicidal." Moscow and Leningrad have already established a defensive system against nuclear attacks. We have delayed too long and further delay to protect our missile sites might well be suicidal for the American people and our nation.

The United States is the strongest bastion of Freedom in the world and therefore the greatest enemy to the extension of Communism which is a negation of all freedom. If our missile sites are destroyed through lack of a defensive system, the United States would be forced to surrender and Communism would prevail not only in our own country, but throughout the world. No one is more opposed to a suicidal nuclear war with Soviet Russia, which would destroy both nations. But even the Communist leaders admit that the protection of nuclear weapons is solely for defensive purposes.

The American people are entitled to know the truth that their lives are being placed in jeopardy by those who oppose President Nixon's limited defense of our atomic sites and should notify their Congressman and their Senator that their security and that of the nation has a priority over everything else.

Communists, fellow travelers, radicals, extremists and left wing liberals have already begun to throw red hot political bricks at President Nixon before he has time to clean up the terrible mess that he inherited from the previous Administration. These extreme liberals even among the United States Senators want to bring bloody fisted chaotic Red China into the United Nations and to extend the hand of friendship to Mao for helping to kill tens of thousands of American boys in Vietnam. This is incomprehensibe at the present time. Those Democrats or Republicans in the Senate should join a combat regiment in Vietnam to test the killing power of Chinese produced machine guns. Communist China at the present time is not a peace loving nation and is not willing to comply with decisions made by the United Nations. The United Nations in New York City is already infested by Communist spies, provocateurs and revolutionists and if Red China is voted into the United Nations, then it is time that either we should withdraw from it, or its headquarters should be moved to Switzerland or to some other smaller nation.

COLLECTING TAXES ON ELECTION DAY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which I believe will eventually cause a major decrease in the burden of American taxpayers. More and more across this Nation, the quiet majority of Americans are in revolt; they are steadily mounting a verbal assault on oppressively high taxes.

The people of this Nation have a long tradition of supporting their Federal Government without complaint, but recently the massive burden of taxes has pushed the quiet American too far. Now, he is starting to speak out and the Congress will have to listen.

For years I have counseled that overspending, and not undertaxation is the problem facing the Federal Government. It has progressed to the stage where the people not only agree but are shaking off the complacency and mounting a verbal, frontal assault on the antiquated, unfair tax system and on the yearly Federal piracy which culminates in the April raid. Members of Congress who are preoccupied with spending all they can get, getting all they can, and leaving little for the man who does the earning will begin to feel the heat of this revolt, and I believe the sooner the better.

The only corrective is through selecting Representatives concerned, sincerely concerned, with lightening the taxpayers' burdens. I am today introducing legislation which I believe will aid in bringing to office such Representatives.

I have proposed a simple change in the tax regulations. It asks that the notorious tax collection day, April 15, be abolished and replaced by the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Election day would also become tax collection day.

I believe that shifting the concern that builds up yearly on April 15 to election day will cause many voters to think twice about the representatives they hope to elect. This is the politics of good Government, of sound Federal financing, of fiscal responsibility in contrast to the politics of Federal excesses, Government by deficit and overspending.

Many measures have been proposed over the years. Some have suggested that tax withholding be abolished, thus indicating to the taxpayer, in one lump sum, the cost to him of his Government. This is, of course, not practical and would increase the financial management burden on the taxpayer.

Another interesting proposal would establish a Tax Freedom Day. Based on the average wage and the average annual tax cost, 1 day each year would be declared a national holiday indicating that from the first of each year to that date the average American has been working for the Federal Government. All the money he had earned to that date had gone to pay his taxes. The rest of the year, what was left of it, he would be earning for himself and his family. Tax Freedom Day this year is estimated to be April 27. This includes the cost of all taxes: State, Federal, and local. I am sure such a day would demonstrate the problem, but it is imprecise. There are few average Americans, and some would have to work longer, some not as long, and the day would lose meaning for most.

I believe that a simple shift of the final tax collection day to the day of national elections will provide sufficient indirect impact to generate a lower tax burden and thorough tax reforms.

Until this proposal is adopted, I suggest that each taxpayer simply jot down the total dollar amount paid in Federal taxes on his calendar in the block designating the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

MRS. CYNTHIA LITTELL WRITES OF THE REALITY OF THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that to many of our citizens the war in Vietnam is not real, that it means little, or nothing, and that they have managed to escape its impact. This is certainly not so when the son, brother, father, or husband is among our fighting men in Southeast Asia, as the following letter so beautifully points out.

It was written by Mrs. Cynthia Littell, who is employed on the staff of one of our colleagues, Hon. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, of the Ohio 23d Congressional District, about her husband, a career man with the Air Force. This touching and moving account of just how real the war is to Mrs. Littell and her daughter is the finest I have ever read. It points up the truth in the line written by the great English poet John Milton, that, "They also serve who only stand and wait." Let us all hope that the day will soon arrive when the waiting for Mrs. Littell, and thousands who share her experiences, will be over.

The letter follows:

WIFE OF MAYWOOD AIRMAN IN COMBAT ASKS AND ANSWERS: IS WAR REAL?—THE ANSWER IS YES

DEAR LEN: Yes, Vietnam and the war is a definite reality.

Eight years ago my husband joined the Air Force and has since chosen it as his career. He's been in that ominous sounding place called "APO San Francisco" nine months this time and was home for only about a month after having been there for four months.

The war is a reality each time I look at my dresser and see the picture of Bob and me, each time my little girl and I sit down for a meal and there is an empty chair at the table, the war becomes a reality. Each time my little girl asks "When is Daddy coming home from work?" the war becomes real. Each day when I come home from work and check the mail box, the war is real. Each time I look at the calendar and see my little notations about how many days left until Bob returns, the war is real. When my daughter's wagon was broken I spent two hours trying to fix it and then she turned and said, "That's okay, Mommy, Daddy will fix it when he comes home," the war is real. Figuring out income tax and then deducting pay received while in a combat zone, that makes the war real. Thanksgiving and Christmas without Daddy made the war real. A piece of jewelry Bob has bought overseas, a doll he has gotten Tami from Okinawa, a koala bear he got in Hawaii, having a broken stereo and knowing that if your handy-man husband were home he'd fix it—these things shatter the protective shield which I've tried to build up, the drone of radio and television reports becomes a violent sound, there is a tremble of my body—and the war is real.

Last year when I was hospitalized I had the experience of truly knowing what the WAR was. I spent some time in Fitzsimmons Army Hospital in Denver enroute to the Air Force Medical Center. The harsh reality of the war was all over. On the flight to San Antonio the other passengers were mostly

men on their way to the nearest hospital, to their homes and families. They were coming from the war, they know it's a reality and one look at them will definitely tell you it's so.

Sometimes I feel I'm the only one that thinks the war is real. Then the Our Town comes bringing news of the people back home, that little town I grew up in that has sometimes been as far away as 2200 miles because of my husband's chosen profession. The Our Town tells me that the boy next door that I can only remember as being in about 9th grade, or the boy I had a crush on when in 4th grade, or a boy I knew only slightly from College English class, has gone to war. Suddenly you realize, that the town may be small but it feels the effects of the war and knows it's real. I'm glad to be from Maywood, Maywood cares. When the February 20 and 27 issues of Our Town hit the homes, I know Maywood felt a great loss, and I know now that Maywood feels as I do.

Pretty soon Maywood will be 2900 miles away in actual miles, but Maywood will be a lot closer since it's a place I love.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA.

REEXAMINE U.S. FOREST POLICY

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer recently printed a very sound editorial examining the U.S. Forest Service policy and its effect on the American lumber industry.

It is common knowledge that the recent large increases in lumber prices have raised the cost of housing by hundreds or even thousands of dollars per home.

In my district and in many other parts of the country the housing shortage is becoming increasingly acute. The situation is deteriorating partly, because a deficiency of wood at a reasonable price exists.

The U.S. Forest Service owns much of the usable timberland in the country. Therefore, any easing of the problem would require some examination of Forest Service policy and administration.

Extensive forest land is one of America's prime natural resources. If forests continue to be mismanaged, and their products wasted, an important industry and a large segment of the populace will be adversely affected.

Following is the editorial:

REEXAMINE U.S. FOREST POLICY

There are so many individual problems wrapped up in the current lumber and plywood shortage-price increase crisis that an observer has a hard time making out the forest because of the trees.

But there it is—a sprawling, timber-cutting industry in which western hardwoods compete with southern softwoods; in which 60% of the nation's total softwood timber is federally owned, but where production has been cut back and trees allowed to decay instead of forests being made more valuable and productive.

The U.S. Forest Service is one of the few government agencies that turns a profit but the receipts go into the general fund and the Forest Service must depend upon appropriations from Congress to operate. Appropriations are not as large as needed for a proper job of forest management and this is critically reflected in the lumber shortage affecting the housing industry and buyers' pocketbooks.

Contributing to the shortage also is a law restricting Alaskan shipping to the U.S. mainland to U.S. vessels. This prices lumber cargoes out of reach. Consequently much lumber and plywood that could ease housing shortages in Cleveland is sold to Japan, being shipped there in Japanese ships. The American and Japanese national housing programs are competing for wood head-on. Current American production is 1.6 million housing units this year. Japan is planning 1.9 million.

U.S. Sen. John Sparkman, D-Ala., chairman of the Senate housing subcommittee and known for 20 years as "Mr. Housing," recently called for means to increase timber outputs in national forests (which are not wilderness areas or national parks), coupled with a wiser policy of cutting on private lands.

The Sierra Club, a conservation group with 72,000 members, says overcutting contributed to closing three-fourths of the Douglas fir mills in the northwest in the last 20 years and to closing 26 western plywood mills in the last two years.

Sierra warns of a "raid on the national forests," while the industry emphasizes that federal commercial forests are designed to supply needs of U.S. citizens.

A reappraisal is needed. The nation, through Congress, needs to strike a proper balance between managing forest resources, production and requirements.

Whether private mismanagement and waste are responsible for the price-supply squeeze should be established or refuted before Congress considers making drastic changes. A national study by an independent commission, as Sierra suggests, seems in order.

LET US ANALYZE OUR SYSTEM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a champion of reform for the Congress. My legislation and writings on the subject make my position quite clear. If the Congress is to have any hope whatsoever of keeping pace in our rapidly moving modern world, we must adopt the modern methods utilized by industry. A good example is the valuable tool of systems analysis. Mr. Bob J. Hansen recently discussed this subject in an article in the April 1969 issue of Government Executive magazine. I insert the article in the RECORD, and commend it to all Members:

THERE IS A ROLE FOR SYSTEMS ANALYSIS IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Bob J. Hansen, president, Decision Research Corp.)

HIGHLIGHTS

1. The workload of Congress has increased over the years and the trend is accelerating;

2. Systems analysis, considering politics and constituency factors, can help weave the entire fabric of legislative decisions;

3. Congress, for the most part, is still leery of systems analysis and must be sold on its potentials;

4. Systems analysis can be a valuable tool for the decision-making legislator, aiding necessary human judgment.

A note on history: This country's first Congress had 65 members in the House of Representatives with constituencies averaging 33,000 persons. During its Sessions, 118 public and private Acts and Resolutions were enacted. At the start of this decade, each Congressman represented an average of 450,000 constituents—and the number is increasing.

The workload has increased proportionately. In a recent Congress, 26,566 measures were introduced and, of these, 4,016 were passed. This suggests that the unlogged, unnumbered hours each legislator spent at Committee Hearings, in preparation for those Hearings, in Committee and Subcommittee attendance must be very great. A clue: During the First Session of last Congress, there were 182 quorum calls, 201 "yea and nay" calls and hundreds of teller (not individually recorded), division or standing (not recorded) and voice votes in the House.

Congressional decision-making is a continuing process between and among each Congress. Decisions must be synthesized to produce a reasonable harmony, with the more important decisions given priority attention. To do this in an effective manner demands that the Congressmen have dependable information as indicated in the chart below.

More and more, systems (or more familiarly, systems analysis) will gain the attention of Congress as a viable, dependable way of reaching decisions. The contrast between a systems trend and traditional bodies in Congress is extreme. However, systems may help Congress provide a framework to consider its role in tying together all of its parts. Explicit in this concept is the effect of decisions between all the parts of Congress and to its whole in the national legislative problem.

Most definitions of a system are similar in content. One definition describes a system as "an array of components designed to accomplish a particular objective according to a plan." There must be an objective, a design or organization and input according to a plan.

There seems to be no single answer for coping with the democratic process. If systems are used in Congress, they must be used with discretion. After all, the systems analyst technician is an advisor, not an elected Congressional decision-maker. He collects all the facts of a problem and presents alternative choices for decision.

It has been suggested that one central organization for systems analysis could be a supporting tool for Congress. However, the individual Congressman might rely too much on this systems analysis group and by-pass his own staff or, conversely, set up a duplicate manual record system to double-check the systems analyst. An alternative might be to contract for pilot applications of systems in Congress.

Congressman Robert McClory (R-Ill.), in an interview in the House Judiciary Committee chambers, stated: "Systems analysis will eventually come to the aid of the Congressman. However, the management science community must make systems analysis fashionable and sell Congress on the great potentials of management science and systems analysis—such as planning, programing, budgeting systems."

Development of new ideas has been encouraged by outside groups studying the Congressman's activities and methods for their improvement. Such an effort was undertaken three years ago by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Here, a group of scholars was commissioned to examine various aspects of Congressional operations and prepare separate studies on how Congress "might be aided in its work to achieve a good society, counting as part of that good society the legislative way of life itself." These studies were combined in the book *Congress: The*

First Branch of Government, published in Washington by the Institute.

Congress now has begun to consider the possibility of acting through legislation to provide technological support for its own activities. In the Second Session of the 89th Congress, Representative McClory introduced H.R. 18428 as a bill to establish an automatic data processing facility to support the Congress. He told the House that Congress "must use every possible mechanism to insure that Congress executes its traditional responsibilities."

A bipartisan group of supporters of the bill has stressed the importance of using ADP and modern program evaluation techniques in support of Congressional budgetary review. The idea is to provide members a logical way to comprehend and respond to the new performance budget mode of operation within the Executive branch. Other priority applications include the preparation of legislative histories of bills and the establishment and maintenance of selected Federal data.

SCOTT'S OBSERVATION

In this regard, Sen. Hugh Scott (D-Pa.) prepared amendment number 63 to the legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. It was approved by the Senate, proposing a new capability to assist Congress. Said Scott: "The requirements of this age—reflected in the broad spectrum of issues facing the Congress—can be coped with only by the utilization of all available human and technological resources. . . .

"The electronic computer and the systems techniques connected with its use are simply tools for use by the decision-maker. They are designed to help provide that information which is necessary to make balanced, accurate decisions."

Many areas of Congressional activity appear to lend themselves to systems. In a report prepared for general distribution to the Congress, entitled "Automatic Data Processing for Congress," a number of possible applications were identified and discussed. The report suggests that areas of focus might include Congress as a whole, the functioning committee and an individual Congressman.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS

Other possible applications included: (1) data showing the status of pending legislation; (2) an automated index-catalog of Congressional documents; (3) current information on issues up for vote; (4) an automated schedule of committee meetings and hearings; (5) histories of committee action in ADP form; (6) appropriations statistics information; and (7) an automated Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) system to retrieve key items of research value for individual Congressmen.

There has been evidence before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress showing that application of systems analysis, operations research and ADP techniques to the problems of the Congressman in his legislative role merits consideration. Constituent-oriented activities of the Congressman also can be made less time-consuming.

Within the House of Representatives in the 89th Congress, a group of 44 Republicans led by Rep. F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts strongly supported the concept of establishing a National Commission on Public Management, by introducing H.R. 17310 and other bills. Similar legislation was introduced in the Senate by Scott and nine other Senators (S. 3762).

Morse and his associates concentrated on the need for further study of the applicability of the systems management approach to nondefense and nonspace public programs. Said he: "Appropriating money and shuffling papers in bureaucracy should not be confused with problem-solving. The traditional Government approach to a complex problem is to divide it into manageable parts and to treat each of them separately. A comprehensive solution is thus impossible. The bureaucracy simply does not have the capacity to solve today's or tomorrow's problems—but private industry with the new approach is rapidly developing that capacity."

Insight into the role of systems analysis in the public domain is also found in the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Science Research and Development, of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics chaired by Rep. Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.). The subcommittee's recommendation dealing with environmental pollution stated: "To place pollution abatement on a comparable basis with our national technology programs, systems analysis and management capability should be established within the Federal Government. This approach should be used along with planning, programming, budgeting techniques to organize both near and long-term Federal research and operational efforts in pollution abatement."

THE JOINT RESOLUTION

Congressional attention to the significance of systems was also manifest in Joint Resolution 110 sponsored by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) in the 90th Congress. This resolution would authorize the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to "study the feasibility of a computer system to help state and local governments to participate more effectively in Federally assisted programs." Kennedy pointed out that Public Law 86-388 already gives authority to employ the type of technical consultants required to perform such a study.

The future need for a joint attack on these problems by business and Government has been identified and is being examined across the Nation. Some states are taking the initiative in supporting systems engineering studies. California, for instance, has funded studies of state needs, being conducted by four aerospace companies.

Congressional decision-making and the decision-maker must be better understood; they must be studied and examined. If a "yea" or "nay" decision is made in Congress, a human decision-maker must rate competing systems, if not qualitatively, at least quantitatively.

The Congressional decision-making process raises such questions as: Would he make the same decision as another Congressional decision-maker with identical information and alternatives? Would he make the same decision in this Congress as he would have in a previous Congress?

According to Kenneth Janda in *Congress: The First Branch of Government,* "Information systems are *not* . . . devices for grinding out policy decision and they are not designed to replace human judgment. Rather, they are intended to provide the human decision-maker—here, the Congressman—with knowledge for making informed choices."

Early last month, this author interviewed Reps. Bill Brock (R-Tenn.) and Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.) for *Government Executive* and was told that more thorough legislative modernization is being sought. The application of modern business management techniques was referred to by the two Congressmen in context with the need to enact H.R. 6278, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969. The act has since been cosponsored by more than 70 members of Congress.

Brock feels "There should be better ways to sift, screen and extract significant information from the accelerated volume of data Congressmen receive. Systems should show the way to achieve some of these better ways. There are various systems tools available that conceivably could be employed to help Congressmen. Some of these are information retrieval and decision-making systems that solve the problem of obtaining timely, accurate and complete and relevant information for decisionmaking."

Some private and public research is going on in the area of how decisions are made and the information necessary to make them. The Decision Research Corp. of Washington has embarked on a study of the systems approach in Congress and has published an independent report.

Rumsfeld pointed to the need to provide Congress with new organizational techniques, more modern procedures and improvements in the Lobbying Act. He said, "The last time Congress modernized was with the Reorganization Act of 1946. There have been enormous changes in our society, the nature of the problems confronting the Nation and in the tools available to help the Congress find solutions for these problems. It is important that the methods of modern management be utilized to help reach more rational decisions that reflect more thoughtfully ordered priorities. The problems of the Seventies are not going to be effectively handled with the rules devices and procedures of 1946."

Title II of the Reorganization Act of 1969 would authorize the Comptroller General of the U.S. to develop, establish and maintain a standardized information and data processing system for budgetary and fiscal data. This would be done in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget so that the Congress could more efficiently perform its overseeing functions and also have available the types of data upon which rational decision-making must rest.

Dr. James A. Robinson, professor of Political Science at Ohio State University, emphasizes the importance attached to this key area by commenting that "as problems proliferate, the amount of information required as a basis for making policy decisions also radically increases. In consequence, no legislator can be an expert on more than a few policy issues."

The unique function of the legislative decision-maker continues to be required. If a measure of effectiveness were to be used in systems methods, it must be predefined subjectively or objectively by the legislative decision-maker alone. The benefits to constituents to be derived from a system are basically the responsibility of a Senator or Representative and should be based on their criteria.

In general, the criteria for a decision originates from the decision-maker's definition of the functional relationships benefits, resources and objectives. The decision-maker approves and thus decides because of his (or his group's) incumbent responsibility for a decision. He also may establish weighting factors known only to him in his mind to be employed in evaluating the cost-effectiveness of alternatives.

The decision-maker solely is responsible to account for the limitations in the quantified analysis. These limitations are data inadequacies, modeling assumptions and uncertainty which often causes doubts about the use of systems analysis data. The final selection of the best alternative, therefore, is primarily the decision-maker's judgment. The point is, that if there were systems in Congress, the information in the array of standard and specialized reports presented to Congress would simply augment but not replace the individual judgment of each member.

The now classic method of weapons systems analysis, for decision-making is collection, analysis, recording and selection of alternatives before a decision. This systems approach can be listed as five steps: (1) establish the objective and mission; (2) specify assumptions and constraints; (3) identi-

fy alternatives; (4) model the system; and (5) select from among the alternatives.

The first four tasks are acts that the technician or systems analyst performs. The fifth is the act of deciding based on the experienced judgment of the Congressional decision-maker.

Old prejudices and outworn traditions tend to encourage fragmentation of systems efforts in Congress. Yesterday's piecemeal pattern cannot be applied in dealing with today's complex and integrated problems. This is especially true in the intergovernmental establishment.

Congress needs to know how to increase the efficiency of its software and brainware for better decisions by using better systems. Modern systems in Congressional decision-making have a potentially powerful role to play.

THE SPREADING IMPACT OF AIR TRAFFIC CONGESTION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Miami and other Florida cities are among the few in the country planning and building airports for the future. Congestion at northern airports, however, has forced flights to wait on the ground at Miami International even though no traffic was backed up at the airport there.

Don Bedwell, aviation writer for the Miami Herald, pointed this out recently as a striking example of the spreading nationwide impact of airport congestion at such hubs as New York, Washington, and Chicago. Demand for scheduled airline service continues to grow at a phenomenal rate. Airline passenger traffic will more than double by 1975. Air cargo will double within the next 5 years. Such growth heightens the need for a truly adequate national airports system.

I believe the penetrating analysis contained in Mr. Bedwell's article is so timely as to be of interest to my colleagues, and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

CLAMPDOWNS CAN HURT AIRPORT, OFFICIAL SAYS

(By Don Bedwell)

Miami, Tampa and other cities that have instigated foresighted jetport planning could find their investment frustrated by artificial restraints, a spokesman for the nation's airline industry told a Jacksonville meeting.

Stuart Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, listed Miami, Tampa and Jacksonville among a "select group of U.S. cities building airports adequate to meet traffic demands of the 1970s."

He told the Florida State Transportation Conference last week that Houston, Kansas City and Dallas-Fort Worth are other cities that have done the necessary planning to cope with the forthcoming age of superjets.

Tipton warned that congestion already clogging major Northeastern terminals threatens such airports as Miami, Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Boston as well.

The three cities selected by the Federal Aviation Administration for limitation of flights—New York, Washington and Chicago—together with Atlanta and Boston constitute 46 per cent of the traffic to Miami last year, and 34 per cent of the traffic to Jacksonville.

"Even that select group of U.S. cities building airports adequate to meet traffic demands of the 1970s will see their investment partly wasted if artificial schedule restraints at major air hubs are permitted to take the place of new runways and radar really needed nationwide," Tipton cautioned.

Restraints proposed by the FAA are designed to reduce congestion at the three critically congested cities. Because of congestion at Northern terminals, flights have been forced to wait on the ground at Miami International even though no traffic was backed up at the airport here.

Sixty scheduled and supplemental airlines, domestic and foreign, have adjusted their planned flights to bring them within the limits imposed by the FAA at New York, Chicago and Washington.

While the airlines worked out a voluntary schedule-cutting for those airports—under the threat that the FAA would do it for them—Tipton said the carriers consider the restrictions "shortsighted and inherently harmful.

"In a very real sense," he said, "we have been closing the door on potential business in an era when rising costs of capital, wages and material for every profit-conscious industry to reach out for new market-expansion opportunities."

Restrictions at the three cities take effect in June.

Within the aviation industry, the restrictions have found little support, despite the critical problems that prompted the action.

The nation's airlines—represented by the ATA—have opposed the restrictions, since they involve thousands of schedule adjustments and reduce flight frequencies. Private and commercial aviation interests have attacked the restrictions in court, contending they are loaded in favor of the airlines.

The FAA rule calls for a maximum of 70 air carrier flights an hour at New York Kennedy, 115 at Chicago O'Hare, 40 at Newark and an equal number at Washington National.

"Studies at ATA show beyond any doubt that all of the major air hubs will need present airports expanded or new airports built by 1975," Tipton said. He cited an FAA airports plan which concluded that 800 new airline and general aviation fields must be built in the next five years to relieve present congestion and accommodate future growth.

"But even if we include airline-served cities of all sizes, only about a dozen have tackled the job," he said, citing Miami and its proposed port in the Everglades.

Even the advanced cities will find their skies clogged "if we don't get moving soon on a meaningful national program to provide adequate airports and airways throughout the country."

"Take each of the 500 or so airports in this country served by airlines," Tipton said, "and add up the dismal impact of artificial schedule restraints on people who want to get to and from major air hubs at their convenience and you have the public price of inadequate airport-airways development."

He urged public support for an airline industry proposal of an airport development trust fund.

He also asked the conference to support modernization of the airways system for air navigation and air traffic control "under a formula through which all users of the system contribute their fair share to its support."

User charges have been staunchly opposed by private aviation interests which argue that they would be billed for costly programs of benefit primarily to the airlines.

ALL HAVE A PART IN THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a monument to the Hungarian revolutionists of 1956 has been dedicated in Denver, Colo. The laying of wreaths on the statue of a fleeing young man trying to break through a symbolic curtain was a sad, and noble occasion.

A man who fought in the revolution, who went through the hope and then the agony of the Hungarian freedom fighters, gave a speech that marked this a memorable event.

Istvan B. Gereben, of Washington, D.C., copresident of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, who has adopted America as his home after struggling to gain freedom and justice for his own beloved country, told the audience:

The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 was fought for the same ideals for which this Republic stands.

This man, who fought for what he believed, knowing it could mean death as it did to so many of his countrymen, said:

Each of us has a part in this mighty struggle for liberty and justice.

Mr. Gereben pointed out the worth of each man's individual effort. He quoted the words of Edward Everett Hale:

"I am only one, but I am one.
I can't do everything, but I can do something.
What I can do, that I ought to do.
And what I ought to do,
By the Grace of God, I shall do."

Today, I would like to share Mr. Gereben's fine speech with my colleagues in the House:

ADDRESS BY MR. ISTVAN B. GEREBEN, COPRESIDENT OF THE HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS FEDERATION, U.S.A., AT THE UNVEILING OF THE HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTER'S MEMORIAL IN DENVER, COLO., OCTOBER 26, 1968

Ladies and gentlemen: In 1956, with the victory of National Communism in Poland, a new chapter began in this History of Communism and of the subjugated countries of Eastern Europe. With the Hungarian Revolution, a new chapter began in the History of Humanity.

These two events, each in its own way, sharply express the internal conditions of the east European countries. If the events in Poland encouraged the aspirations of Communist Parties, * * * Particularly those of Eastern Europe—for equality with Moscow, the Hungarian Revolution made a gigantic leap and placed on the agenda the problem of freedom in Communism, that is to say, the replacement of the Communist System itself by a new social system. If the former event had encouraged both the people and certain Communist Circles, the latter encouraged the popular masses and democratic tendencies.

Between the two events, although they happened almost simultaneously, there lies a whole epoch. The changes in Poland mean the triumph of National Communism, which in a different form we have seen in Yugoslavia. The Hungarian uprising is something more, a new Phenomenon, perhaps no less meaningful than the French Revolution.

In short, these events have brought to the fore the following new questions:

1. The further possibilities of National Communism.

2. The replacement of Communism by a new system, and along with this, the right of people heretofore under Communist rule to choose its own—Non-Communist—path of development.

3. The problem of the future foreign—and in my opinion, internal policy of the Soviet Regime

Had the Hungarian Revolution been saved from Soviet Intervention, it would have been difficult indeed for Moscow to obscure its internal conflicts by means of foreign conquest and the so called "World Mission." The Soviet system would soon have been confined to its own national boundaries and there, too, the citizens would be forced to reflect on their position and their destiny. And not only the citizens, but the leaders. They would have to break up into different groups which could no longer carry out mutual purges within their own closed circle, but would be forced to bid for popular support. This, new processes would begin in the Soviet Union too.

Moscow could no longer preserve Hungarian Communism: it faced the choice of either leaving Hungary or occupying it. Thus, the Russian Imperialism dropped its last Socialist mask.

The events in one Communist Country necessarily affect all other Communist countries, as in one and the same living organism. And just as Yugoslav Communism, separating itself from Moscow, initiated the Crisis of Soviet Imperialism, that is, the inevitable birth of National Communism, in the same way the revolution in Hungary means the beginning of the end of Communism generally.

As in all other great and decisive historic events, the Hungarian Fighters for Freedom, struggling for their existence and country, may not have foreseen what an epochal deed they had initiated. The world has rarely witnessed such unprecedented unity of the popular masses and such heroism. The unity of the popular masses was so strong that it appeared as though there had been no civil strife, as though a ruling class had not been wiped out overnight as if it never existed. And the heroic intoxication was so high that bare handed boys and girls were stopping the tanks of the interventionists, who like the Cossacks of Nicholas the First in 1849, tried to suppress their liberty and enslave their country.

Until now, the words spoken by me were not mine. They have been written by an expert on Russia and Communism: Professor Milovan Djilas of Princeton University, the Former Vice-President of Yugoslavia. I could not find better, clearer and more truthful evaluation of the Hungarian Revolution, in which I had the privilege to participate.

The Hungarian people on the basis of independence and equality and accordance with the spirit of the UN Charter wished to live in true friendship with their neighbors, the Soviet Union and all peoples of the world.

The Hungarian people desired the consolidations and further development of their National Revolution without joining any power blocks . . . We appealed to our neighbors and to countries far and near to respect the unalterable decision of our people for a free, independent, democratic and neutral Hungary.

The citizens of Denver today pay tribute to the spirit of the Hungarian nation and to the overwhelming sacrifice of her people by dedicating this square and monument to freedom especially freedom for Hungary and her people which values liberty more than life or love.

The history of recent times undoubtedly shows that the trend throughout the world is toward the recognition of individual liberty as essential necessity for social and political progress. America has been a forerunner in this progress, and accordingly, America's conceptions of liberty, as described in the constitution of the United States are unique.

Americans have devised the best government on earth: three branches, equal, with appropriate checks and balances between each branch. A bill of rights enumerating those essentials that make the difference between freedom and slavery.

And Edmund Burke expressed it so properly: Our liberties are tied to "Tangible objects":—Tax Consciousness, a device to control reckless government, the Habeas corpus and the right to trial by jury all part of this concept.

There can be no doubt that Americans are privileged, at least in this respect; But this special place in history commits America to certain things; we must not only protect our liberties, we must share our spiritual wealth with others. Americans must be convinced that their course is the right course. They must take their historic mission seriously, and if they do so, they will act accordingly.

Nowadays, it seems this American Mission frequently is misinterpreted and misrepresented. This mission is what the citizens of Denver fulfill today by showing understanding, respect and admiration of a small nation which tried and tried hard to achieve the privileges that we inherited from our forefathers.

Let there be no question about it: America is a nation nurtured in the Age of Reason. We have rooted in our thought an abiding faith in the rationality of man, we sincerely believe in the capacity of men to reason together and iron out differences according to the interests of all concerned. We believe, that differences, however acute, can be reconciled. We take an optimistic view of humaniity, we have faith in man's power of regeneration; we have in a word—faith in the idea of progress. And overall we have a deep and abiding faith in man's individual capacity to achieve genuine freedom.

This background, however admirable, must not be interpreted as a *carte blanche* for Americans to arbitrarily set the standards of freedom in the various areas of the World, especially not in the Communist-dominated countries. America, merely by having become the most powerful nation on this earth, has committed herself to propagate those ideals that made her great, rather than to accept tokens of material improvement in the captive nations as indicators of liberty. America, having won the second World War, has committed herself, expressly and officially, to promote the liberty in those historically sovereign nations, that had the misfortune to fall under the aegis of Soviet Communist influence.

Hungary and the rest of the Eastern European countries have over a thousand years history of constitutional government. It has been pointed out many times, that two nations in History were able to maintain constitutional governments without written constitutions: the British and the Hungarians. It is known that the Hungarian Golden Bull, a historic document guaranteeing the rights of the individual and restraining the powers of the Monarch, the Golden Bull was issued only six years after the Magna Carta.

Yet, many Westerner is talking about Hungary just as he talks about some newly formed, underdeveloped nation. Hungary and Poland have little to learn about Western ideals; some of them originated there.

Recent history in Central Europe confirms our belief that Communists will never voluntarily establish the criterions of what we, and what the Hungarians for one thousand years knew as liberty . . . They do not have to. The peoples of the West are satisfied with much less.

As members of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, and as proud citizens of the United States we have learned to understand one basic fact:

The Hungarian revolution of 1956 was fought for the same ideals for which this Republic stands.

This identity of objectives of the American people and the Hungarian people gives us hope that with the support of the American people so impressively displayed here today, we can bring an end to the Communist ordeal in Eastern Europe. The American people are coming to realize that their dedication to the American principles must reach far beyond the borders of the United States, if they want to protect their spiritual heritage.

You might be second or third generation Americans—I am an immigrant. What you must understand, however, that as participants of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, we have no exclusive rights to be Freedom Fighters. Each of us must take our share in fighting for freedom, you too must become Freedom Fighters.

In this mighty struggle for liberty and justice each of us have a part. Stand up and be counted. If you get discouraged, as you certainly will, do what we do, remember the words of Edward Ewerett Hale, when he said:

"I am only one, but I am one.
I can't do everything, but I can do something.
What I can do, that I ought to do.
And what I ought to do,
By the grace of God, I shall do!"

With these thoughts in mind on behalf of the Hungarian People and all participants of that glorious, memorable Revolution I say to the citizens of Denver:

Thank you!

INTELLECTUAL INCONSISTENCY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, highly vocal opponents of the anti-ballistic-missile system offer as one of their objections the position that the cost of the ABM to defend our country would run in the neighborhood of $6.6 billion.

They make an emotional pitch that this money should go to help the impoverished—whatever that means.

Comparison of figures proves interesting. Interest alone on the national debt for the current year will exceed $15 billion—$16 billion for the coming fiscal year.

Further, Americans are now spending 40 billion of dollars through Federal, State, and municipal agencies to help poverty. Would these anti-ABM proponents feel that the $6.6 billion for providing defense would be a sufficient additional sum to cure poverty woes?

Would not the $15 billion contribute more? Yet the anti-ABMers would be strange hats at any movement to retire the interest on the national debt—which, if paid, would make available moneys for poverty uses.

Seems as if these errant intellectuals are more interested in defending the recipients of interest on the national debt than to defend our country—all

citizens, be they rich, poor, or of moderate means.

Mr. Speaker, several news articles follow:

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 13, 1969]

AFTER THE TAX PAIN, RELIEF?

Sacrifices being made by Americans now should bring early rewards. We say so because the best chance for lower federal taxes is not merely to balance the budget but to get a surplus.

Consider, please, that the interest alone on the national debt has nearly doubled in the last 10 years. It was $7.07 billion in 1959.

The estimate for the current year is more than $15 billion and for the coming fiscal year nearly $16 billion.

This is an inescapable charge—a budget item which cannot be cut.

Interest on the federal debt is directly controllable. Balancing the budget would mean no further increase in this item. Yet merely equalizing income and outgo would bring no relief from that $15-billion-a-year interest on the debt already incurred.

Any decline in the interest due on the public debt is the surest and soundest hope for tax reduction. And tax cuts, as experience has shown, leave more money in the hands of individuals and corporations to spend as they please, thus boosting business.

[From the Morning Advocate, Mar. 29, 1969]

NOW HEAR THIS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It will surprise those who have been watching the search and destroy tactics of the war on poverty strategists—who've been in the big city jungles for almost five years—that this nation actually is spending some $40 billion this year to help the poor.

Positively now, these jungles need swift defoliating. The coordination is amateurish. The supervision is unskilled. The responsibility is diffuse. And the Office of Economic Opportunity, partially to blame for the chaos, has been drawing too much of the lightning criticism. It has been spending $2 billion annually. This is but five percent of the $40 billion disbursed by federal, state and municipal agencies, which is supposed to help the 11 million children and 15 million adults who are the poor and the hungry of the land.

They are the poor by Social Security Administration standards, which say that a rural family of four which has a weekly income of $46 is impoverished, as is its counterpart in the city, where the line rests on $61 weekly.

Bluntly, much of the responsibility for the discombobulation, the discoordination, the chaos, the failure to get directly to these poor, rests squarely on the White House of Lyndon Johnson.

The Congress set up a watchdog committee, the Economic Opportunity Council, in 1964. It was directed to coordinate and counsel. It was to supervise and direct. It was to mesh all government agencies which pour billions into rural and urban slums. Some of these agencies are rarely though of as anti-poverty fighters—which is why the Office of Economic Opportunity is being blamed for it all.

The other agencies include the Veterans Administration, the Labor Dept., the Health, Education and Welfare Dept. and the Department of Agriculture.

But the watchdog commitee did not watch. Its chairman, Sargent Shriver, OEO chief, just could not coordinate its members—the President's department heads—much less the fantastically intricate and innovative official "war on poverty."

So in December 1967, the Congress recast this Section 604 of the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It wrote Section 631. And it said that "there is established in the Executive Office of the President the Economic Opportunity Council, which shall be composed of the director and heads of such federal departments and agencies, such presidential assistants and such other officials of the federal government as the President may from time to time designate . . ."

This new council was given the responsibility to assist the President in coordinating the federal war on poverty.

This new council was never appointed.

And the General Accounting Office, after a 15-month, $500,000 probe of the poverty war, reported "the council has never functioned effectively and as recast by the 1967 amendments has not been established."

Thus there never has been a specially trained, specially aimed, watchdog over the government's spending of some $40 billion in search of the poor during 1969. This sum will rocket in the next few years, just as it has since 1961, when it was an unescalated $9 billion.

The federal government alone, which spent $24.4 billion in fiscal 1969, projects the spending of $27.2 billion in 1970. The other poverty prevention funds come from the state and cities. In addition, the public, through its churches and voluntary organizations, spends about $2.4 billion a year.

There's no doubt that much of this flood of cash is on target—and that some of it just swirled around the poor.

Without a nationally prestigious watchdog council centrally directed, how could this have been otherwise? The OEO is new and itself is a jungle within jungles. In a few years, it launches a thousand Community Action Agencies—each wtih scores of mini-agencies and "cooperations" dangling in hundreds of neighborhoods, counties, precincts and "blocks."

At the same time, it had to be innovative amidst ghettos burdened with the disbelief of the displaced, disadvantaged, unskilled and "hardcore." It has never happened before:

So the best of the projects—Head Start—reached 29 per cent of the people it should have aided. Upward Bound got to four per cent of those needing a lift. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, heavily looted, got to six per cent of its target population. The Community Action Program (CAP) Parent and Child Centers got to one per cent of the needy. CAP Migrant Day Care operations helped two per cent.

This is but a sample. The 26 million poor, still hungry, still needy, still are there despite the outpouring of $40 billion a year.

Now let's get directly to them. Jungles are out of style.

INCOME TAX RETURN FORMS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, only too well I am afraid, yesterday marked the deadline date for completion of personal income tax returns.

The trauma perpetrated by that deadline are widespread and devastating. The annual ritual of wrestling with tax forms can reduce grown men to mere children. Without the assistance of a competent tax lawyer, that too few can afford, successful completion of a tax return form can truly be a formidable endeavor.

I am inserting a newspaper article today which pleads for relief from these yearly struggles. The relief sought is in the form of more simplified tax return forms. It appeared in the Reading Times and was written by my good friend, Martz Schoffstall. The article follows:

HELP, GUS

(By Martz Schoffstall)

Good morning! And this morning may I address myself to Rep. Gus Yatron, my man in Washington—and yours, if you live in the 6th Congressional District?

DEAR GUS: Along about this time of year, after wrestling for weeks—yes, Gus, weeks—with that confounded nuisance, the annual federal income tax return—I am invariably ready for the psychiatrist's couch. I need help and as I know you're always ready to help, I appeal to you for succor. You're in the big time now and are in a position, as the saying goes, to "do something." Now, I'm not a tax-yawper. I always have held the view that if we expect our government, from township to Washington, to give use services, we must expect to pay for them with our taxes. I'm not even, here and at this time, yammering about the amount of taxes I pay Uncle Sam. What I'm talking about is the fantastically complicated forms we have to fill out to pay our taxes. Can't something be done about this, Gus? Would it be possible—and I'm in dead earnest about this—for you to introduce a resolution directing the Internal Revenue Service to make a study-in-depth of the income tax form so that mathematical dolts and dullards like me can work with a greatly simplified form, do it more quickly, and not be expected to have a Ph. D. in mathematics or statistics in order to do it without going half daft?

Before I left the full-time staff of this newspaper nearly six years ago, my IRS task was nothing too onerous. I got my W2 form from the front office. I had my 1040 form through the mails. I had instructions with it. I filed Form 1040, attached the W2 and that was it. But since retiring, I now fill in Form 1040 plus Form B, Form C, and Form C3. There is also that cute little addition of the 10 per cent surtax. Have you done your form yet, Gus? Have you seen that little gimmick under "12b, tax surcharge. If line 12 is less than $734, find surcharge from tables on Page 10 of instructions. If Line 12a is $734 or more, multiply amount on Line 12a by .075 and enter result (If you claim retirement income credit, use Schedule B (Form 1040) to figure surcharge." Now isn't that a real jim-dandy, Gus? A little gem in the crown of our sovereign government? And a heck of a brick to throw at taxpayers (or most of us) who were never too bright at arithmetic in the first place?

I have a pretty fair education, Mr. Congressman. But do you think that helps me through the IRS gobbledygook? Not one little bit. I'm just as confused as the fellow who just made it through sixth grade. Moreover, I suspect that many a college professor with an A.B. an M.A., and a Ph. D. has just as much trouble translating these IRS documents out of the original Sanskirt as I do. Help us, Gus. Help, please! Get that resolution in instanter!

THE CASE AGAINST DOPE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent series of articles and editorials which recently appeared in the San Pedro News-Pilot in San Pedro, Calif., entitled "The Case Against Dope."

I wholeheartedly commend these articles on the problems of drug use and abuse to parents and teenagers alike. I particularly wish to thank Mr. Bob Beck, publisher of the San Pedro News-Pilot, for the fine job he did in putting this series together. I am sure the Members will find the articles a most interesting and enlightening commentary on this troublesome problem facing our country today. The articles follow:

[Articles and editorials from the San Pedro (Calif.) News-Pilot, Feb. 20, 1969]

THE CASE AGAINST DOPE

(NOTE.—The accelerated use and abuse of drugs in Harbor Area schools has become a major problem of the community, educators and authorities.

(The News-Pilot feels that awareness of the problem may be a deciding factor in controlling and perhaps curtailing the narcotics situation.

(The News-Pilot, with the cooperation of the Community Relations Committee of the Chamber, presents to its readers this special section of comprehensive stories and editorials on the drug problems in city, county and state.

(We hope in bringing the sometimes shocking statistics to light that an aroused public will demand—and receive—an end to a sordid situation.)

(By Arthur Ribbel)

Since 1959 in California, the proportion of boys and girls committed to Youth Authority institutions for narcotic and drug offenses has doubled.

Joblessness, discrimination, despair and destructive family situations have combined to spawn more crime and delinquency in ghettos.

These are the highlights of a recent YA report showing that some changes in characteristics of boys and girls committed to California institutions.

In 1959, boys committed for drug offenses made up only 6 per cent of the institution inmates, but by 1968 that proportion had increased to 12 per cent. The girls also doubled in drug offenses.

Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch of California also recently focused startling statistics on the drug problem in youths.

Allen F. Breed, YA director, said the narcotics figures "are simply another confirmation that involvement with drugs among young people in California is a growing problem."

He reported that in the last eight years there has been a 2000 per cent increase in juvenile drug arrests.

Drug arrests in some of the larger counties, like Los Angeles, San Diego and Orange, have doubled.

Breed said the YA is stepping up its juvenile delinquency prevention efforts in ghetto areas of California. He said new community treatment programs for YA wards on parole are being developed, plus expansion of efforts to cooperate with organizations which already have launched ghetto programs.

The report also showed:

1. In the 10 years, girls in institutions increased from 387 in 1959 to 562 in 1968; boys from 3140 to 4922.

2. The percentage institutionalized from Southern California increased substantially, while the percentage from other areas declined.

3. In 1959, 66 per cent of the boys in institutions were there on there first commitment. In 1968, only 54 per cent were in institutions on their first commitment. Among girls, the percentage on first commitments declined from 78 per cent to 56 per cent. Those figures, said YA, reflect an increasing number of parole violators in institutions.

SAN PEDRO HIGH SCHOOL CONFRONTED WITH A 400-PERCENT DRUG USE HIKE

(By Dan Scanlan)

San Pedro High School is confronted this year with a 400 per cent increase in the incidence of students using dope in the first part of this semester over all of last year.

Narcotics is our biggest problem this year, school administrators are saying.

More than 70 students have been arrested during school hours on school grounds and booked on narcotic charges so far this year.

Last year, only 16 boys were arrested for dope usage. No girls were arrested last year, although there were a couple of incidents in which girls would carry pills or marijuana for their boy friends.

The story is different today, however. More than five girls so far have been arrested and more than 63 boys.

Two of those incidents resulted in the near deaths of two boys who had taken an overdose.

"That had a pretty deadening effect on the kids," Principal Arthur Farnham said. "No announcement was made, but they knew."

The sight of ambulance crews rushing dying classmates to emergency centers and the sight of policemen taking students into custody does seem to have lessened the onslaught of dope usage experienced at the school in the earlier days of the semester.

Four days of one week were incident-free, according to Boys' Vice Principal Robert Mills, who pointed to recent "busts" and the two near-deaths as possible causes.

Dope usage at the high school is tending to emerge in five patterns.

First, students who use illegal drugs and narcotics, are switching from marijuana to pills.

"They (pills) are easier," Mills said. A kid can pop a pill unseen during school but it's pretty difficult to smoke a marijuana cigarette and get away with it."

According to figures released by Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch, this phenomenon is statewide.

Juvenile usage of marijuana in the first half of 1968 increased over the same period in 1967 by 126 per cent. Dangerous drugs, however, were being used by juveniles by a 323 per cent margin over last year.

Other offenses, which includes prescription violations and possession of narcotic paraphenalia, increased in the same period by 356 per cent among juveniles.

A second pattern that seems to be emerging is that pills are constantly being used by younger and younger students.

Only last year, for example, the median age of the student pill-popper was around 17. Today, however, the predominance of narcotic users seem to be in the B–10 class.

Which means they're 14 years old, and just barely out of junior high.

Police, too, are recording a greater number of pre- and early-teen arrests for narcotic usage.

Police reported the incident of an 11-year-old boy who staggered home and became belligerent with his family. That same day a 14-year-old boy was also arrested on a Wilmington sidewalk, drunk from pill usage.

Marilyn R. Duncan girls' vice principal at San Pedro High School, said that the five girls who had been arrested on narcotic charges, were incoming freshmen.

"It just seems like they want to be popular," Mrs. Duncan said.

A third pattern emerging on the high school level is the growing universality of narcotic usage. Marijuana and dangerous drugs were once thought to be solely the habits of the poor and oppressed. Today, however, the habit cuts across all strata of society.

Affluent families as well as the underprivileged are being called by police to be told their son or daughter is being held in a drunken stupor.

A fourth pattern is the shift from almost a solely male endeavor to one afflicting both sexes. In times past, teenage girls did little more than stash the dope for their boyfriends. More and more of them, however, are beginning to take up the practice.

No longer can a parent feel immune from the horrors of her child being taken in by pushers, simply because her child is a girl.

The last pattern is the most terrifying of all—a conspiracy of silence and acceptance.

All three San Pedro High School administrators shared the fear that today's youths are accepting drug abuse by their classmates.

"What would you do if you found out your best friend was popping pills?" asked Mrs. Duncan. "Would you accept her or him anyway?"

Today's youths seem to be answering that it wouldn't make any difference.

The problem is the problem of the "so-called good person who knows what is going on but who won't say or do anything," said Farnham.

This conspiracy hampers both school and police officials who are trying to probe the narcotic usage centers.

"When a kid is sitting in my office under the influence of a drug," Mills said, "all he will tell you is 'everybody takes it'."

The feeling among the administrators is that many more students know what activities are taking place than are coming forward. In fact, rarely does a student come forward at all.

This squelching of the rumors that used to float freely and voluminously cross high school campuses leads to the inevitable grimace of disbelief on the parts of both parents and teachers who come across a student under the influence.

The silence has been attributed to some as a sidekick of the anti-establishment attitude prevalent among youth.

"Somebody's got to get to the kids somehow," Farnham said. "This growing feeling on the part of some—a considerable segment—who don't believe what teachers, parents or their minister tell them, has got to stop.

"Someone who can give them a feeling of assurance and integrity has got to get to them.

"Someone has got to get to these kids."

EIGHT STUDENTS A DAY NABBED FOR DRUGS

(By Jay Berman)

LOS ANGELES.—Illnesses caused by drugs send as many as eight high school students each day to the Health Office, the Los Angeles City Schools' medical administrator told an Assembly committee Thursday.

Dr. Harriet B. Randall spoke before the Assembly Committee on Public Health, which was meeting in Los Angeles to hear testimony on the state's growing drug problem.

Dr. Randall told the committee that on any given day at any high school in the Greater Los Angeles Area, "Between one and eight" students will report to the health office, suffering from a drug-related problem.

Dr. Randall estimated the district's drug problem has doubled in the last few years.

"District procedure specifies that the nurse will contact the child's parents," she said. "If the symptoms are more than superficial, the school physician is called immediately."

Discipline is handled by the vice principal's office, Dr. Randall said, and it is the vice principal who decides whether to notify police.

"Most of these youngsters are obviously under the influence of various types of drugs," Dr. Randall said, "but they'll often tell the nurse they have a cold and want to lie down."

Testifying at the same time as Dr. Randall

was Joseph Langan, director of drug abuse information for the district.

Langan said the increasing problem "can only be solved with a program employing qualified health education teachers—not English teachers teaching health education.

"They need the proper audio-visual and teaching aids along with planned curriculum structures, and the whole program should be in context with other health programs."

Earlier in the day, the committee heard from David and Winifred Kershaw, former drug users, who now represent the Berkeley-based committee for psychedelic drug information.

The husband and wife—both 25 years old—said they began experimenting with LSD and marijuana while undergraduates at Harvard University, in an attempt to "find some personal answers about ourselves."

After studying the teachings of Meher Baba, an Indian philosopher, they turned to eastern spiritualism and abandoned all use of drugs.

Kershaw told the committee, headed by Gordon Duffy, R-Hanford, he and his wife have been speaking against the use of narcotics and drugs for two years.

He said law enforcement agencies are "doing the best they can" in opposing drugs but said "the police can't put a man in every home."

"At any given time on a weekend night in Berkeley, there are probably as many as 2000 pot parties going on. The Berkeley police department just doesn't have 2000 men."

After the hearing recessed for lunch, Kershaw told Copley News Service that buying narcotics—especially marijuana—in Berkeley is "as easy as buying a loaf of bread."

"They (drug sellers) assume that most people on Telegraph Avenue are interested in buying drugs," he said. "I was walking down University Avenue near the campus a week ago and was offered 'some really good stuff'."

In response to a question by Assemblywoman Yvonne Brathwaite, D-63rd District, Kershaw told the committee many young people have stopped using opiates, amphetamines, LSD and others but have continued using marijuana.

"They (the users) aren't convinced that marijuana is harmful," Mrs. Kershaw said. "They have started to worry about chromosome damage caused by LSD, but they think marijuana is perfectly acceptable."

Mrs. Kershaw said the use of marijuana is so vast that fear of being arrested is not an effective deterrent.

"Young people think the laws against marijuana are too severe," she said. "They think marijuana should be legalized, and they rationalize their case by claiming it is less harmful than alcohol.

"We think marijuana is more harmful, but the kids don't. We hear the same thing all the time. We need more information to give them to let them know it can be dangerous."

Her husband told the hearing one of the main dangers of marijuana is not in the plant itself but in impurities. He said:

"Dealers, in an attempt to sell as much as they can, aren't always selling pure marijuana. If there is belladonna in the mixture, it could even cause blindness.'

Another speaker, Dr. Joel Fort, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco State College, told committee members present programs of drug information "are markedly ineffective."

He said young people are taking drugs "because society encourages it."

"If the advertising of alcohol and tobacco were stopped," he said, "along with ads for sleeping pills and capsules for everything else, maybe we wouldn't have this problem."

DOPE ONE OF WORST OF WORDS

(By Tom Coulter)

Dope—a four-letter word which has awakened today's society and its conscience—is as easily obtained by teenagers in the Harbor Area as walking to the nearest supermarket.

"In today's generation, the pusher concept no longer exists," the Rev. Vincent Coletta said.

"Instead there seems to be a sharing concept among the youth of today in drug traffic. Asking authorities to completely wipe out the problem overnight would be like trying to sweep the bottom of the ocean with a broom."

Coletta, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Palos Verdes, is one of four ministers who are on 24-hour call on the highly-acclaimed Peninsula "Hot Line."

As chairman of the Community Resource Committee of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Council of Churches, he helped initiate the program nearly two years ago as an effort to provide instant counseling by telephone for distressed parents and youths involved in drug abuse in the Harbor Area.

Today the "Hot Line" is averaging more than 60 calls a month.

"We don't have all the answers to the problem of drug abuse, but we have made some discoveries during the short time that we have been counseling youth and parents," Coletta said.

His committee, which consists of a psychiatrist, psychologist, physician, school administrator (from another school district to avoid conflict) and a parent, meets once a month to study the moral and sociological phenomena of drug abuse amongst youth.

Among the committee's findings in the Peninsula area were:

Widespread publicity across the nation seems to have brought more youth into contact with drugs than would normally have been.

Most of the involvement with drugs by youth in the Peninsula area seems to be experimental—but this doesn't lower the risk.

How affluent a background a youth comes from has a lot to do with his involvement in drugs.

Youths tend to utilize drugs as a means of coping with pressure.

Some become involved in drug abuse because of their relationship with their peers.

For others, it becomes a way of life.

Expanding on the findings, Coletta told the ministers that drug abuse by youth has shifted from the poverty ghetto to the affluent ghetto.

"We had to wake up to the fact that drug abuse is not a respector of families and students. The affluence of a family has a lot to do with the kicks in life for kids today. The wealthier the family, it seems the greater degree what will provide a kick for the youths."

The pastor said that many youths abuse drugs as a method of coping with the problems of today.

"We had one kid tell us that when he was using drugs was the only time "I feel my parents are off my back," he related.

"We are living in a psycho-chemical age of 'instant copability,' instant authenticity,' 'instant well being' through the use of chemicals. Parents are non-verbally influencing their children by reaching for an aspirin to quiet the nerves, reaching for a glass of liquor when things aren't going right, or reaching for a cigarette. Our society today has told youth through our actions that it is alright to scothe the internal problems with external help. Thus, the youth turns to narcotics and drugs as a pressure release."

Coletta said that parents and youth should keep the use of chemicals within the beneficial realm.

"We have suggested that education in drug abuse should begin in the primary grades of school—not in crash programs in high school. Schools should offer youth creative ways of escape other than through chemical means."

The ministers on the Hot Line feel that there are five aids for parents:

(1) There is a need for a third point of reference. Youths don't want to tell their parents about their drug problem and parents are afraid to talk to their kids. A third point of reference offers an area of release and guidance. In the urban society of the Harbor Area, families don't have the close relationships with aunts and uncles that they can confide in without telling dad or mom, Coletta said. And they can't confide in their peers. Parents don't want to talk to their friends about such a personal family problem. The "Hot Line" serves this purpose.

(2) It is very healthy, Coletta said, if one can succeed through personal counseling or group discussion to discover what they have found out about life on the trail to independence and self reliance. "Once you can convince a youth that he can not find a place in life unless he can say yes or no based on his own convictions and findings, then you have made progress."

(3) Since most teenagers and youth can not be swayed by medical or legal complications of drug abuse, attempt to reason with them. "If the only way they can have a good time at a party or get along with their fellow peers and withstand the problems of life is through the use of chemicals, then he's a phony."

(4) Parents do not have to feel guilty about over-reacting to the realization that their teenager is involved with drugs. "That is a perfectly healthy feeling for parents to have. But before they talk with the youth, they should curb that tendency to over-react."

(5) The parents must have authority in their home.

If he doesn't have authority over his children by the time they are in their teens, he will never have, Coletta said.

Parents should be pseudo-parents. Their relationship with their children should not be with a capital M for Mom and a capital F for Father. Children don't have a normal upbringing in that manner. There is such a thing as earned authority by parents. This is gained by having a meaningful relationship as parents, living and laughing and talking with their children as they grow up.

Coletta added that too often parents set themselves up as perfect. "We, as parents know, we goof occasionally and it doesn't do any harm to let your children know you do goof. But let him know that you are doing something about it. You are coping with the problem. This way he will learn to tackle his problems and not give up and resort to chemicals later in life.

"Drug use is a growing phenomenon, but it is no worse in the Peninsula high schools than anywhere else. It has just been more widely publicized," Coletta noted.

"We have attempted to keep only members of the clergy on the "Hot Line" for the reason that information they receive is privileged and can not be used against them in court. We attempt to establish a good rapport with the caller. In 80 per cent of the cases, we are successful in having them come in for personal consultations."

The committee then attempts to refer the caller to every possible community resource, including church related or religious oriented counseling with a priest, minister or rabbi, psychologists, psychiatrists, and a new program of a 4-week study-therapy group for parents and youth.

"Our youth today is faced with great dilemmas—Vietnam, academic excellence, concerns about the 'established order'—and our psycho-chemical age can make it easy for both adults and youth to 'get away from it all.' "

But it can also lead to false notions of mind expansion through chemicals, Coletta said.

The "Hot Line" number is 320–2020.

BIG PROFITS KEEP SOURCES MUM ABOUT TEEN DOPE PUSHERS

(By Dan Scanlan)

A 16-year-old boy drops his school books in a hallway at San Pedro High School.

He stoops in an effort to recover the books. One book is two feet away from him. He reaches out from his stooped position and falls on his chest.

A second student sees his classmate's plight and kicks the book further away from the youth, laughing.

A teacher, attracted by the laughter, watches as the boy tries to get to his feet and half stumbles in the direction of the book. The boy rests a moment, and leans against the wall.

Before he can move from the wall, the teacher has approached him and assists him to the nursing office.

"Where did you get the reds?" the police will ask when they arrive.

"From a guy. I don't remember his name," is the inevitable answer.

The question is always unanswered—where do they get the pills? Who's picking up the profit on pills that normally sell for $6 per thousand when they are sold to high school students for 25 cents each?

The teenager who lives in an electronic world that blares the news of wars and talks of deaths and drafts and kidnapings and mud slides is a sorry enough creature already without introducing him to the stupifying and distorted world of dangerous drugs.

Somebody is making more than 400 per cent profit on the illegal sale of legally manufactured drugs to teenagers.

According to Walter Gates, acting U.S. customs agent in charge at the San Ysidro, Calif., point of entry from Mexico into the United States, all the pharmaceutical companies in the United States export to Mexico dangerous drugs which wholesale at $6 to $9 per thousand.

These same pills, Gates says, then are smuggled back across the border to sell on the street at more than $60 per thousand. (The current rate for a seconal capsule is 25 cents at San Pedro High School.)

It wasn't until a little less than two years ago that dangerous drugs actually made in Mexico began to appear in smuggling cases. Before that, all drugs were American-made. At the moment, officials are unable—or unwilling—to say how much or what percentage of the seizures are Mexican or American-made.

One unidenified federal narcotics agent in Los Angeles told a county probation officer that most of the pills are manufactured by legitimate and well-respected pharmaceutical companies, however.

Gates said also that no single American company is responsible—there is no particular manufacturer whose product is conspicuous on the border. The pills are of all brands.

The average monthly seizure by San Diego police is 10,000. When the smuggling case involves 2000 or less tablets or capsules of a dangerous drug, the customs people turn the suspect and evidence over to the San Diego Police Department for state prosecution.

In the last fiscal year, the number of capsules and pills of dangerous drugs seized at the border was more than 2.6 million. In one case alone last September, 100,000 pills were seized.

The average age of the carriers of contraband drugs is 20 to 30 years. Sixty to 70 percent of those arrested fall in that age bracket.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department lists the two major sources of dangerous drugs as "illegal diversion of legal domestic drug production and drugs that are legally exported to Mexico and then illegally returned to the United States."

Other sources includes illicit production in the United States—limited at the moment to "backyard chemists"—and thefts from pharmaceutical plants, warehouses, drug stores and doctors' offices. Drug users sometimes will forge prescriptions and feign symptoms which require the use of the particular drug they are seeking.

But the largest single source remains the legal drug manufacturers themselves. Once the pills have been packaged and placed on a truck, their responsibility is over, one county official said.

The pill companies manufacture more pills than needed legally. They are then transported to Mexico for "charitable" or other purposes. Somehow—and no one is saying how—they get back into the country.

The pills the San Pedro High School student popped the day he was "busted" probably had been manufactured under strict government controls in a large and respected American company.

Whether the pill came from a hijacked truck that was to carry drugs legally to a warehouse or from a backyard chemist with a homemade machine cannot be known.

But whether the governments—state, federal and local—should move quickly to halt the chances of legal drugs arriving illegally into the hands of an emotional high school student is certain.

A county probation officer, who wished to remain anonymous cited a large part of the problem besetting any beneficial actions when he said:

"There's a lack of coordination among the pros. Each one of us (involved in the drug problem) has a bit of knowledge. Law enforcement is developing its techniques. We're working with what to do about a kid who has the habit and wants to kick it. The schools are working on another angle. Parents are worried about something else.

"We don't draw on one another's knowledge. The feds don't know what the local police do and the local police don't know what the feds are doing.

"If we want to lick the problems—and we have to—we must get together. We've got to get together.

LET US TAKE A LOOK AT THE YOUTHFUL USER OF DANGEROUS DRUGS

It's late on a Saturday night. Your 15-year-old son calls. You can't understand what he is saying. He sounds like a drunk man. You drive to pick him up. He stumbles, has a difficult time trying to walk. Just like a drunk.

But there is no alcohol on his breath . . .

Or: You wake up one night to find your boy literally trying to climb the walls. You try to put him to bed. He can't lie still. He thrashes about. Soon it's so bad you have to rush him to the hospital . . .

This is how those newspaper stories, those PTA programs, those TV documentaries suddenly become real. This is how the nasty facts of teen-agers and dope quit being statistics and start being part of your life, part of your child's life.

The number of juveniles arrested in Los Angeles County on drug charges in 1967 was 164 per cent higher than the number arrested in 1966. The number of arrests continues to increase. The problem grows despite the efforts of the police, the schools and many concerned groups.

But those arrests represent not hardened criminals, but children, boys and girls like yours. And this is what is so shocking. They are like your children and could well be your children. There is no stereotype of the individual who is most likely to start taking pills, smoking marijuana.

The drug abusers come from homes of the wealthy as well as the poor, from the homes of educated as well as the uneducated. They also come from the homes of parents who are concerned about this problem as well as from the homes of parents who are not concerned.

"He was in advance classes of school. He kept his room neat. He was never a discipline problem." This is the way one mother described her son. We won't use his name. The police have it. The boy indulged in what is probably the most dangerous teen-age fad of all times—the taking of drugs.

"We had discussed drugs with our children," the mother said. She knew there was a problem. She tried to warn her boy.

But when temptation came, his reaction was, "Well, one time won't hurt me."

The onetime came when he was offered pills by a boy he had known most of his life.

This is the story repeated in case after case with few variations—a "friend" provided the pills.

"Friends are the problem," one mother conceded. Then added bitterly, "I wish those older boys would be put away. They go around giving them away. Later they try to sell them."

It's like an epidemic. It spreads from one child to another. Older brothers and sisters involve younger children and the friends of the younger children.

Another mother recounted the experience her son had with pills.

"This older boy came up to my son. This older boy was the brother of a boy my son knows. He told my boy of all the wonderful feelings you get from the pills. First he wanted money and when my boy said he didn't have any money, this boy gave my boy the pills.

"He had heard all the other guys talking about pills so he decided to try them. He wanted to find out."

Finding out almost cost the boy his life. The normal dosage for the type of drug he took is one pill in a 12-hour period. He took four. "He took four because the boy he got them from said you have to take six to get any reaction," the mother said. "My boy thought he would be cautious and he took only four.

"These kids don't know anything about what they are taking, what they are giving others to take."

Her son almost died. In two days he lost 10 pounds. When he was finally discharged from the hospital he was still pale and weak.

So the stories go. Drug abuse among teenagers is a national problem. It's a Los Angeles problem. It may well be your problem someday—or today.

You are interested in protecting your child. You are concerned. But can the same be said of all parents? Tomorrow we will look at the parents as we continue to explore the problem of drug abuse.

PARENTS NEED INFO ON TEEN DOPE USE

The ever increasing use of dope by teenagers has many parents alarmed, many frightened.

These parents attend meetings of the Parent-Teacher Association to hear discussions of the problem. They listen to lectures by police officers. They attend seminars on drugs at their church.

These parents are the ones who need such information least.

True, they do need it. Information, facts and methods of combating the problem are essential for every parent. But those who go to the meetings, who take time to find out the details, are demonstrating the most important ingredient for the parent—concern.

They know there is a problem. They know their child is vulnerable. And they are worried.

It's the parents who do not go to the meetings, who refuse to recognize there is a problem—they are the ones who need the meetings, the information, the lectures most.

Some parents adopt the attitude "not me, not my children." Some will cling to this delusion all the way to the police department as they make the trip to town to get their child out of police custody.

Sgt. Heber King heads the Juvenile Narcotics Bureau and he can tell you stories that will touch your heart. And he can tell

you stories of parents that will make your blood boil.

Some parents, according to incidents related by King will ignore every bit of evidence that their children are involved with drugs.

What's this going to do to me?" is the first thing some parents say when they hear their child has been arrested for using dope.

Still worse are those who get over protective of their children. These parents get a lawyer immediately then forbid their children to talk with police.

The police say they want the children to have every legal protection they are entitled to, but they are also concerned about the teen-ager's reaction. "Aren't these parents really telling their child that he can do anything and they'll shield him?" King asked.

This type of reaction is not just reserved for the police.

One couple tried to warn another couple that their children were deeply involved in the use of pills, even to the extent of passing them out to other children.

The father being warned reacted "I'll take you to court for saying such a thing about my boy."

Of course, he didn't take anybody to court, but such shortsightedness may well mean his son will eventually wind up in court.

These parents can't see that they are harming their own children by such a reaction. The primary goal of everyone working on this problem is to eliminate the problem, not see how many people they can lock up.

If the problem is ignored or hushed up within a family, the child will get the idea he can do anything he wants and get away with it.

People have to realize they can't shut their eyes to the problem when it crops up within their own family. The sooner it is dealt with, the less trouble there will be.

But there is still a worse parent than those who refuse to help guide and correct their own children.

"Another mother bought the glue," one heartsick parent recounted after her son got in trouble with drugs.

"She went to a store and told them she was a den mother and needed several tubes of glue. She then gave it to her own son and his friends."

The woman who told of the incident said the glue sniffing led to pills and later to detention for her son. There are other cases where parents know their children are using pills, passing them around and yet they do nothing.

Evidence for a court case against such parents is all but impossible to gather. The tragedy is it is the young people whose lives become ruined.

While the parents may ignore the problem, the law cannot. There are strict penalties on use, possession and sale of the various drugs, and narcotics.

DOPE LINGO AN ESCAPE FROM LIFE

Teenagers talking about football may not be discussing the popular autumn sport, but a deadly game involving pills.

If the talk is of yellowjackets, those doing the talking most likely are not worried about insects, but something which can pack a much worse sting, a capsule.

Almost every American knows some of the terms being used by the drug cult. Acid head, pot, grass, busted, weed, hooked, these terms are becoming part of the language.

The general knowledge of such terms is an indication of just how much drug abuse has crept into the life of this country.

The language of pills and dope is colorful, clever, frequently witty. This type of talk disguises the dangerous nature of the subject, makes it "smart." It also keeps the unwary from realizing just what he is doing and what the results will be when he swallows a brightly colored tablet or capsule.

The language is as much an escape from the reality of drug abuse as the use of the drug is an attempt to escape from the realities of life.

There are five categories of substances which have the potential of abuse. These are narcotics, sedative tranquilizers, stimulants and hallucinogens.

In these terms they lose a lot of their glamour. They also lose a lot of their glamour after a few days in the hospital for the treatment of an overdose, or after many months in jail for the sale or possession of illegal drugs.

Hallucinogens are used in medical research. The others are essential to the practice of modern medicine.

To the abuser, though, these same medically useful drugs have a compelling attribute: they affect the nervous system, producing a change in the individual's emotional responses or reactions. The abuser may feel intoxicated, relaxed, happy or detached from a world that is painful and unacceptable to him.

With repeated use many drugs cause physical dependence. This means the abuser has the habit, or in the language of the cult, he's hooked. He's an addict. His body must have the drug and if it does not get it he will suffer severe physical reactions. Some teenagers feel they are safe from physical addiction if they stay away from hard narcotics such as heroin. This isn't true.

Barbiturates including those yellowjackets, create a physical dependence with excessive use.

There is also the psychic or psychological dependence present in many cases where there is not a physical dependence. Psychic dependence is an emotional or mental adaptation to the effects of the drug. The user not only likes the drug experience, he feels he does not want to live without it.

Life can get pretty difficult for a teenager at times and he'd like to escape to another world.

One mother whose son has taken pills said, "He's shy with girls. Someone told him if he would take the pills he wouldn't be shy."

Another boy's mother reported, "He (her son) was making low grades and having to work hard to get those. He couldn't keep up with the class. He had nothing else to fall back on so he started taking pills."

Teenagers fail to realize that in grappling with the problems of school and of getting along with the opposite sex, they are learning methods of adjustment to life which they must know. If they don't learn to make these adjustments as teenagers, they never will. They may wake up from the drug-inspired dream world one day and realize they can never face reality.

A reality they may well have to face someday, if they continually use drugs, is the law.

Anyone who produces or sells dangerous drugs illegally may receive from one to three years in prison or a fine of from $1000 to $10,000 or both.

Anyone over 18 years old who sells or gives any of the controlled drugs to persons under the age of 21 faces anywhere from two to six years in prison, a fine of from $5000 to $15,000 or both.

Adults who aid and abet teenagers in getting drugs had better ponder these legal penalties, too.

There are many kinds of pills and they can produce a variety of results. Pills are popular with teenagers because they are easy to take and because many teenagers are not aware of the dangers involved. Not many teenagers have graduated to hard narcotics, but many are involved with marijuana and LSD.

LSD, MARIHUANA LEAST UNDERSTOOD DRUG SUBSTANCES

The popular phrase of the day among the drug abusers is "take a trip" and the most popular vehicles for these flight from reality are LSD and marijuana.

Of all the substances the drug cult is taking these days, LSD and marijuana are the most discussed and the most misunderstood—or least understood.

There is a great lack of understanding and knowledge of LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide). It is the most potent of the hallucinogens and no one, scientist or teenybopper, knows everything LSD can do to the mind and body.

LSD is a tasteless, colorless and odorless liquid which affects the central nervous system.

The LSD experience consists of changes in perception, thought, mood and activity.

It can sound very thrilling and if all it was were weird lights, colors and sounds, it might be thrilling. But this is only part of the LSD story.

Many individuals have had LSD experiences without apparent ill effect, but there is growing medical evidence which shows the drug can cause serious and often damaging reactions in many.

One of the primary dangers of LSD is that the reactions cannot be predicted. They are different for each individual.

LSD heightens or reveals emotional problems, problems which the individual may not have been aware of. Some users of LSD have wound up in the hospital, or killing themselves.

Then there is a delayed psychotic reaction in some people.

Another danger is that when LSD is manufactured illegally, impurities occasionally occur and the effects of these can be more dangerous than the acid itself.

James L. Goddard, commissioner of Food and Drugs, said medically unsupervised use of LSD is analogous to playing "chemical Russian roulette."

While little is known of the full LSD story, much is known of marijuana. Adults must realize that when talking about marijuana, the teen-ager may know more than the adult.

Scare tactics built upon misinformation are no good in dealing with teen-agers today.

First of all marijuana is not a narcotic, although the federal government treats it like one and punishes users with the same stiff penalties it reserves for the user of heroin and opium.

Marijuana is not physically addictive. It has no known detrimental effect on a person's physical health, though it is possible to become psychologically dependent on it.

Teen-agers are not convinced by the argument that marijuana leads automatically to heroin. While most heroin addicts started with marijuana, not all marijuana users become heroin addicts. All alcoholics start with one drink, but not all drinkers become alcoholics, they argue.

The effects of marijuana are very much like alcohol and the marijuana users say that it should be as legal as alcohol.

But alcohol is not legal for teen-agers and there is no one advocating that 15-year-olds be allowed to drink. They are not prepared to deal with alcohol nor are they prepared to deal with anything which can produce similar reactions.

Some people want the same legal controls put on marijuana as exist on alcohol. Lawrence Kolb, M.D., assistant surgeon general (ret.) of the U.S. Public Health Service, answers this argument with:

"Alcohol, during the past 2500 years, has apparently become an irreplaceable part of our social structure. We know that it does much harm, but the fact that we tolerate this harm is no reason for permitting the indiscriminate use of another intoxicant."

While people debate the effects of marijuana, there is no arguing with the fact that it is illegal and the penalties for even the possession of it are stiff.

Under the federal law, possession can bring two to 10 years in jail and a maximum fine of $20,000 for the first offense. Penalties for the sale of marijuana are even stiffer.

There are tough laws governing LSD, too. All other arguments aside, the surest trip you can get from LSD or marijuana is to jail.

DRUG USE CALLED A CANCER

(By Robert Betts)

"Drug abuse has become a social cancer," said John Finlator, associate director of regulatory and scientific programs at the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

He was referring not just to the "junkies" with their hypodermic needles and their desperate craving for dope.

The bureau is also concerned about the growing misuse of a vast variety of drugs generally.

They include the busy executives, hard-pressed salesmen, long-distance truck drivers, nervous housewives and others of all classes and professions who take pep-pills to keep them going, or tranquilizers to help them relax—plus the frightening numbers of young people who'll try any kind of drug just for "kicks."

An ever-expanding array of drugs is available to the public, most of them unknown 30 years ago. Most are legally obtainable, from a doctor or a pharmacist.

In addition to some 10 million patients taking drugs on medical prescription, untold numbers are self-medicators.

Many find themselves so drug-dependent that they resort to illegal means to obtain something stronger.

If they cannot get it by forging prescriptions, going the rounds of different doctors or making an arrangement with some unscrupulous pharmacist, there are plenty of pill-pushers and dope-peddlers eager to serve them.

"There is widespread abuse and illegal trafficking in depressant, stimulant and hallucinogenic drugs," reports the bureau.

It estimates that the illegal sale of additive drugs in the United States—one of the most profitable businesses in the world—now grosses around $400 million yearly. The figure is increasing at the rate of 15 per cent a year.

"Dangerous drugs get into illegal retail trade through larceny from reputable manufacturers, wholesalers or pharmacies," said a narcotics agent. "Clandestine manufacturers operating illegally in garages, basements and warehouses produce substantial quantities. The illegal peddler is an important link in the traffic. He deals in hundreds of thousands of capsules and tablets."

About half the 12 billion amphetamines and barbiturate tablets and the 50 million tranquilizers manufactured in this country are diverted into the illegal market.

The growing danger of drug abuse gave rise to the establishment three years ago of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control within the Food and Drug Administration. Some 300 undercover agents were assigned the task of suppressing illegal drugs and keeping all legal drugs within legitimate channels.

In April this year the bureau was merged with the Department of the Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics and transferred to the Departments of Justice under a new name—Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

In addition to the federal laws controlling the movement of narcotics, laws have been passed to prohibit the sale of other dangerous drugs not covered by legal prescriptions. Illegal possession for resale, failure to register as a manufacturer or wholesalers of controlled drugs and failure to keep records of receipt and distribution are all punishable offenses. State laws vary greatly, but have become increasingly stringent.

Anyone producing or selling dangerous drugs illegally is subject to a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment and/or a $10,000 fine.

"The growing abuse of drugs by teenagers is a particularly tragic and disturbing aspect of the entire drug abuse problem," said the Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Bureau's director, John E. Ingersoll.

There are special penalties for peddlers and pushers over 18 years of age who sell or give drugs to anyone under 21. A first offense can incur two years imprisonment and/or a $5,000 fine. Second violations can carry a penalty of six years imprisonment and/or a $15,000 fine.

Although marijuana is not classed as a narcotic drug under federal law it is considered a narcotic under state laws. In some states, anyone who sells marijuana to a minor risks the death penalty.

EXPERTS HAZY ON DANGERS

(By Robert Betts)

Is a pot-head a drug addict? Can a pill-popper become hooked? Does LSD lead to heaven or to hell?

The nation's drug addiction problem is enshrouded in an ever-thickening fog of misconception, controversy and confusion.

Experts themselves are hazy about relative dangers of dozens of different drugs, especially the newer synthetic ones like LSD.

"No really cold explanation for the exact method of action of drugs now exists," admitted Dr. Samuel Eiduson, chief research biochemist in the Brain Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles.

"It has become impossible in practice, and is scientifically unsound to maintain a single definition for all forms of drug addiction and/or habituation," said another medical expert at the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

"Thousands of drugs and chemicals are capable of altering perception and behavior. Some in proper dosage may increase or decrease psychological or physical functions without distortion and find a useful place in modern medical practice. The same substances in greater dosage, and in certain susceptible individuals in almost any dosage, incite to violence or incapacitate mentally and physically."

Much of the confusion arises from differences in the legal, scientific and lay meanings of such terms, as "narcotics," "addiction," habituation," "tolerance."

The World Health Organization recently decided to substitute for "addiction" and "habituation" the single term "dependence."

Some 1600 drugs deemed dangerous are on the official controlled list. They have three general classifications.

Depressants include morphine, heroin, codeine and other opium derivatives, and the barbiturates—tranquilizers, pain-killers and sleeping pills, commonly called "goof balls," "candy," "barbs," "peanuts" and various other names.

All can produce physical dependence and withdrawal symptoms ranging from tremors, sickness and sleeplessness to vicious physical and mental torture.

Stimulants include cocaine and the amphetamines—pep-pills, weight-reducers and inhalants ("eye-openers," "truck-drivers," "co-pilots," "bennies," "peaches," "speed," etc.). Though not physically addictive they are mentally habit-forming.

Hallucinogens form the third category. They include peyote and other cactus, mushroom, fungus and seed derivatives, and several synthetics, such as LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide) and DMT (dimethyltriptamine) which have not yet been proved medically valuable.

Hard narcotics as defined under federal law include mainly the opium derivatives. But cocaine, classified in the pharmacological register as a stimulant rather than a narcotic (which means stupifying), is also included.

Marijuana, although legally classified with the narcotics for purposes of control, is chemically different from the hard narcotics. Like cocaine, it is not physically addictive, most experts say.

Whether it is "habituating" is a matter of wide debate. Many individuals and groups, insisting that it is no more harmful than alcohol or tobacco, have constantly attacked the marijuana control laws. The official view, however, based on formidable scientific evidence and wide experience with its victims, is that marijuana is indeed harmful. It produces a form of intoxication that can result in unpredictable and occasionally violent behavior.

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the smoking of a marijuana cigarette is a dangerous first step on the road which usually leads to enslavement by heroin," warns Henry L. Giordano, associate director of the Narcotics Bureau.

The bureau listed 62,045 "active narcotics" addicts in 1967. These were the ones who came to the attention of the authorities—usually "junkies" and "hopheads" hooked on hard stuff.

How many more persons are active addicts or on the dangerous "high" road to addiction through growing dependence on a wide variety of other drugs—drugs to sleep, to stay awake, to calm down, pep them up or ease their aches and pains—is anybody's guess.

"We live in a drug-oriented culture," said Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health. "From aspirin to sleeping pills, from tranquilizers to 'the pill,' Americans of all ages are ingesting drugs in greater variety and greater numbers than ever before."

All drugs are potentially dangerous. They upset the body's chemistry and can damage the central nervous system. A doctor prescribing a particular drug for a certain case weighs the risk against ultimate benefits he thinks can result.

The danger lies in the unsupervised use of drugs. This, the experts agree, is where the drug addiction problem really starts.

ADDICTION SHOWS IN EYES, PULSE

(By Robert Betts)

First the breathing and pulse rate are slowed down. Blood pressure and body temperature drop. Eyes become reddened, pupils pinpointed, lids drooped.

Dizziness and drowsiness alternate with bouts of wakefulness, lapsing back into sleep. Dreams become more fantastic, more frightening.

These can be the first stages of acute drug addiction.

Desire for the drug grows. Inability to get it gives rise to restlessness and irritability. Eyes water, mucus runs from the nose, muscles start to twitch.

Seized with violent stomach pains, vomiting and diarrhea, the addict kicks, jerks, curls up in bed or on the floor with as many blankets as he can find, even in the hottest weather. But sleep is impossible. Unable to retain anything in the stomach, he loses weight rapidly—as much as 10 pounds in 24 hours.

About the third day he is in deep torment—an unkempt, disheveled wretch, neglecting all thought of personal hygiene or decency.

The description, culled from studies and testimonies of hundreds of addicts, was given by Henry L. Giordano, associate director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

"It is not a pretty picture," he said "There are many angles to drug addiction and every one of them is bad."

Not all authorities on hard narcotics and drug abuse agree with Giordano when he paints such a distressing picture.

They say many people become addicted to narcotics after sampling them and finding withdrawal is not as bad as it has been pictured. So they continue to use narcotics until they are hooked and develop a dependency

that leads to theft, prostitution or some other crime to pay for drugs. The odds are against their being able to kick the habit for good even if they want to.

These authorities, among them some officials of the California Rehabilitation Center, contend it would be far better in the long run to explain the risks of drug abuse in realistic terms rather than using scare techniques. The "tell it like it is" technique might discourage thousands of teenagers from sampling marijuana, they reason.

Studies show that although fewer than 2 per cent of known addicts are under 18, most of the 72 per cent who are under 30 began the habit as adolescents.

It can start in many ways—from glue-sniffing at the age of 8 or 9 to a game of "fruit salad" played with different colored pep pills (one of each color swallowed all at once).

Some start out for a dare. Some are led by others who dabble in pills, "hash" and "stuff." A sniff of heroin on a handkerchief ("Just smelling it can't hurt you," says the pusher), can be the first temptation into the trap. Heroin is the No. 1 destroyer in the underworld of dope.

Many college students start out on an "acid" trip.

LSD, a white or tan-colored powder soluble in water or alcohol, is tasteless and odorless, and often deadly. LSD precursors can be obtained from morning glory seeds or ergot, the parasitic fungus found on wheat, rye or other grasses.

It can be synthesized by any college chemistry major. Only 25 micrograms are needed to "turn on" the average person. Two aspirin-sized tablets is enough to send 3000 people on a trip, federal drug reports say.

Whatever the claims made by LSD users—of indescribable delight, of terrible torment, or both—it can damage brain and bone marrow cells or chromosomes, trigger psychosis or suicides, clinical studies show. Its use has frequently ended in tragedy.

Sucking it on a sugar cube used to be the popular method. Since possession of sugar cubes became synonymous with possession of LSD, smugglers and users have become more imaginative. LSD has been found in animal crackers, candy, chewing gum, vitamins, vodka, mouthwash, perfume, shaving lotions and many other articles.

Most adolescents get their first high from smoking marijuana—Mary Jane, also called "pot," "grass," "tea" or "weed." Cigarettes are known as "reefers," "sticks" or "joints."

An ounce costs $10 to $15, depending on the grade and supply, and is good for 50–60 "sticks." It is rolled in cigarette paper twisted at the ends, and passed around at teen-age pot parties, the pot-heads taking turns at drawing the smoke deep into their lungs. Three or four drags are all that is usually necessary to start feeling high.

NARCOTICS KNOWN TO CAVEMEN

(By Robert Betts)

While they cannot say for sure that there were cavemen drug addicts, archaeologists believe opium, cocaine and marijuana were known to Stone Age people.

The Chinese, Egyptians, Persians and Greeks used them thousands of years ago, to heal and to hallucinate.

Ancient battles in the Orient and Asia Minor were fought by warriors high on the homicidal drug hashish, which is concentrated form of marijuana.

From hashish came the word assassin—originally a member of the secret Muslim sect which during the Crusade terrorized Christians by murders committed under the drug's influence.

Drugs have been used more recently to subvert, corrupt or demoralize the enemy—by the Japanese in World War II, by the Communists in Korea.

Red China is believed to earn around $500 million a year in hard currencies from the illicit sale of drugs.

Addiction started becoming a U.S. problem in the late 19th century. Wounded Civil War soldiers, injected with pain-killing morphine by way of the newly invented hypodermic needle, became addicted. There also was increasing self-medication with preparations—such as cough syrup—containing opium, from which morphine and heroin are derived. More opium was brought into the country by Chinese immigrant laborers.

First U.S. efforts to control addiction was an 1890 tax imposed on the importation of opium and on the domestic manufacture of its derivatives except for medicinal purposes. At the 1912 Hague Conference, 13 nations agreed to regulate domestic sale and use of opiates. Dope smuggling had become big business.

Despite various treaties and United Nations protocols to control the worldwide movement of drugs, and increasingly stiffer penalties for drug trafficking, prohibited drugs have continued to find their way into this country in increasing quantities.

The opium poppy grows profusely in many parts of the world, especially in China, India, Turkey and the Near East. The harvest is far more than needed for medical purposes. Under international agreement, some governments buy up the surplus at a nominal price. Many farmers, however, withhold a sizable portion of their over-production and sell it on the black market at a much higher price.

Price climbs with distance. A kilo (2.2 pounds) of heroin can fetch up to $15,000 wholesale in this country, where its use for any purpose is illegal. After passing through back-street "cutting laboratories," where it is diluted with lactose (milk sugar) and broken down into white grains, it is passed out in capsule form to peddlers and pushers. The strength varies from city to city, California narcotics officials say.

Last in line is the desperate "junkie" who will eagerly pay $5 for one capsule. One kilo can produce up to 300,000 capsules; thus the original kilo has a retail worth of more than $1 million.

Traffic in cocaine—which comes from the cocoa leaf—is largely restricted to the American continent, originally mainly in Peru and Bolivia.

Most marijuana, which comes from the female hemp plant, Cannabis sativa, enters the country across the Mexican border in California.

It is impossible to say how much dope gets through the customs net, but the amount being seized is increasing yearly. Total weight of all narcotics and marijuana taken by customs and narcotics officials last year was 35 tons. Commissioner of Customs Lester D. Johnson reported that seizures in fiscal 1968 broke all records. The amount of heroin seized was up by 215 per cent, cocaine by 143 per cent and marijuana by 166 per cent over last year. More drugs destined for this country were seized by U.S. undercover agents overseas working in cooperation with the authorities of the host countries.

Johnson also said that violence is more prevalent in the apprehension of smugglers. "It has been noted throughout the year that an unusually large number of pistols and other weapons have been found in the possession of smugglers," he said.

PARENTS MUST REALIZE THAT DRUG ABUSE CANNOT BE SWEPT AWAY—IT IS PART OF THE SCENE

It's obvious now that the problem of drug abuse among the teen-agers cannot be wished away any more than it can be ignored. Drug abuse has become as much a part of the scene for the school as a spring prom.

Parents must realize this and proceed from there to prepare their child for this new hazard in growing up.

No family is immune. Drug abuse is not a problem for just one group of citizens of one area of the city.

The success or failure of the marriage of the parents offers no clue as to the likelihood of a child taking drugs.

We cannot offer a foolproof answer for the problem. There is none. There are things a parent can do and the first is to examine his relationship with the child.

The parent must determine whether or not he can communicate with his children. This does not mean talk at them, but talk with them. Have you listened lately to what your child has to say?

If you want your child to listen to you, you should pay him the respect of listening to him.

As for the drug problem, the parents should become informed. One mother found a package of marijuana in her home and did not know at the time what it was. Would you recognize marijuana or some of the pills which can be dangerous?

Become informed, then make sure your child is informed. The school has programs, but these alone cannot do the job.

The police have been most cooperative in helping groups and individual families with this problem.

One mother who found her son had been smoking marijuana called the police.

"Officers from the Juvenile Narcotics Bureau came out and talked to us. They were most understanding, most helpful," the mother said. "If the parent is even suspicious, I recommend they call the police for help in talking about this to their child."

There is a new program, the Peninsula "Hot Line," which has been set up in the Palos Verdes Peninsula to help parents deal with the drug abuse problem and youngsters in trouble.

In all programs, though, parents must not remain isolated in groups, still not communicating with the child.

Parents need to know what their child does, where he goes, who his friends are.

It's not some mysterious stranger who is giving and selling the children drugs, but a fellow student or the older brother or sister of a friend.

"Parents should watch their children," one mother said after her son had an experience with pills. "Stay up until the child comes home. Then check him. Talk to him a minute, find out what he did, where he went."

This does not have to be an interrogation, but can be a friendly conversation when you are interested in your child and what he does.

While there was no single factor involved in the cases the News-Pilot checked, in the majority the child was making poor grades or having a difficult time making average grades. Also, the child participated in few if any extracurricular activities.

Several of the children were in classes for slower students. This seemed to make them feel they had already been relegated to an inferior position in life.

"My boy made average grades until the fifth grade," one mother said. "Then in the sixth grade his grades fell down and they placed him in junior high according to his sixth grade marks. This put him in with a bad group, I believe. Smoking marijuana seems quite prevalent in this group."

But there are cases of students with high grades getting mixed up in drug abuses so there is no absolute guideline. Girls are just as involved as boys.

Parents in dealing with their child had better have the faith of that child. If the child knows the parent is hypocritical on one issue, the child will tend to disbelieve his parent on other matters.

Some parents will write an excuse for their child when he misses school to go to the beach. The child knows he was not sick and when his parents write an excuse that says

so, he knows his parent will lie to help him flaunt the rules. The parent may think he is being a good sport, but he has actually destroyed some of the child's faith.

Parents must remember that children look to them for guidance and leadership, not just permission, money and the car.

"SCARE" CAMPAIGN DOESN'T DO THE JOB

(By Paul Corcoran)

Parents, alarmed by lurid stories of hippies and "pot" parties, admonished their 12-year-old son he should not use marijuana because it is a dangerous drug.

But, while mother and dad say marijuana is bad, their older, college-age daughter triumphantly produces statements from public health officials that marijuana is not addictive. The same health officials cannot agree, even, if marijuana is more dangerous than alcohol.

Who is the 12-year-old boy supposed to believe?

"It creates a credibility gap," says Peter Frank, who heads the narcotics education program for San Diego County schools. He is trying out a plan to educate kindergarten-age children—and their parents—on narcotics.

Frank is one of those who believes an intensive research program to evaluate just how hazardous marijuana is should be conducted. The same type of crash program awakened law officers and health officials to the extreme hazards of LSD, one of the hallucinogenic drugs, which found favor a couple of years back with the hippies.

Yet possession of marijuana is a felony, while possession of LSD is a misdemeanor.

This does not mean, Frank is quick to say, that marijuana should be legalized now. Its use and that of other drugs can bring on a "brave new world" in which modern man is dependent upon a variety of drugs and narcotics from the cradle to the grave, he said.

Whatever the disagreements about marijuana may be, some points seem pretty well established.

1. Marijuana is harmful, whether addictive or not. "Marijuana is undoubtedly a . . . harmful drug," says Dr. Lawrence Kolb, retired assistant surgeon general of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Alcohol, taken to excess, also is harmful and is increasing as a problem among young people. But Kolb says:

"Alcohol, during the last 2500 years, has apparently become an irreplaceable part of our social structure. We know that it does much harm, but the fact that we tolerate this harm is no reason for permitting the indiscriminate use of another intoxicant."

2. The use of marijuana among high school and junior high school students far exceeds that of LSD or any other drug. "It must now . . . be recognized that drug abuse has become a serious public health problem and that it should be dealt with as such," Dr. Lester Breslow, California director of public health, recently told a legislative committee.

3. The use of marijuana cuts across socio-economic barriers. It is found among the middle class as well as the poorer minority groups. A shortage of money to pay the ever-present pusher can increase crime incidence among even the younger marijuana users.

4. Despite the absence of statistics on a national level there is every reason to believe more and more boys and girls of junior high school age are using marijuana.

5. The majority of hard narcotics—heroin, cocaine and others—users first used marijuana before becoming addicted to stronger drugs.

On all levels—federal, state and local—there is the feeling that "education" should not mean only indoctrinating the chid to drug abuses in school, but should be emphasized even more in the home.

Kolb, Breslow and many others feel that preventing narcotics use is one of the best ways to attack the drug problem, which has so many aspects, including the use of drugs by Communists and criminals to gain control over the addict.

Capt. L. L. DeVore, chief of the San Diego Police Department juvenile division, says, "The problem is the breakdown with the parent. The problem goes right back to the parent."

Frank and Clifford J. Lawrence, associate superintendent of instruction for the Clark County School District at Las Vegas, Nev., are attempting to promise programs that inform pupils at an early age.

"There must be close cooperation between parents and teachers," said Frank, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh who has been exposed to the narcotics problems in England as well as San Francisco and San Diego schools.

The sheriff's office at Las Vegas assigns members of the narcotics division to talk to school groups and civic clubs. Also, they hold demonstrations for teachers to train them to identify narcotics users. The officers burn marijuana so teachers know how "pot" smells.

Frank believes many teachers and parents are completely inadequate in background and information on drugs, and that many teenagers know more than their elders. That makes it all the more important to present the proper information to the youngsters, explaining that excessive use of all drugs—as well as alcohol—can destroy a life, he said.

Authorities on all levels agree that a "scare" campaign will do little good. The actual danger of drug abuse is so acute that it doesn't need exaggeration.

WHEN DO YOU START TEACHING A CHILD NOT TO USE DRUGS?

(By Paul Corcoran)

When do you start teaching a child not to use dangerous drugs?

How can you instill an awareness of the dangers of abusing any drugs or alcohol when a son or daughter sees parents drink too much liquor, and use pills to slow down, speed up, go to sleep or stay awake?

What can be done about drug pushers, some of them in their teens, who lurk near high schools and junior high schools when students protect them as their only source of illegal narcotics?

The accelerated use of marijuana, LSD and other drugs—particularly of an hallucinogenic nature—worries parents, and causes both schools and law enforcement officers one of their biggest headaches of the 1960s.

Some school officials believe education must start early, even at the kindergarten level. Peter R. Frank, who heads the narcotics education program for San Diego County schools, says a pilot program is beginning in selected schools in kindergarten, 4th and 6th grade classes. It is also an attempt to educate parents, many of whom provide more misinformation than fact, Frank says.

In Las Vegas, best known as an entertainment and gambling spa, mothers and fathers are just as worried as those in California, Illinois, New York, and other U.S. communities. The sheriff's office has developed a community education program starting with the 6th grade pupils.

William Beckett, a teacher-coach at San Gabriel High School in Southern California, noted that children in the 12–14 age bracket are being taken into custody for use of everything from glue to marijuana.

The Chicago Police Department was one of several agencies reporting concern existed for children sniffing glue. However, merchants there are trying to avoid dispensing glue to youngsters.

Some California police report children as young as 7 and 8 are using glue to get high instead of making airplanes. Some sniff the fumes of gasoline.

The Narcotics Bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce sees marijuana usage at the age of 16 or over is already regarded as a problem by federal officials.

Police and school officials decry glamorizing hallucinogenic drugs or hard narcotics by the hippie movement, films and news media. They may differ on the hazards of marijuana, for example, but all are concerned about misinformation that leads youngsters to sample different drugs. The parents, many believe, deserve much of the blame for the startling increase in drug usage.

"I think I can look back to 1966 as the time it really became a problem among the young people," said Capt. L. L. DeVore of the San Diego Police Department. He said there was a "progressively lower age group," with one child having a record as a drug user at the age of 12.

The Department of Youth Authority for the state of California has drug therapy programs at several institutions, but none for those of 15 or under. One official said it was "possible" some of the younger inmates, at 8 or 9, had taken marijuana before confinement, although there were no specific records.

The most frustrating problem for those confronting the narcotics problem is just that: There is so little information and so few statistics—such a limited, short history of drug education and rehabilitation exists—that they must work from scratch.

John M. Heslep, chief of the division of environment sanitation for the California Department of Health, said his agency feels very strongly that there is a "critical need for investigations and research in several areas."

For one thing, "what is the incidence of drug abuse in the population by areas, and by special population groups . . .?"

Second, what segments of the population are most apt to become drug abusers and what techniques of education and persuasion would be most effective in reaching each?

"How may we ignore early case findings so as to reach individuals before they become physiologically or psychologically addicted?" asked Heslep.

The records that are available from law enforcement agencies do "indicate a substantial increase in illegal use of drugs, particularly among the young."

It is evident that the drug problem in general is more acute in port cities such as New York, San Francisco and Los Angeles, and near the Mexican border, where it is virtually impossible to stop marijuana from being brought into California, Arizona or Texas.

But this does not mean other areas of the nation are not affected.

The nature of modern society, Frank stresses, is a major factor in drug abuse.

"Let's face it, we're living in a drug-taking age," he said.

NAR-ANON CHAPTER MAKES DRUG PROBLEM A GROUP AFFAIR IN THE HARBOR AREA

(By Tom Coulter)

"Let me turn you on to a bennie. It will really pep you up and make you feel good," or, "Let's drop a red and get high. It's real crazy, man."

Too often these or similar statements are being made by teenagers and young adults, Los Angeles County Sheriff Peter J. Pitchess warned today. "They make it sound so innocent and harmless when the abuse of dangerous, harmful drugs is involved."

"The use of drugs is spreading throughout the community. It is spread by users themselves to relatives, close friends and associates. It is not a stereotyped peddler who is lurking in the shadows waiting to turn on innocent victims. The dangerous drugs are inexpensive and readily available. The teenagers are quick to say, 'They are cheaper than booze'."

"When prescribed by a doctor, some drugs do have therapeutic value and we in law enforcement are not concerned with this legal use of the drug," Pitchess noted. "We are

concerned with the abuse or indiscriminate use, and primarily with the traffickers."

"Dangerous drug abuses are difficult to detect because symptoms are similar to those of alcohol. Drug sale profit is not the cause of drug abuse; however, it does have its place in the picture."

Pitchess said that recently the county has experienced a tremendous increase in dangerous drug use, particularly in schools and colleges. "This increase can be attributed to the changing attitudes of society and the sensational publicity by all media."

Pitchess noted that the acceptance of drug use by educated and affluent persons also is a major factor.

"Many persons," the sheriff said, "who are now being arrested for drug use have no history of any prior delinquent or criminal behavior. Thus the message that we are attempting to deliver to the citizens of Los Angeles County is that it could happen in your family."

A Palos Verdes Peninsula group has realized that drug abuse is very much a family affair.

For every user of a dangerous drug or narcotic, there is a family in the shadows—waiting and waiting—sometimes with no place to turn for advice or counsel.

For more than a year now, a chapter of Nar-Anon has been meeting at 8:15 p.m. each Tuesday at St. Peter's by the Sea Presbyterian Church in Portuguese Bend.

Patterned after Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, the chapter helps the families of narcotics addicts through group therapy. So far it has proved successful, with as many as 50 people turning out for the weekly sessions.

"Everyone receives calls asking help with the dope situation—but no one has an answer," said the pretty housewife who founded the chapter out of concern for the families of addicts.

"The probation department gets calls—so do the police—they don't know what to do. Churches and ministers all get calls—but what is the answer?

"Any home where there is dissension, illness or alcoholism, there is more likelihood for narcotics addiction," she believes.

"Our little group goes into this, trying to help the family understand the problem and learn to adjust to the situation so it becomes more bearable. The families, too, must make a life for themselves—rid themselves of the terrible emotional distress involved, and by doing so encourage the addict to change too."

"Today many Nar-Anon members are finding serenity through our program—one of five chapters in the greater Los Angeles area."

She said that through discussion of common problems, the group members lose the compulsion to criticize, judge, condemn and retaliate. "We learn that hostility can damage us far more than those against whom we use such weapons. We have found that a change of attitude in the addict's home helps the addict to find help."

"We try very hard at our group discussions to point out the problems and what we think are solutions," she said. "When families come to Nar-Anon they realize that they are not alone, but among friends who understand the problem as few others could. By discussing their problems with others—with similar situations—and hearing 'professionals' discuss it, they can reach a solution for themselves."

The Tuesday night meetings are open to anyone with a problem.

Drug abuse is not only a family affair—it also has become a group affair in the Harbor Area.

PARENTS NEED TO KNOW SYMPTOMS OF DRUG USE

(By Dan Scanlan)

"Parents ought to be more aware of the symptoms of drug use," a Harbor Division narcotics agent told the News-Pilot. "Too many parents think the actions of their sons or daughters are simply a process of growing up."

Detective Sgt. Kaye Palmquist has worked with both adult and juvenile narcotics users for the past two years. She spent one of those years working primarily with juveniles. Since that time the police department has created a department that is responsible for working with narcotics suspects regardless of the violator's age.

One of the major problems encountered by Miss Palmquist in her work is the lack of parental knowledge concerning the problem of drug usage among teenagers and, in some cases, pre-teenagers.

"Parents have to pay more attention to what their kids are doing," she said.

There are so many changes in personality between the ages of 12 and 16 that it is difficult to perceive abnormal behavior."

Worse yet, she says, many parents know fully well what is happening to their child and yet attempt to hide it.

Miss Palmquist pointed out that it is much better for a child to have a relatively minor drug infraction on a record that can be completely cleared in a matter of a few years than to allow a child to "mess up his life" by fighting the problem with incompetence and fear.

Many pushers have begun to give away seconal and benzedrine tablets in order to increase their prospective clientele, although the going rate on the streets remain at 25 cents per pill.

A great hindrance, as was encountered among high school administrators, is the growing acceptance among teenagers themselves to condone or at least not react negatively toward those who use drugs.

"These kids don't want to fink on each other," Miss Palmquist said. "If they saw a man on the street waving a gun they would tell someone. But if they see a man with a bag full of pills they don't—even though the man with the pills can, and usually does a great deal more harm than the armed man to a lot more people."

The police department, as well as a number of agencies, is attempting to provide instructional materials for both parents and teenagers on drug abuse.

In order to combat its growing usage, it is necessary to educate parents as to the symptoms of drug use and the proper steps to take when the symptoms become visible.

Pamphlets can be obtained from the Harbor Division police station and by writing to the Office of the District Attorney, Hall of Justice, 211 Temple St., Room 618, Los Angeles 90012.

THE LINGO OF USERS—A NUMBER OF WAYS TO SAY TEENAGE TROUBLE

Here is a glossary of narcotic and dangerous drug slang:

Acapulco Gold—A supposedly superior grade of marijuana, somewhat gold in color and grown near Acapulco, Mexico.

Acid—Lysergic Acid Diethylamide Tartrate (LSD).

Acidhead—LSD user.

Bag—About one ounce of marijuana or a "lid." Also pertains to use of small plastic bags that are purchased in coin shops and used to contain either marijuana or powdered drugs.

Balloon—Rubber toy balloon used for storing or delivering heroin.

Beans—Benzedrine.

Bennies—Benzedrine.

Bindle—A small paper packet of heroin, morphine or cocaine.

Blow—To smoke marijuana.

Blow a vein—Use too much pressure when injecting a drug into a vein, causing it to rupture.

Blue heaven—Amytal, sodium petrothal or numorphin.

Blues—Sodium Pentothal.

Blues & Reds—Tuinol, 50 per cent sodium amytal, 50 per cent seco-barbitol.

Brick—Kilo of marijuana in compressed brick form.

Bummer—A bad or nightmarish LSD experience; also, colloquially, a stroke of bad luck.

Burn—To accept money and give no narcotic in return, or to substitute a phony substance instead of the expected narcotic.

Can—One ounce of marijuana.

Cap—A capsule of heroin, commonly a No. 5 gelatin capsule.

Chippy—An occasional user of heroin.

Crystals—Methedrine.

Clean—An addict who is free from narcotic injection marks, or is not in possession of narcotics; also, non-user.

Coke—Cocaine.

Connect—To buy drugs.

Cottons—Bits of cotton saturated with narcotic solution used to strain foreign matter when drawing solution up into a hypodermic syringe or eyedropper. These cottons are often saved by addicts for an emergency, as they contain a residual amount of the drug.

Crutch—A device used to hold marijuana cigarette when it has burned to the point where it will burn the fingers.

Cut—To dilute narcotics; in heroin use, the narcotic is mixed with milk-sugar, dried and cut with a razor blade.

Dexies—Dexedrine, Dexamyl.

Ditch—The inside of the elbow which has two large veins.

Doper—Someone who takes dope.

Fit—Short for "outfit" needed for injection.

Fix—A drug which is about to be injected; the act of injecting.

Flash—The feeling immediately following fixing; to throw up because of fixing.

Flip out—Go crazy.

Freak—Become afraid; wild sex; a crazy person; a fantastic "trip."

Frantic—Nervous, jittery drug user.

Fuzz—The law.

Goof ball—Any barbiturate tablet or capsule, combined with an amphetamine.

Goofer—One who drops pills.

Goofed up—Under the influence of barbiturates.

Gram—Approximately 10 capsules of heroin.

Grass—Marijuana.

Guide—A person who does not use LSD while sitting with a user during a session.

H—Heroin.

Hand-to-hand—Delivery of narcotics person-to-person.

Head—Marijuana user.

Heat—The law.

High—Under the effect of narcotics or drugs; euphoric feeling induced by them.

Hog—An addict who uses all he can get his hands on.

Holding—In possession of narcotics.

Horning—Sniffing narcotics up the nose.

Hype—An addict.

Joint—A marijuana cigarette.

Jolt—An injection of narcotics.

Joy pop—An occasional injection of narcotics; one who is "joy popping" only takes an injection now and then.

Junk—Heroin.

Kee—Kilo of marijuana.

Kilo—2.2 pounds of marijuana.

Lid—One ounce of marijuana; can.

Main-line—Veins of body, usually in arms; also intravenous injection.

Main-liner—One who injects narcotics directly into veins.

The man—The law; narcotics detectives. Also, peddler.

Manicure—To prepare marijuana for use in cigarettes.

Meth—Methedrine.

Narc, narco—Narcotics detectives; police.

O.D.—Overdose of narcotics—usually heroin.

Outfit—Equipment for injection by the hypodermic route: eyedropper, needle, spoon, small piece of cotton and handkerchief.

Panic—A scarcity of drugs, usually caused by the arrest of a big peddler.
Piece—One ounce of heroin.
Pill head—Amphetamine or barbiturate user.
Pot—Marijuana.
Pure—Pure heroin, prior to cutting.
Rainbow—Tuinal.
Red devil, redbird, or reds—Seconal, secobarbitol.
Reefer—Marijuana cigarette.
Roach—A partially smoked marijuana cigarette.
Scoring—Making a purchase of narcotics.
Script—A prescription, usually forged.
Shooting gallery—A place where addicts congregate to inject their narcotics.
Smack—Heroin.
Snow—Cocaine.
Speed—Methedrine.
Speedball—A powerful shot of drug, usually heroin and cocaine combined.
Spike—A hypodermic needle.
Spoon—A quantity of heroin theoretically measured in a teaspoon (usually between one and two grams).
Stick—Marijuana cigarette.
Stoned—Under the influence of narcotics or drugs.
Straight—Under the influence of narcotics.
Strung out—Addicted.
Stuff—Heroin.
Tea—Marijuana.
Toke up—To light a marijuana cigarette.
Tracks—A series of puncture wounds in the veins caused by continuous narcotic injections.
Trip—A drug experience, often euphoric.
Turn on—To use narcotics or to introduce another person to the use of narcotics. To alter awareness.
Weed—Marijuana.
Weed head—Marijuana users.
Whites—Amphetamine; benzedrine. Double-scored tablets.
Yellows, yellow jackets—Nenobutal.

IS THE UNITED STATES IMPERIALISTIC?—INDIANAPOLIS STAR SAYS "NO"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been far too much careless and irresponsible talk about how the United States has become "imperialistic" and, by implication is seeking world domination in one form or the other. There has been nothing to back up these charges except impassioned fevered and totally wrong logic. The following editorial from the April 4, 1969, Indianapolis Star sets the matter straight:

IMPERIALISM: THE RECORD

At the height of United States' military victory in World War II, our nation held more of this planet's surface and population by force of arms than any conquering power held in history.

American forces held most of Western Europe, much of North Africa, the strategic islands of the South Pacific, the Philippines, Japan.

Not only did our armed forces hold vast realms of sea, land and peoples, but our nation had a monopoly of the world's most powerful weapon, the atomic bomb. Our government had used it twice to give the death-blow to Japan and speed the war's end.

If ever the opportunity was ripe for imperialistic conquest, that was it. If ever one nation had the throat of mankind in its grip, that was the time.

The armies of the Soviet Union, then the world's only Communist power, also held large territories in their power. They held the Balkans except for Greece and Turkey, and they held Hungary, East Germany, the Baltic states and Czechoslovakia.

In countries from which the Soviet troops moved out, they left behind the one-party ruling machinery of Communist power.

The strength and significance of the Soviet grip upon those lands may be measured by the fact that when Hungary sought to overthrow it and when Czechoslovakia attempted to loosen it they were invaded by Soviet and Soviet-bloc armored divisions and occupied by Soviet troops.

What the United States did with its occupied territories was unique in the annals of war and politics.

Once our military force had destroyed and dismantled the enemy war machine and the power of its masters, the United States returned the territories it had conquered to the peoples—Italy, North Africa, West Germany and Japan, all won at tremendous cost of American life and treasure. The Philippines had been recaptured, also at high cost, and a pre-war promise of independence was fulfilled. Most of the Pacific islands were submitted to United Nations mandate.

Then America poured billions of dollars in food, equipment and money into rebuilding the societies, cities and economies of the nations it had defeated in war. Today those nations are independent and thriving. They are ruled by their own people. They have many parties—even including Communist parties—constantly competing for rule.

America's nuclear monopoly held for several years. But this nation never used its ultimate weapon for aggressive purposes. We have fought defensive wars and actions to honor alliances and protect allies from armed conspiracies and aggression.

The costliest of these of course have been Korea and Vietnam. We refrained from using nuclear force in Korea although it could have ended the war within a few days. We have used neither nuclear force nor the logical strategy of conventional warfare in Vietnam.

Whatever else our conduct of the Vietnam war merits being called, it cannot be called the act of an imperialist power. When Communist propagandists smear it with that tar of falsehood, it is time to haul out the record.

The record shows who the imperialists are.

REPORTS ON THE TROUBLED GREEK DICTATORS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the April 5 Washington Post contained two articles, datelined Athens, by its Pulitzer Prize winning correspondent, Alfred Friendly.

The first, a news dispatch, documented some of the incompetence and heavy-handedness that have characterized the military regime that has ruled Greece since April 1967.

The second, an editorial column, discussed the tight censorship that has deprived the Greek people of the right to know what is really happening in their country. In Friendly's words:

It is corrosive to a responsible political and national life; moreover, it is probably doing the dictatorship more harm than good.

Both articles follow:

GREECE'S JUNTA UNABLE TO IMPROVE ITS IMAGE AT HOME OR ABROAD

(By Alfred Friendly)

ATHENS.—The high hopes of the Greek military regime to win "legitimacy" through last September's referendum have been bitterly disappointed.

The referendum, nominally for approval of a new constitution, gave the junta a "yes" vote of 92 percent. Presumably, that should have demonstrated great popular support and solved two of the regime's main and overwhelming difficulties: The refusal by Greeks of prestige, technical competence and executive skill to reign themselves to the permanence of the colonels' government and to go to work for it, and the refusal of Western governments to become friends.

No such hoped for changes took place. As almost everyone but the junta members themselves foresaw at the outset, the referendum was discounted as a phony, not because it was rigged, which it was not in the technical sense, but because it was held in an atmosphere of intimidation and under martial law, the antithesis of a democratic electoral environment.

The comment of one canny Greek is apt, if bitter: "Everyone knows that throughout 3000 years of history, 92 per cent of Greeks have never agreed on anything."

INCOMPETENCY REMAINS

Failure of the regime to recruit able people at the top or near-top levels means that the national administration still wallows in incompetency. It turns out—if the point still needs demonstrating—that a dictatorship is not necessarily more efficient than a democracy.

"The colonels promised to end anarchy in the streets, and they did," one opponent of the regime remarked recently, "but what they substituted was anarchy in Government.

Now, almost two years after the bloodless coup, that brought it to power, the junta presides over a country stagnant in internal development and deteriorating in its foreign relations.

From an average annual growth rate of 7 to 8 per cent in recent years, Greece dropped to about 3.5 per cent last year. It may, with luck, work up to 5 per cent in 1969. Its foreign exchange losses continue although they are masked by short-term loans at high interest rates, a phenomenon that cannot continue indefiitely.

At best, in the judgment of a neutral diplomat whose information is to be credited, "The economy is going sidewise, growing neither much worse nor much better."

The failure of the referendum to do what it was supposed to is even more evident in foreign affairs. The vote was dismissed abroad, and for the same reasons as in Greece itself.

Thus the nation finds itself on the verge of being expelled from the Council of Europe, boycotted by Scandinavian tourists, denounced by the Scandinavian countries and Holland, and regarded with great dubiety by Germany in a way that hurts—German lines of credit have yet to open up in a volume vital to the Greek economic future.

Finally, in a totally unnecessary and unbelievably badly handled row, it is making an enemy of Italy, the neighbor whose good relations are most important to it.

NENNI AND PAPANDREOU

The hurlyburly began on March 6 when Italian Foreign Minister Pietro Nenni, acting in his non-governmental capacity as leader of the Italian Socialist Party, received Andreas Papandreou, son of the late Greek Prime Minister and now an agitator-in-exile against the junta.

For domestic political reasons Nenni, who had been under fire for allegedly trending to the right, issued a statement expressing his

support of Papandreou's cause and, in vague terms, promising material as well as moral support to him.

The intelligent response of the Greek government, to keep the damage to a minimum and avoid building up Papandreou in Greece itself to a stature he does not deserve, would have been to pay no attention. Its censorship would have prevented any publication of Nenni's statement and that could have been the end of it.

Instead, the junta blew its collective top, issued a denunciation of Nenni, gave it maximum publicity and demanded a denial. Privately, Nenni gave assurance that no real "material" support was intended, but reaffirmed, as an exile himself for 15 years under Mussolini, his sympathy with Papandreou and the dictatorship-ridden Greek people.

Once again, the Greek government could have let the matter drop. Instead, its demands for a public explanation grew more frenetic and it began to talk of an economic boycott. The fury of the attack gave Nenni no option but to make matters worse. On March 26 he replied that there was nothing to deny and that, in effect, Italy viewed the junta as an abomination.

In the last week or so, the junta spokesmen have soft-pedalled talk of a boycott. Greek imports from Italy cost much less than any substitutions from other suppliers would and Italy is virtually the only possible market for Greece's tobacco and olive oil.

But Greek Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, currently stumping northern Greece, grows more strident day by day, talking of Greek blood shed by Italian invaders throughout history, and more recently, in World War II.

Foreign diplomats here, as well as many thoughtful Greeks, find the whole affair a classic example of how to conduct foreign affairs disastrously.

With such profound troubles abroad and at home, some Greeks assert that the days of the colonels' government are numbered. Athens is full of highly imprecise rumors that "something is stirring."

If there is—and the proposition seems dubious—it would almost certainly have to be from within the military establishment itself. The exile organizations carry little weight inside Greece (although the junta seems to be doing its best to build up Papandreou from a much disliked figure into something better). And the former political leaders, who early had dreamed of some sort of consolidated drive to topple the junta, remain as divided as ever and are getting exactly nowhere.

But, according to most Greek political observers, the junta also remains deeply split within itself, torn by rival personal ambitions as well as by deep doubts about the regime's effectiveness and future prospects.

TWO TRENDS SEEN

These sources say there are two completely diverse trends within the military establishment. One is supposed to hold that the junta must become more autocratic and dictatorial and abandon even thinking about an ultimate restoration of democracy. The other is said to be convinced that the military dictatorship will fail and a more traditionally democratic regime must be substituted.

In a situation so precarious, these sources insist that the stimulus of some as yet unforeseen crisis could collapse the junta structure into a heap.

Possibly so, for Greek political affairs are notoriously unpredictable.

But the majority of observers, informed as best they can be about what is a closed and secret government, believe that not only is nothing much happening inside the country and the administration, but also that for some time to come nothing much will.

There is not the slightest indication of any intent of the junta to move toward democratic institutions, to hold elections or, in fact, to do anything but cement its regime more firmly and more permanently in power.

CENSORSHIP BY GREEK RULERS FEEDS RUMORS AND MISTRUST

(By Alfred Friendly)

ATHENS.—As a newspaperman with something more than passing interest in the issue of censorship, I find myself spellbound on each visit here with the workings of the Greek version.

Some of its aspects can be dismissed as merely ridiculous or sad. A couple of examples:

The writings of historian Arnold Toynbee, and even his name, may not be published in Greece. The reason: he once wrote—not too solemnly, one assumes—that the Greeks made a mistake in winning their war of independence from Turkey in 1829 because they were already well on their way to taking over the entire Ottoman Empire because of their superior abilities. The Athens censor deems the remarks denigrating of Greece's "holy war."

The governor of Northern Greece recently had a falling out with Stylianos Patakos, Minister of Interior and No. 2 man in the junta. On the governor's orders, the Salonika censor, independent of the one in Athens, accordingly forbade papers in his area to mention Patakos by name. For a week, until the row blew over, Patakos was a nonperson in northern Greece.

But for the rest, censorship is no laughing matter. It is corrosive to a responsible political and national life; moreover, it is probably doing the dictatorship more harm than good.

Where there is a news vacuum, rumor fills it. Yet rumor is surely the most dangerous threat to the goal the junta most desires: public confidence in it and governmental stability. The more insecure the colonels' regime senses itself to be, the tighter and more frantic its censorship. A vicious circle comes into being. Some serious examples of its operation:

The battle of the Greek tycoons, the former brothers-in-law Aristotle Onassis and Stavros Niarchos, over which one will operate the proposed new $400 to $500 million investment program for a new oil refinery, aluminum plants and several tourist projects raised for the first time the suspicion of corruption with the junta.

The government's off-a-gain, on-again handling of the intricate affair may have been merely clumsy or shabby, testifying only to its administrative incompetence. But on its face, the Niarchos proposal, which was ultimately rejected, seemed so much more advantageous to the country than that of Onassis as to suggest bad faith by the regime.

One would have supposed that, once the suspicion arose, the government would have taken elaborate pains to demonstrate clean hands. After all, one of the junta's most loudly proclaimed justifications for its coup two years ago was the premise that it would end the notorious corruption of previous governments. If it is subject to the same failing, it loses a principal excuse for its existence.

Suspected of sticky fingers, the regime's logical response would have been to lay out the proposals in detail, argue them and supply a complete explanation for its final choice. Instead, after a few weeks of pulling and hauling, the junta clamped complete censorship over the whole matter. Nothing more may be printed about it in the Greek press. The consequence was obvious: what was once a smoldering rumor is now a wildfire scandal.

Publication of any criticism of the regime is, of course, taboo. But the junta, seemingly driven by a compulsion to make the worst of every situation, cannot risk the temptation to make public answers to each unpublished attack.

Thus, last week when Greece's only Nobel laureate, the poet George Seferis, broke a long silence to denounce the junta, his attack remained unpublished in the Greek press. But the government at once made it obligatory on the newspapers to give major play to its response, thereby giving infinitely more prominence to what Seferis and—or to what a readership, imagining the worst, assumed Seferis said.

The reply, incidentally, achieved the nadir of nastiness. It implied that Seferis was senile—he is anything but—and said he never deserved the Nobel Prize in the first place. Its tone can be appreciated from one passage saying Seferis had spit on Greece with the saliva of Italian Foreign Minister Pietro Nenni.

The reference to Nenni recalls still another instance of the wondrous workings of the censorship. On March 6, the leader of the Italian Socialist Party received Andreas Papandreou, bete noir of the junta and its most strident critic in exile. Speaking as a private politician rather than in his government role. Nenni expressed his support of Papandreou's campaign to restore democracy in Greece.

Publication of his statement was prohibited in Greece. But ever since, the junta has flooded the country with its replies. As in the previous instance, the Greek citizenry has only a presumption of what Nenni said and is left to imagine the worst.

The consequence of the affair is twofold: confidence in the regime's handling of foreign relations, already justifiably low, is further reduced, and the one man whom the junta most despises gets a publicity buildup in Greece that makes him look like a hero.

To use the overworked term of the New Frontier, the junta's censorship is counterproductive. To a regime that wants nothing so much as the people's trust, its censorship breeds only doubts.

A prominent Athenian puts it this way: "We Greeks simply cannot know what the government is doing. How can we possibly trust it?"

DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT AWARD GOES TO UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the University of Connecticut, located in my congressional district, has received considerable publicity concerning expressions of campus dissent. Unfortunately, the press accounts have tended to overstress these events which in reality involved only a small fraction of the student body and faculty. In all fairness, at least equal notice should be given to the very significant accomplishments being made by the university.

I am therefore extremely pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the distinguished achievement award for excellence in teacher education, given annually by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, has been presented this year to the University of Connecticut for the development and implementation of the program, "educating teachers for the city."

I am at this point inserting into the RECORD an article from the Meriden, Conn., Record; one from the Torrington, Conn., Register, which describes the program that brought this outstanding honor to the University of Connecticut, and the text of the citation. The articles follow:

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record, Mar. 27, 1969]

"ON-SITE" AND INSIGHT

"On-Site" involvement can lead to insight, especially when the site involved is the inner city ghetto itself.

Such "on-sight" involvement in one of Connecticut's inner cities has won for the School of Education at the University of Connecticut the Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Teacher Education for 1969.

More than 100 American colleges and universities where teacher preparation is a major function submitted their programs for evaluation to a committee of distinguished judges enlisted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The University of Connecticut won the award; ten other institutions were recognized for distinguished achievement.

"Educating Teachers for the City" was the program which won top national recognition for UConn. The program embraced an experimental project developed at the Hamden-New Haven Center for Educational Development. Face-to-face confrontation with the ghetto, its people and problems, with school and governmental officials and with neighborhood and community organizations provided "on-site" opportunities for unusual insights.

Such innovative and imaginative approaches to teaching teachers are a credit to the School of Education at UConn. Connecticut citizens can take pride in the recognition accorded its achievement.

[From the Torrington (Conn.) Register, Feb. 28, 1969]

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT WINS ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

CHICAGO, ILL.—A teacher-training project developed by the University of Connecticut has won for it the 1969 Distinguished Achievement Award of the American Assoc. of Colleges of Teacher Education.

On hand here last night to accept the first place plaque for his institution was Pres. Homer D. Babbidge Jr. The university had been cited on the basis of its "CONN-ED" project launched last fall at the Hamden-New Haven Cooperative Education Center.

About 120 institutions across the nation entered the annual AACTE competition. The association lists, as members, some 830 colleges and universities which train about 92 per cent of the nation's teachers.

The CONN-ED program is an experimental project of the U. of C. School of Education. Housed on the Old Quinnipiac College campus in suburban Hamden, the project involves a number of future teachers in the life of the inner city as well as its classrooms. It represents a radical departure from the traditional observation and practice teaching courses.

Support for the project came from the State Board of Education and the Hamden-New Haven Center.

Initially, 12 senior U of C coeds left the rural campus in September to take up residence in an old three-story, grey stone house at the center. Each of them was henceforth immersed in an experience unlike any she had ever known—at college or at home.

Their new "dorm" was furnished—beds, desks, the usual essentials—and a house mother from the Inner City was their guide. At first, instead of visiting the city schools, they contacted the pupils at the center. The children had been bussed from the ghettos of New Haven and Hamden.

In addition to the house mother, the university and center supplied two other resident staff members—black lecturers from New Haven's inner city whose credentials were heavy on the practical side and lighter on the theoretical. The trio had been chosen in large part for their ability to translate the language and behavior of inner city youngsters into terms a middle class white student could grasp.

"Without them the program would have been impossible," insists Dr. A. J. Pappanikou, U of C project director and one of the principal architects of the innovative venture in teacher-training.

"The reality of life in the Inner City could not have been communicated to our students without their help," he declared.

Although the project was designed as a teacher-training exercise, the formal practice in techniques was but the top of the iceberg. Underneath was an intensive exposure to lives of the ghetto children.

On Mondays and Tuesdays—during the six-week observation period—the coeds visited the inner city. Community Progress Inc.'s Community Action Institute assigned workers to each pair of students. They took them on visits to inner city homes, businesses, redevelopment centers, and the neighborhoods.

"What are you doing here whitey? Are you another do-gooder?" the students were asked brusquely. But the black CAI worker helped bridge the gap and misunderstandings were averted. Meantime, the U of C students began to learn something about the black culture and acquired some insight into need for adapting teaching techniques to the life experience of the city.

On Wednesdays the students worked in the pre-school kindergarden and grade one at the center. Here they observed the youngsters in a real learning situation. Their role was similar to teacher aides. By introducing them to the inner city children at the center, the coeds were only gradually exposed to the learning problems. Later they were to be more responsive to the situation in the city. After observing the youngsters, the students attended seminars to discuss what occurred in the classroom.

On Thursdays the students spent the entire day—9 a.m. to 9 p.m.—with a member of the faculty from Storrs. These elementary education professors taught the methods courses in language arts, science and social studies. They also "entered actively into dialogue" with the students and a new give-and-taking kind of teaching occurred.

Fridays were turned over to visiting lecturers and meetings with parent groups from the inner city. Among the guest lecturers were Dr. Alexander Plante, one of the CONN-ED's foster parents and an official in the State Department of Education. Mrs. Trudi Johnson, a Department of Community Affairs' official and William Brown, former head of the Hartford Urban League.

John Rogers, a University of Hartford professor, lectured on black history; Henry Parker, a redevelopment official and one-time president of the black coalition, attempted to bridge the gap between the moderate and militant views; and CPI staff discussed training for inner city work.

Parents told the U of C students in plain talk what they wanted for their children, "We want our kids to learn to read, write and do arithmetic. I don't care if you love my kid. All I want you to do is teach him," they declared.

But Professor Pappanikou observed, "Our main goal is to get our students to look at these youngsters as exciting children not black kids."

Asked if he had any feedback with which to measure the success of the project—which later involved eight weeks of practice teaching in the inner city—Dr. Pappanikou produced some interesting statistics.

"When we started out, only three of the girls had any idea of teaching in the city. Already three, who completed their degree requirements last month, have taken jobs in the ghetto. Seven more, who will graduate in June, said they plan to take jobs in the city in September—four of them in New Haven.

"When the second semester began this month, 23 girls were at the center with two more living at home. In September we didn't think we would enroll our minimum, now we're turning them away," he smiled.

TEXT OF CITATION

The Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Teacher Education of The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for 1969 is presented to the University of Connecticut for the development and implementation of the program, Educating Teachers for the City.

This program features face-to-face confrontation with and immersion in the realities of a metropolitan area. The ghetto area provides ninety percent of the educational environment, while ten percent is provided by the formal seminar. The former involves observation, dialogue, interview, and teaching; the latter revolves around formal instruction.

Unique features of this program include (a) full-time, qualified lecturers representative of the ghetto's informal power structure, who introduce and translate to students the sociological and psychological realities of the ghetto and who serve to articulate and interpret the styles, perceptions, and reactions of the families and people to the students; (b) cooperative investments of time and money by local school districts, the State Department of Education, and the university without outside funding precipitated by ultimate benefits to inner-city education; (c) contact with the inner-city way of thinking, achieved by on-site residence during the entire program under the general supervision of a housemother-counselor who is a ghetto resident, and a program characterized by discussion and analysis of in-the-street education with inner-city leaders and representatives of community organizations, homes, and neighborhood establishments; and (d) replacement of the traditional lecture-text-examples approach to methods instruction in the campus classroom by on-site methods instruction dealing with real people, problems, materials, and situations.

Evaluation indicates that this program is successful in providing an opportunity to participate in the social problems of the city and to appreciate the complexity of metropolitan educational problems.

A NEW REPORT FOR EXECUTIVES WHO CANNOT AFFORD THE TAX CONSEQUENCES OF A BIG SALARY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Congress and this Nation are very much concerned with the matter of tax reform, I received an advertisement in the mail this week that highlights one very important aspect of the problem.

This advertisement, which was probably received by every Member of Congress, and thousands of business and professional men throughout the United

States, is for a report entitled, "10 Ways To Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company."

The report is nothing more than detailed advice to businessmen, professional men and corporation executives on how to take advantage of loopholes in our existing tax laws; in other words, how to avoid paying a fair share of the tax load, and shift more of this load to the "little guy," for whom these loopholes do not exist.

There is nothing illegal or wrong about this publication. It merely demonstrates how the tax-loophole situation has reached such a point that people have gone into the business of making money from it.

The blatant, arrogant message in this advertisement is that these loopholes do exist for the benefit of high-income individuals and corporations, but the low- and middle-income working man must still continue to stagger under the increasing tax burden.

I think this advertisement, and the message it bears, show us clearly that action is not only needed, it is imperative! For the benefit of my colleagues who may have overlooked this advertisement, I include it in the RECORD:

A NEW REPORT FOR EXECUTIVES WHO CANNOT AFFORD THE TAX CONSEQUENCE OF A BIG SALARY

DEAR SIR: Today, few people judge their business success by salary alone.

They know that under our present tax setup it isn't tax-wise to draw all the money you can in the form of salary.

Instead, most successful businessmen have found the Tax Law allows them other ways to get money from their companies—with little or no tax. This shelters their incomes from the high tax brackets.

This strategy gives them far more after-tax money with no loss in deductions for the company.

There are many ways to do this. But 10 of them are extraordinary—they stand out as the best. They are 100% legal . . . amount to big money . . . and are readily available to most every company owner and executive.

They are fully explained in the Research Institute's new Report—10 Ways To Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company:

1. It tells you how your company can deposit money to your credit tax-free (100% deductible by the company). You pay no tax on this money (including the interest) until you withdraw it—and then it can be long-term Capital Gains, about ½ the usual tax.

2. It tells how to determine your best tax-wise salary—and when the company can supplement it with business meals, lodging, club membership, recreation, other expenses that add up to a tidy sum.

3. It explains when you can get tax-free cash from the company, without running the risk of having it considered a taxable dividened. This method can be a life-saver for the man who has substantial cash "locked in" the company.

4. It reveals how executives can make "private arrangements" with their companies to guarantee them a good sum of money when they retire—or slow down. Since this money comes when the executive is in a lower tax bracket, he keeps a great deal more of it.

5. It tells you how the Tax Law enables executives, for the first time, to remain in a lower tax bracket even when their incomes jump dramatically from bonuses, dividends, or other sources.

6. It explains how accident and health insurance (even a large life insurance policy) can be tax-free to you, deductible by the company.

7. It tells you the one kind of life insurance the company can buy for you, so as to by-pass the Tax Law's new $50,000 ceiling on tax-free life insurance. This kind of policy is tax-free to the executive, regardless of size, and deductible by the company.

8. It tells how the latest Tax Law treats stock options—and explains how you can still get Capital Gains breaks on old options—how to handle new options for maximum tax breaks—and why closely-held corporations need no longer fear tax trouble when they issue options.

9. It reveals what other executives in your own and related fields draw in the form of salaries—and the other forms of compensation they benefit from.

10. It shows how to combine a vacation with business and get travel expenses paid by the company, tax-free to you.

These methods are fully explained in the new Report—10 Ways To Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company.

This Report can help put any executive or company owner thousands of dollars ahead, each year, while saving money for his company.

A special section in the Report shows executives and owners of non-incorporated firms how they, too, may enjoy these benefits—without paying any corporate tax, whatever. The ways to qualify for this tax break are spelled out in the Report.

The Report is offered without charge to introduce you to the regular weekly Research Institute recommendations on business and taxes—the leading source of business and tax advice in this country.

These are the weekly recommendations which help over 30,000 executives lift part of the tax load off their backs.

Frankly, we felt that by offering you this new Report—letting you see for yourself how it switches dollars over from taxes into net income, you'll then see the type of tax-saving help you get with a year of the regular weekly recommendations.

Though the recommendations are weekly, they cost but $2 a month, payable annually. But it's only fair to tell you . . . the last time we made a comparable offer, the demand outstripped our supply.

If you want a copy of 10 Ways to Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company the enclosed card should be returned at once.

THAILAND: ANOTHER VIETNAM IN THE MAKING?

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as the consequences of our military involvement in Vietnam have become more manifest, increasing attention has been focused upon the implications of U.S. military involvement in other countries. Despite the fact that the initial commitment to South Vietnam involved only a few hundred military "advisers," that lead to greater and greater involvement to the point that today more than some 540,000 U.S. military men are serving in Vietnam, and over 33,000 combat troops have been killed since the initial stages of American involvement nearly 8 years ago.

The United States today maintains 50,000 troops in Thailand. In a Washington Post column of April 14, Stanley Karnow has outlined the dimensions of our involvement in Thailand. As Mr. Karnow points out, the question of our military presence in Thailand is one of the questions which post-Vietnam appraisal of U.S. military commitments must answer.

As Mr. Karnow notes, much of our unfortunate involvement in Southeast Asia has resulted from the "cold-war tendance to tailor foreign policy to suit military expedients." I urge my colleagues to heed his call for a reexamination of this issue and to end the domination of the military in the formulation of national policy.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1969]

HEAVY U.S. HAND IN THAILAND REFLECTS INFLUENCE OF MILITARY

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG.—Any reappraisal of the military's influence on United States foreign policy should logically focus on Thailand, where Washington's commitments have grown to extraordinary proportions for debatable security reasons never fully explained to the American public.

These commitments, which have escalated steadily over the past two decades, are reflected in the current presence of 50,000 American troops in Thailand and U.S. "defense support" expenditures there of roughly a billion dollars since 1965.

In several ways, the basic military orientation of the U.S. approach to Thailand has inhibited development of modern political institutions in the country while indirectly bolstering the authority of its ruling generals, whose power remains undiluted despite a recent constitution and elections.

Perhaps more significantly, the United States has been drawn in the course of this strategy into a pledge to protect Thailand through an agreement that amounts to a treaty—even though it was never ratified by the American Senate.

With the Vietnam war gradually drawing to a close, the U.S. position in Southeast Asia is bound to undergo a new assessment. Thus a key question at present is whether Washington aims to continue bulwarking Thailand as an anti-Communist "bastion," or whether less ambitious and more realistic plans are in the offing.

Seen in retrospect U.S. involvement in Thailand resulted not from any Pentagon plot but from the Cold-War tendency to tailor foreign policy to suit military expedients. As so often happens, these expedients eventually become immutable policy dogmas.

After 1950, alarmed by the Communist takeover of China and the outbreak of the Korean war, the United States poured military aid and advisers into Thailand, matching that move with propaganda portraying the Thai leaders as beleaguered lovers of democracy threatened by subversion or invasion or both.

Since then, the Thai leaders have repeatedly evoked the Communist menace in appeals for American aid. Similarly, U.S. officials have frequently pointed with pride to Thailand's requests for aid as evidence of its firm anti-Communist posture.

A major milestone in U.S. relations with Thailand was 1954, when the French defeat in Indochina prompted Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to promote the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, with Bangkok as its headquarters. American military aid to Thailand again increased, again justified by warnings of Communist threats.

In March, 1962, following the establishment of a neutral government in Laos, Secretary of State Dean Rusk sought to reassure the Thais by promising that the United States would defend Thailand without the

"prior agreement" of the other SEATO members.

This accord, in substance, modified the SEATO treaty, which called for unanimous decisions by its eight signatories. But the accord was not submitted to the U.S. Senate for approval, as the original treaty had been and hence its legality seems cloudy.

Meanwhile, U.S. involvement in Thailand took a quantum jump after 1964, when the United States built six airfields there as bases to bomb North Vietnam. Secure from enemy attack, these bases have effectively been the equivalent of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong sanctuaries in Laos and Cambodia.

That the bases were built in secrecy is a tribute to the skill of the U.S. mission in Bangkok at news management. Had plans to build the fields been publicized prematurely, their construction might well have been vetoed by the Thais, who were anxious to avoid appearing too committed to U.S. policy.

Indeed, one of the ironies over the years is that so many high-ranking Americans have believed in Thailand's total devotion to anti-communism while the Thais, with the shrewd diplomatic talent that has kept them independent for a millenium, have consistently retained their traditional flexibility.

Even as they joined SEATO and proclaimed their determination to fight communism, for example, Thai officials were quietly in contact with Peking. Though hard evidence is lacking, it is plausible that such contacts still continue.

Plainly aware of the Thai penchant for accommodation, Mao Tse-tung told visitors to Peking some years ago that "it is worth dealing tactfully with them."

All this suggests, therefore, that the Thais have been quite competent in handling themselves and that the Great American effort to save them was, like some other crusades in Southeast Asia, a vastly misguided venture.

ARMY ENGINEERS AND FLOODS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to see President Nixon activate the Army Engineers in Operation Foresight to prepare for flood emergencies that may possibly plague some areas in the New England area and elsewhere if spring thaws come too fast.

Let us hope that the runoff can happen without any serious damage.

Some time ago in anticipation of developing flood dangers because of the large amount of snow on the drainage grounds, I communicated with the Engineers as a measure of flood forewarning, even though I knew that this great organization, so experienced in coping with floods and disasters, would be prepared for any eventuality.

I am informed that about $2 million had been obligated by the Army Engineers for emergency work to date. This permits local flood emergency work, stockpiling of supplies and equipment of many kinds, including heavy construction equipment and sandbags, polyethylene sheeting, radio equipment and lumber and so forth, and this materiel is being deployed throughout the areas of communities threatened with floods.

I am also advised that the Engineers, as a precaution, have visited literally hundreds of communities.

According to the Engineers there are potential trouble spots in 22 communities or valley reaches that have been carefully checked out by the Engineers as to adequacy of local protection systems, debris, snags, and other channel blocks that might block or reduce the discharge of flood flows.

Various communities have been contacted tnd technical advice rendered and made available to them.

Coordination has been established and will be maintained with State, Federal, and local agencies.

Dams have been inspected and the owners of three whose outlet works are in questionable condition are being assisted.

Reservoir pools are being drawn down when possible and necessary.

Flood-related equipment of many kinds—dam gates, pumps, emergency generators and the like—is being tested and made ready for emergency use.

I am told that 125,000 sandbags are being pre-positioned, and more are being readied for distribution.

Fortunately, for New England and Massachusetts, and my own district in particular, where in the past floods have been very destructive, the absence of quick thaws accompanied by heavy rain, and the generally slow melting rate in our area have been very favorable factors, and in a real sense have reduced the threat and the fears.

However, we are not out of the woods yet, and we cannot rest on our oars. Constant vigilance must be exercised by all local, State, and Federal agencies. But I think, generally, the situation is in good shape, and unless we have some sudden, rapid melting and heavy rains coming without much notice, the prospects should be good for keeping down the damage and bearing up under any floods that do occur.

Certainly the Army Engineers are invaluable in protecting afflicted areas against floods and providing suitable relief when they happen, and the American people in many communities may well be grateful for their readiness and outstanding work.

THE IDEOLOGICAL POWER STRUGGLES OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Stephen Pan, director of the East Asian Research Institute in New York, has prepared an interesting paper on the factional disputes and personality cults which have developed within the Chinese Communist Party since its inception.

Dr. Pan traces the history of the party to the present day and includes material on the cultural revolution, the Wuhan rebellion and the recent clash between the Soviets and Chinese along the Ussari River.

The material presented, I believe, can assist the Members of Congress achieve perspective in following the important Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Community Party which has just been convened in Peking.

For that reason I insert Dr. Pan's article at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

THE IDEOLOGICAL-POWER STRUGGLES OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY (CCP)

(By Stephen Pan)

Shortly after the creation of the Chinese Communist Party under the inspiration and encouragement of the Comintern in the 1920s, splits and purges took place within it. Sharp differences of opinion concerning strategy and tactics of revolution were held by its leaders. Evidences of anarchism, liberalism, conservatism, pluralism, leftism and rightism can be found in Chinese Communist documents and publications. Factionism and personality cults have long played a part in the history of the Party.

FROM 1922 TO 1949

Chen Tu-hsiu, founder and first secretary of the Party, was purged at an emergency conference on August 7, 1927, held after the August First Nanchang Revolution, which was led by Chu Teh and Ho Lung. Chen was replaced by Chu Chiu-pai, a faithful disciple of Moscow. Shortly afterwards, Li Li-san, another Soviet trained cadre, suceeded Chu as Party leader, but he was subsequently attacked for his extreme leftist tendencies, which were known as "Li Li-san Line." Chen Shao-yu (Wang Ming) and Chin Pan-hsien (Po Ku) succeeded Li to lead the Party, but they too were quickly purged.

From 1922 to 1949, there were five serious struggles, two against right opportunism and three against left opportunism. The ascendancy of one faction did not necessarily render the complete defeat of another, and at times, the superseded faction would recoup its strength to fight again.

FROM 1949 TO 1966

Since October 1949, after the seizure of power in Peking by the Chinese Communist Party, there have been several great power struggles and purges, political as well as cultural, among the Party leaders and between the authorities of the Party and Government and those belonging to the opposition.

(A) In 1951, a campaign called the "Three Anti's," i.e., "Anti-Corruption, Anti-Waste, and Anti-Bureaucracy," was launched, primarily aimed at the Party-Leaders who were actually running the Government by other Party leaders exclusively engaged in Party-Affairs. It was said that this movement was also meant to clean up those elements left over from the *Kuomintang* and professional government employees. Other Communist sources said that the "Three Anti's" movement was an attempt to convert professional government employees and intellectuals to Communist ideology.

(B) In 1952, a new campaign known as the "Five Anti's Movement," took place. This time, the "Five Anti's" were: "Anti-Bribery, Anti-Tax-Evasion, Anti-Fraud, Anti-Theft of Government property, and Anti-Theft of State Economic Secrets by Government employees, merchants and intellectuals." This movement was essentially against the people outside the Government, but the purge included everybody, except those having high authority in the Party. This campaign was intended to brainwash intellectuals and bourgeois leaders.

(C) In 1953, Kao Kang and Yao Hsiu-shih were purged for their Anti-Party Alliance in

Manchuria. This was principally a political and military purge. Chairman Mao accused Kao and Yao of creating an "Independent Kingdom" in Manchuria, which might overthrow the Mao rule. The "crime" of Kao and Yao was their alleged attempt to seize Party and Government power by forming an "Anti-Party Alliance." Mao utilized the 4th Plenary Session of the 7th Central Committee in 1954 and the National Party Congress of 1955, to purge Kao and Yao and their followers.

(D) The Hundred Flowers Bloom Together Campaign in 1957 was outwardly a relaxation of Mao's policy against the intellectuals, who in 1956 had asked for some freedom of expression. It is difficult to ascertain whether or not the Hungarian Revolt exerted an influence on the demands of the Chinese intelligentsia. The intellectuals and students in Hungary formed the *Petofi Circle* in Budapest in 1955 to seek for freedom of speech just as Czechoslovakians are asking for degree of freedom. However, as a matter of fact, shortly after the Hungarian Revolt, Nikita Krushchev, fearful that the Chinese Communists might be drawn away from the Soviet Union, paid a visit to Peking. Almost immediately afterwards, Peking announced a softer policy towards intellectuals. Chairman Mao declared that each intellectual could "say what he knows, say it all." He further assured the intellectuals: "Those who utter the truth cannot be criminally held responsible." His famous and poetic words were: "Let one hundred flowers bloom, and one hundred schools of thought contend."

Unfortunately, those scholars and intellectuals who accepted Chairman Mao's words in good faith and expressed critical opinions on many subjects found themselves later accused of being "rightist opportunists." They were forced to admit their errors or crimes, and some were sent to labor camps for correction.

(E) *The Purge of Right Opportunism (Revisionism) and The Anti-Party Group in 1958.* When Mao proposed to the Party the launching of the "General Line," to expedite the realization of Socialism by establishing the "Great Leap Forward Movement" and the "Commune System" in 1958, Mao was criticized by Peng Teh-huai, Minister of Defense and Huang Keh-cheng, Chief of Staff. In August 1959, at a Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee of the Party in Lu Shan, Kiangsi Province, Peng and Huang were dismissed from their official position. Chang Wen-tien, Deputy Member of the Politburo and Peking's Ambassador to Moscow, was also dismissed. This purge involved many other high Party members. Its effect was still being felt when the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" began in 1966.

At the 8th National Congress of the CCP in 1956, the rift between Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi was apparent. In 1957, Chairman Mao was openly criticized in Central Committee sessions for his policy towards intellectuals and favoritism to the proletarians and peasants. In November 1958, the Central Committee dropped Mao as a candidate for Chief of State. In August 1959, Mao yielded this highest government post to Liu Shao-chi, who was then elected "President" by the National People's Congress, while Mao remained Chairman of the Party. From then until August 1966, most of the full and alternate or deputy members of the Central Committee of the Party were dominated by Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, secretary of the Party and member of the Politburo, who sometimes issued orders in the name of the Party without consulting Chairman Mao.

On October 25, 1966, Chairman Mao admitted that since 1962, he had "retreated to the second line," and did not conduct Party affairs, and that his instructions were unenforceable, even within Peking. He related that several times his opinions were ignored by Peng Chen, then Mayor of Peking. Mao concluded that he must leave Peking for Shanghai in order to find some new means to counteract his adversaries. He decided that the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, using the young revolutionaries—the Red Guards—as a means, was the only practical and proper solution to his problems.

(F) *The Present Purge inherent in the Cultural Revolution since 1966.* An editorial entitled "Never forget the Class struggle," in the *Liberation Army Daily* on May 4, 1966, gave the initial order to launch an unprecedented campaign against any and all opposition elements to Mao's thought. It is a struggle to purge Anti-Party, Anti-Socialism and Anti-Mao elements.

It is evident that this purge is far greater in scope and intensity than any of the previous purges. Its importance has been admitted in Mao-Lin writings saying that if this struggle is not successful, they "may lose their Party, Government and even their heads."

MISCONCEPTION OF THE "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

Some China experts in the United States say that the Cultural Revolution simply aims at the restoration of the Confucian Age, of the "Ta Tung," the Great Community of the Universe. Dr. John K. Fairbank in "the People's Middle Kingdom" in *Foreign Affairs* (New York, July 1966, p. 574), wrote: "Communist China, how far Communist, how far Chinese, and what is the difference anyway?" When Fairbank asserted that there is not much difference between Communist and Chinese, he overlooked the simple fact that Communism under Mao and Lin is totally opposed to all the Chinese traditional cultural heritages. Confucionism has been one of the first traditions to be discredited by Communists in Mainland Chinas. Fairbank also stated that "we should not get too excited over Peking's cultural revolution." (U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, *Hearings, etc.* Washington, 1966, pp. 100–1).

The great significance of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution has not been fully realized by Occidental observers. Perhaps the Red Guards, who became the principal means to carry out the cultural revolution from August 1966 to 1968, in their own literature and Big Character Posters, have properly described the nature of this revolution. They said that "the cultural revolution has threatened the Heavens and shaken the Earth." The Red Guards in their revolutionary zeal have caused much bloodshed, destroyed many Chinese cultural heritages and upset the social, economic, political and cultural traditional in Mainland China. Their impact has been felt outside of Mainland China, especially in Maco, Hong-Kong, London, Paris, Moscow and some Japanese and Italian seaports.

WHAT IS THE PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION?

The 11th Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee of the CCP held in Peking, August 1 to 12, 1966, was dominated by the Mao-Lin faction. Many members of the Liu-Teng group were prevented from attending the meeting. Besides the participation of members of the Central Committee and the cadres of some regions, provinces and cities, it was also attended by hundreds of "Revolutionary Teachers and Students." The latter shouted and booed at speakers who were against Mao-Lin faction.

A communique issued at the conclusion of this session declared that Chairman Mao was the greatest genius of modern times and the greatest Marxist and Leninist of all times, and asked all the "Revolutionary Forces" to help Mao defeat the "Anti-Revolutionary Revisionists and the Leftists and Rightist Opportunists."

The aim of the Cultural Revolution was outlined by a Big Charcater Poster displayed at Tien An Men on August 18, 1966, at the inauguration of the Red Guards. The most significant phrases on the poster were:

"Raise high the great Red Banner of the thought of Mao Tse-Tung."

"Carry out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to the end."

"Oppose old thought, old Culture, old Customs and old habits."

"Establish new thought, new culture, new customs and new habits."

"Down with Imperialism and Revisionism."

The Peking press media describe the rapid development of the Cultural Revolution as a single spark growing into a prairie fire. *The People's Daily* and the *Red Flag* on August 18, 1966 declared:

"The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a great revolution; a rebellion requires a series of struggles; . . . its purpose is to overturn the old order. Thus, the greater the disorder, the better it will be for the revolution. The world must be turned upside down."

SPORADIC RESISTANCE (SEPT. TO DEC. 1966)

The Proletarian Cultural Revolution was resented and resisted by the Chinese people in many cities and in the countrysides. However, most of the resistance from August to December 1966 was sporadic and not well organized. Communist newspapers, including the *People's Daily* from October 1 to December 15, 1966, on several occasions accused the "reactionaries" and "black elements" of "carrying the Red Flag to oppose the Red Flag," and "engaging in counter-revolution by shouting revolutionary slogans." So great was the confusion that Pro-Maoists fought other Pro-Maoists, as well as Anti-Maoists. There were violent clashes among students, between students and workers, between peasants and students, and occasionary army units joined opposing sides.

NATIONAL RESISTANCE (DEC. 1966 TO JULY 1967)

The Red Guards increased the tempo of their activities from November to December 1966 and spread the revolution from Peking to various cities. Shortly after mid-December 1966, Red Guard activities began in factories, mines, communes and on the countryside. Workers' strikes and peasants helping themselves to rice and grain from store-houses occurred everywhere. Delegations of workers and peasants went to Peking to petition Chairman Mao for higher wages and better living conditions.

Riots, strikes, violent and bloody clashes between the Maoists and Anti-Maoists took place in Nanking and Shanghai, between Nanking and Peking were suspended for a week. Two thousand people on both sides were killed in Nanking in early January 1967 during the clashes. On January 6, 1967, the Associated Press quoted *Yomiuri Shimbun* as saying that when Chairman Mao was asked to explain at a meeting why all these troubles occurred, he conceded that he was partly responsible for elevating those current antagonists to high positions. This was an unusual admission from a man considered "infallible and almighty." Violence also occurred in Chengtu, Chengchow, Tsientao and several cities in Manchuria, Sinkiang and Inner Mongolia. Actually resistance to the Cultural Revolution occurred almost everywhere in the Nation.

THE WUHAN REBELLION, JULY 1967

Unlike previous resistance to the Cultural Revolution in the Mainland, the Wuhan Rebellion constituted a large-scale, direct and open challenge to the Mao-Lin rule in Peking. This rebellion involved about one million people including students, workers, peasants, armed forces and Party cadres in the Triple Cities of China's Heart-land, known as "Wuhan." Wuchang and Hankow are known to Westerners as the "Twin Cities of China," comparable to Saint Paul and Minneapolis of the United States. Hanyang, the third city of the Triple Cities is not so well known. In Chinese history, Wuhan has

been of great political and military importance and it still is today.

Opponents in Wuhan to the Mao-Lin faction recruited workers, anti-Mao Red Guards, security officers, policemen and organized them into the "One Million Strong Forces." They were secretly supported by the commander of the Wuhan Military Region.

In order to cope with the Anti-Mao activities in Wuhan, Hsieh Fu-chih, Vice Premier and Minister of Public Security, and Wang Li. Member of the Cultural Revolutionary Committee of the Party and first Deputy-Editor in Chief of the *Red Flag*, were sent to Hankow on July 14, 1967. Wang Li at a military conference in Hankow on July 19 recommended that the "One Million Strong Forces" be considered conservative and reprimanded. The local officers immediately rejected Wang's recommendation and accused him of falsifying Premier Chou En-Lai's intentions and instructions. At midnight of the same day, Wang was arrested by the local forces. Hsieh Fu-chih vainly intervened. On the following day, Wang was dragged into the streets. Hsieh was insulted and placed under house arrest. When Peking learned of the assault and abduction of Wang and Hsieh, airborne troops were sent to surround the Triple cities of Wuhan from July 20 to 22, 1967. Then Chairman Mao unexpectedly adopted a conciliatory policy towards the Wuhan rebels, and Wang and Hsieh, together with their secretaries and suites, were allowed to return to Peking. Mao issued these instructions to the Wuhan authorities:

"(a) To pardon those persons who were involved in the rebellion, as long as they would not continue their erroneous acts.

"(b) The 'One Million Strong Forces' thereafter should follow Chairman Mao's line of thinking and action.

"(c) All were to be aware of the 'bad elements' who try to destroy or upset the social order."

The Wuhan Rebellion was temporarily suppressed by power and persuasion, but the basic causes of dissatisfaction with the policies and actions of the Mao-Lin faction were not removed. Mao's policy in solving the Wuhan Rebellion was an adroit piece of diplomacy. It avoided open armed large-scale conflict in Mainland China, which might have led to the overthrow of the Mao-Lin rule. The Mao-Lin group which had preached the theory of "Rebellion is justified against the authorities," began to get just a bit of their own medicine.

THE THREE-WAY ALLIANCE WITH THE CADRES, THE ARMY AND THE MASSES SINCE JULY 1967

After the Wuhan Rebellion, Peking adopted a policy known as the "Revolutionary Three-Way Alliance," hoping for cooperation among the revolutionary cadres, the army and the masses. The main purpose of this policy was to calm down the violent actions of the extreme left, to isolate the revisionists of the right, and to join the armed forces with the Party cadres in order to continue the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This policy is intended to preserve the production of agricultural and industrial products and to enable the schools and colleges to be reopened, at least for the study of Chairman Mao's thought.

As a supplement to the Three Way or Triple Alliance, Peking has tried everything possible to form more revolutionary committees, which have temporarily substituted for the leadership at the various levels of the Party.

FORMATION OF 29 PROVINCIAL AND REGIONAL REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEES

In a statement made in April 1967, Chairman Mao said:

"In every place or unit where power must be seized, it is necessary to carry out the policy of the revolutionary 'three-in-one combination' in establishing a provincial organ of power, which is revolutionary and representative and enjoys proletarian authority."

Since the formation of these revolutionary committees, most of their leaders are military. Of the 29 Committees, 21 are now dominated by military leaders. This shows that the situation in Mainland China is still far from stable. Also the Committees are composed of men who are not altogether faithful to the Mao-Lin faction. In eight of the Committees which are administered by non-military men, three of their chairmen are compromise choices.

Another serious problem confronting the Revolutionary Committees is the conflict between the old and new cadres. Their hostility toward each other is unveiled and growing.

The establishment of the 29 Provincial and Regional Revolutionary Committees does not mean total victory for the Mao-Lin group or for the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Mainland China is still in a state of turmoil with no sign of an early return to normalcy.

WORKERS AND PEASANTS VERSUS RED GUARDS

It is traditional for Communists to liquidate the group with which they have cooperated. From 1946 to the autumn of 1968, the Mao-Lin faction made use of the youthful Red Guards to liquidate its opposition elements. In so doing, the Red Guards became an object of attack by the workers and peasants. This may be because some Red Guards were too zealous carrying out their purges. Also others were carrying Mao's banner against Mao's thought. The Red Guards were divided among themselves and no one could really distinguish who was for what. Mao and Lin finally decided to deal with the Red Guards by organizing the "Worker-Peasant Mao Tse-tung Thought Propaganda Teams" and using their members to cope with the student Red Guards. Such teams were first organized in Peking, Shanghai, Tientsin, Wuha, Changsha and Canton to suppress and calm down student Red Guards. With the support of some of the local armed forces, these worker-peasant teams moved into schools and colleges to "publicize" Mao Tse-tung's thought. The actions of these teams have not been confined to their mission of distributing propaganda or publicizing Chairman Mao's thought; they attempt to control student activities, supervise student meetings, publications and other activities. These teams also have substituted for some of the defunct school Party Committees, which are now to ensure the students would not deviate from Mao's thought.

Now students in Mainland China are ordered by the Party through these teams to follow the leadership of the workers and peasants and to learn and apply Mao's thought. A drastic change of policies has been clearly evidenced since the end of last year. The new Mao Tse-tung propaganda teams are replacing the Red Guards as the real rulers of the schools and colleges. This theory and practice is based on Mao's latest advocacy, which has been quoted by Yao Wen-yuan, a newly risen writer on Communist theories, quoted Mao as follows:

"The worker-peasant propaganda teams should stay permanently in the schools and take part in fulfilling all the tasks of struggle-criticism-transformation in the schools, and they will always lead the schools. In the countryside, the schools should be managed by the poor and lower-middle peasants—the most reliable ally of the working class."

These propaganda teams are outwardly administered by the workers and peasants but actually they are controlled by the Army cadres. The Mao-Lin faction needs the strong backing of the armed forces to suppress and mop up all the Anti-Maoist activities in the schools and colleges. However, these teams are encountering wide-spread and violent resistance, and they are also weakened by their own contradictions and conflicts. Their chance of success as a permanent organization is problematical.

Since Chiang Ching, Mao's wife, has been a strong advocate of the Red Guards, she certainly must feel very uncomfortable when she witnesses the current tough methods of dealing with these young revolutionaries. On September 7, 1968, at the rally held in Tien An Men in Peking, celebrating the formation of the 29 Provincial and Regional Revolutionary Committees, she made these unusual remarks: "It was this morning that I learned of the plan to call such a great rally . . . I was told at short notice to say a few words." This was very strange indeed, because since August 1966, nobody could call a rally in Peking without first notifying Mao's wife. In addressing the rally, Chiang Ching then said that "we must not forget that the revolutionary youth and the young Red Guard fighters have made tremendous contributions at the initial and middle stages of the revolution." However, she admitted that "now a small number of young fighters have committed mistakes of this kind or that, and it is quite ridiculous for them to clash with each other in a few units." She urged "the working class," backed by the Army to "help them correct these mistakes." In fact, her plea for the Red Guards indicates that there is a great difference in policy between Chiang Ching and Chou En-lai and possible between Chiang Ching and Lin Piao.

LIU SHAO-CHI EXPELLED FROM THE PARTY

Liu Shao-chi from 1958 to 1966 was Number 2 man in the Chinese Community Party, Chief of State, and logical successor to Chairman Mao. His fall from favor was apparent when he became the principal target of Mao's Cultural Revolution, and was called "China's Khrushchev."

The formal dismissal of Liu occurred at the Enlarged 12th Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Party in October 1968. This session hailed the Proletarian Cultural Revolution led by Mao and Lin Piao, the designated successor to Mao. It further decided to call the 9th Congress of the Party as soon as possible. Previously, the denunciation of the Chief of State did not mention him by name, but at this Plenary Session Liu was called a "traitor, scab, and lackey of Imperialism, Modern Revisionism and the *Kuomintang*." It also announced its intention to "dismiss him from all posts both inside and outside the Party and to continue to settle accounts with him and his accomplices for their crimes in betraying the Party and the Country."

Theoretically and legally speaking, it is doubtful whether or not the Party Central Committee has the authority to remove Liu as Chief of State, as he was elected by the National People's Congress, and there has been no meeting of that Congress since his election. The Communists, however, are not particularly concerned with legality, and procedures. They can say that they are revolutionaries and they follow revolutionary strategy and tactics and do not care about bourgeois legality.

PEKING'S IMPACT ON THE UNITED NATIONS

As a result of the violent nature of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which has affected much of the foreign rights and interests in Mainland China, many Communist and Non-Communist nations have openly criticized Peking's policies and agitations. Peking owed Moscow very much of its success in conquering Mainland China, yet the Soviet Union is more critical of Communist China and the Cultural Revolution than any other country.

Peking's blundering use of the Red Guards, its revolutionary activities and plots in Indonesia, Burma, Vietnam, Cambodia and other Asian and African nations, have alienated the friendship and good will of many countries. Peking's defiant attitude towards both Moscow and Washington and its vilification of the United Nations,

slammed the door of the world organization in 1966, 1967 and 1968.

The Assembly of the U.N. in the past three years repeatedly rejected the admission of Communist China into the world organization. In pursuance of the U.N. Charter Article 18, section 2, the question of China representation was decided in 1968 with two-thirds of members of the Assembly present and voting. Thus, the American-Australian Resolution, adhering to this Charter provision, was upheld by 73 in favor (4 more than 1967, and 7 more than 1966), 47 opposed, 5 abstentions and one absentee, on the other hand, the Albanian-Cambodian Resolution suggested the admission of Communist China into the U.N. This resolution only obtained 44 votes, compared with 45 votes in 1967 and 46 in 1966, while 58 votes opposed to it, with 23 abstentions and one absentee. These voting records clearly indicate that Peking has further alientated itself from the majority of the Members of the United Nations.

In short, the Proletarian Cultural Revolution has created great great disorder, unrest and turmoil at home and distrust abroad.

PEKING'S XENOPHOBIC AGITATIONS

Peking's xenophobic agitations were well publicized since 1966, yet xenophobia is not traditionally Chinese or Confucian, as some China experts such as Dr. John K. Fairbank claim. Confucius and all his disciples believed in "universal brotherhood and harmony among nations." Some anti-foreign activities, such as the Boxer Rebellion and the Taiping Rebellion of the 19th century, were results or reactions to foreign encroachments and aggressions in China, rather than xenophobia *per se*.

Since the inauguration of the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese Communists of the Mao-Lin faction have launched campaigns against the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Portugal and some other nations. Some of these agitations are well known to the western world. But Peking's agitations against Bulgaria, East Germany, Outer Mongolia and Yuogslavia are less known facts. Their diplomats have been publicly insulted and their property damaged in Peking. Although President Charles de Gaulle tendered recognition to Peking in 1964, yet the French Ambassador in Peking was insulted by the Red Guards in 1967 and all Chinese personnel attached to the French Embassy in Peking were arrested by them.

The United Kingdom in 1950 was the first Western Power to recognize the Peking regime. But the British diplomats and consuls suffered tremendously on Peking and Shanghai. British newspapermen were arrested and a Reuter correspondent, Anthony Grey, is still detained in Peking. British property in Peking and Shanghai was damaged. The notorious Hong Kong riots in 1967, full of violence and terror, including the demonstrations against the Hong Kong Governor's House, must be still fresh in the minds of many people.

India was one of the first Asian nations to be friendly with Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai; yet India was twice attacked by Peking's armed forces in recent years. In spite of India's advocating the admission of Peking into the U.N., fighting again erupted between the Indian and Chinese Communist forces on the borders of Sikkim in 1967.

Peking also had an important hand in the Indonesian *coup d'etat* in October 1965 to overthrow the Jakarta government and to create a Communist rule there. This caused the Indonesian Government on September 13, 1967, to announce the withdrawal of Indonesian diplomats from Peking. Jakarta's unfriendly attitude towards Peking resulted from the anti-Indonesian campaigns in Peking at that time.

Burma also had maintained very cordial relations with Peking since 1950. But because of Peking's subversive activities in Burma, the Burmese Government denounced Peking's policies and activities in Burma in 1967 and the relations between Peking and Rangoon have deteriorated.

Even Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk on September 13, 1967, at a rally publicly announced the closing of two pro-Peking newspapers in his country. He also denounced Peking's subversive activities for interfering with the internal affairs of Cambodia and accused the Chinese Communists of helping Cambodia Communists to overthrow his Government.

The recent Sino-Soviet clashes on the island of Chen Pao or Damansku on the banks of the Ussuri River have been actually used by the Peking regime as a pretext for propaganda against the Soviet Union. Similarly, perhaps Moscow also is happy to utilize the border clashes as a means to charge Peking for its aggressiveness in order to get more support from the Communist Nations at the meeting of Warsaw Pact nations recently held in Hungary and also for the forthcoming World Congress of Communist Nations, which was scheduled to be held in May but now postponed to June this year.

All the anti-foreign agitations and movements in Mainland China from 1966 until today are probably outgrowths of Chinese Communist internal disorder, confusion and power struggles. The leaders in Peking today would utilize the anti-foreign sentiments and movements to liquidate and unify their opposition elements and their counter-revolutionary efforts. The Mao-Lin faction hopes that such anti-foreign movements will be able to divert national attention from the internal troubles.

THE DELAYED NINTH NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE CCP

The Proletarian Cultural Revolution has practically paralyzed the machinery of the Chinese Communist Party since 1966. Most of the veteran Communist leaders have been either purged or disgraced. The regional bureaus and the provincial and municipal committees of the Party cannot carry on their normal functions. It is the "Revolutionary Committees," which are performing the necessary functions at the different levels of the Party. These Revolutionary Committees are dominated by the military leaders whose loyalty to Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao is questionable. According to Communist theories, the Party is supreme and the armed forces and other organs are subservient to the Party. The existing Party Constitution, adopted in 1956, stresses the importance of "collective leadership" exhorts members of the Party not "to place the individual above the collective body of the Party." This certainly constitutes a great obstacle to the use of Mao Tse-tung and his thought as guidelines for the Party. Thus, it is natural for Mao Tse-tung himself, and Lin Piao who wants to be Mao's successor, to reorganize or rebuild the Party to suit their needs.

Furthermore, the 9th National Congress of the Party is long overdue . . . According to Article 31 of the existing Constitution, as adopted in 1956, "the National Party Congress is elected for a term of five years." It also stipulated that "a session of the National Congress shall be convened once a year by the Central Committee." However, the same article states that "under extraordinary conditions, it may be postponed or convened before its due date, as the Central Committee may decide." The last Congress, the 8th was convened in September 1956. The present members of the Central Committee have perpetuated their own terms and powers by not calling a conference. This was probably because of the Ideological-Power struggles during all these years. The 9th Party Congress has repeatedly been delayed, although it was officially announced that it was to be held in May, in October, and then at the end of 1968. But temporarily at least, the Mao-Lin faction seems to have control of most of the "Revolutionary Committees," which are substituting for the different levels of the Party machinery, and that Congress is either being held secretly or about to begin in Peking soon. This is borne out by Peking's intensification of Anti-Soviet agitations and movements throughout the Nation, based on the Sino-Soviet border clashes in order to calm down and to unify the opposition elements and embody an anti-foreign policy clause in the new Constitution.

As a matter of fact, since the delegates of the Congress are hand-picked by the Mao-Lin faction, they will certainly approve *in toto* the draft Constitution made by the same faction. This Constitution will be thoroughly "proletarian" in nature and adopt the thought of Mao Tse-tung as a guide line for action. One of the provisions of this Constitution clearly declares:

"The Communist Party of China firmly . . . fights to overthrow imperialism headed by the United States, modern revisionism headed by Soviet revisionist renegade clique, and reactionaries of all countries, in order to build a new world free from imperialism, capitalism and system of exploitation."

However, it is questionable whether the Mao-Lin faction can continue to suppress opposition from within the Party and from the masses of the Chinese people. It is also too early to predict what will be the outcome of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which is still going on in Mainland China. It depends on how the Chinese people continue to react to it at home and abroad. The policies of the Republic of China could also play an important role in the outcome. The policies of Moscow and Washington can certainly exert considerable influence in the present ideological-power struggles in Mainland China today, even though the Americans and Russians may be reluctant to admit this truth. Furthermore, the peoples in adjacent territories to Mainland China could and should also be able to exert a considerable influence in the outcome of the confusing and disorderly situation in Mainland China. There are strong indications that the ideological-power struggles of the Chinese Communist Party will continue in one way or another or even they may be aggravated and enlarged.

SP4C. MICHAEL POGGI, U.S. ARMY, KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that another one of my constituents, Sp4c. Michael Poggi, U.S. Army, of Peekskill, N.Y., died in Vietnam last month.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

CORTLANDT GI VIET CASUALTY—SP4C. MICHAEL POGGI VICTIM OF CONG AMBUSH

Spec./4 Michael Poggi, 21-year old son of Mr. and Mrs. Peter L. Poggi, of Birch Brook Road in Van Cortlandtville's Westchester Acres, was killed in Vietnam last Friday, his family has been informed.

Spec. Poggi, a telegram from the Army said, lost his life while riding in a motor vehicle on combat operation, ambushed by the enemy.

The young soldier, a member of the 25th Division, was promoted to Spec./4 in January and was due for advancement to sergeant

soon. He had been expected to return to the U.S. in August.

Spec. Poggi, who played football at Lakeland High School from which he was graduated in 1966, was a sophomore at Orange Community College, Middletown, N.Y., when he enlisted in March 1966. He had been majoring in engineering.

Born on August 30, 1948, in the Bronx, the son of Peter and Jean Mangiatordi Poggi, the youth had resided in Westchester Acres with his family for the past 10 years. He had trained at Fort Jackson, S.C.

Funeral services have not been arranged, awaiting the arrival of the body within 7 to 10 days.

In addition to this parents, Spec. Poggi is survived by an sister, Karen Jean, a senior at Lakeland High, and a brother, Peter, 9th grade student at Lakeland Middle School.

THE HARVARD CRIMSON GOES RED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if Lance Buhl, the "intellectual" history instructor at Harvard, were as dedicated to the understanding and teaching of history as he is to revolution and SDS, Harvard would remain the Crimson, instead of now having an image as the Red of the East.

The assorted news accounts of the death of Harvard as an academic institution are quite liberal in the estimation of participation. While the involved anarchists are unidentified as to what percentage are from Harvard, it is perhaps noteworthy that the 1969 World Almanac shows Harvard with a student population of 15,215 and a teacher population of 7,330.

Most loving parents know that the way to correct a disobedient child of insolence is to cut off his allowance.

The responsible taxpayers of America abhor this mobocracy on our campuses and look to us in Congress for responsible leadership. One of the first things we can do is to cut off Federal funds for grants and subsidies to all professors and students involved in this insolent strike. We can also demand the full cooperation of the Harvard board and if they do not comply then cut off all Federal funds going to Harvard for the duration of hostilities.

Education must remain education and riots, strikes, and revolution are not acceptable standard college curriculum.

How regrettable that the reputation of Harvard as one of the leading educational institutions in the world has been shattered by a public display of irresponsible mob force.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that reports of the Harvard fiasco and the collegiate press follow my remarks:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

MAJOR VICTORY FOR THE SDS—HARVARD TURNS TO THE LEFT—POLITELY, OF COURSE

(By Mary McGrory)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The Students for a Democratic Society have won their greatest victory. They have taken over the oldest, proudest university in the country, Harvard, which was founded 333 years ago to train young men of the Massachusetts Bay Colony for the ministry.

Five days ago, they were a grubby and despised minority whose language, tactics and goals set Harvard's teeth on edge. Now they are the biggest men on campus and they celebrated last night with a rock band and a psychedelic light show that kept the yard thumping half the night.

Their triumph was ratified at a mass meeting in Soldiers Field which a townswoman sympathetic to their opposition to university expansionism called a "demonstration of the greatness of Harvard."

All but the details of their demands were voted closely at a gathering of 10,000 or more people. It was a model of tolerance, decorum and restrained rhetoric, with crimson-clad monitors and an imperturbable chairman, Lance Buhl, 29.

At one point, a small band of black students, one of them dressed in a World War I Army uniform, stormed the long tables set in the middle of the field for moderators, clerks and counters. They shook their fists and demanded action, with obscenities. But they were taken in hand by each other. The only creature clearly out of control was a lost black poodle who raced madly across the turf, barking at the applause.

The vote to continue the student strike for three days was a surprise to almost everyone. After it was taken, a young radical leaned out of the stands to shake the hand of SDS co-chairman Mike Kazin, son of literary critic Alfred Kazin.

"All our demands are legitimized, Mike," crowed the boy, "Wasn't it beautiful?"

The revolutionaries did not do it alone. They had an assist from a remote and, they said, intransigent president, Nathan M. Pusey. They had the innocently fatuous statement of the Harvard Corporation, which after a secret meeting, declared that it faced the "spectre of closing down the university with distaste."

The meeting rose as one when Alexander Korn of Washington, a graduate student in economics, stood up and suggested a motion to "repudiate the right of seven men (the Corporation) to close down our university."

The moderates decided to create a popular front with the radicals partly because they knew that the SDS—its numbers vastly augmented after the police assault on occupied University Hall last Thursday morning—was going to continue the strike anyway.

As they chose the SDS over the cops, they chose SDS over the Corporation.

The endless talks—"colloquia" they are called here—have brought the original issue of ROTC to the surface.

Harvard students, like students everywhere else, are anti-militarist, and during the five days since the SDS seized the building and got thrown out, the call of abolishing ROTC has become a frenzy.

During their occupation, the radical raided the university files and discovered a letter from Dean Franklin Ford of the faculty of arts and science, suggesting to President Pusey how a previous faculty resolution to cut down ROTC status could be circumvented.

The publication of the letter in the Harvard Crimson has somehow justified SDS violence, for it has been recalled that SDS tried for nine months by nonviolent means—meetings, petitions, dinner speakers at the houses—to change the university's mind.

"The administration sent in the police finally," said one young moderate. "That's what comes of protest in this country. It's the same thing as Chicago."

A young SDS member said proudly over supper in Adams House, "There has been more political discussion here in the last five days than in the last 333 years."

The moderates are hoping that by making a popular front with the SDS, they can have control over the strike. Their chances seem dim. They are leaderless. The SDS is tightly organized, and while their spokesman say they do not intend to get tough, the youngbloods among them are making plans to invade classrooms and say they do not object to "militance."

The V-signs which were visible when the moderate group of students voted their first strike last Thursday, are now clenched fists. The SDS interrupted their music and their sound and light show last night to appeal for runners for their literature, their posters and their collection boxes.

One young SDS member said, "people think we want to wreck Harvard for the hell of it. We're just trying to change the system whereby they train students to accept imperialism represented by the Corporation."

Some bewildered old grads who had come back to celebrate their 25th anniversary found themselves in the Yard pleading with the inexorable young men to save the school.

Milton Binder, a dress manufacturer from the Class of '44, stood in the sunlight arguing with Emmanuel Krasner, Class of '69.

"Why are you more moral than your mothers and fathers! Are your parents so crass! Why am I so devoid of sympathy for the poor?"

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

HARVARD STRIKE WIDENS GAP

(By Lance Gay)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Students and faculty groups appeared farther apart today as dissident students began a new three-day strike against Harvard University.

Despite faculty efforts to forge a middle ground of agreement with striking students, most moderates lined up with militants in response to what they called administrative recalcitrance.

At a mass meeting—unprecedented in Harvard's 333-year history—students voted to continue their strike for another three days and demand a public reply from the administration on the use of police to quell militant students' occupation of the administration building last Thursday.

STADIUM MEETING

The meeting was held at Soldiers Field, Harvard's stadium, under bright blue skies. An estimated 10,000 to 12,000 students and faculty members turned out.

The session was tumultuous and by the time agreement was finally reached, some of the students had left.

The students heard six proposals ranging from conservative to liberal views on the splintered campus. They chose to support a liberal motion.

A faculty-student rapport seemed in the offing when Prof. Stanley Hoffman read a letter signed by 50 faculty members.

A generous concession to student demands, it announced the inclusion of five students on a 15-member faculty board which will study and recommend action on key issues—ROTC, expansion of the university, Afro demands for an independent department, the student takeover of University Hall and the subsequent police action, and scholarships on campus.

GREETED BY OVATION

Hoffman's statement was followed by an almost unanimous standing ovation.

"We as teachers demand that we work together in a rational atmosphere and compassionate spirit," Hoffman said.

Hoffman called for time to work out a rapport and respect for one another's views. "We need a sense of perspective. Enormous things have been changed. We must not turn into a carnival of masochism—if we do this, then we are wrecked."

Norm Daniels, chairman of Students for a Democratic Society, told the assemblage that on Sunday night, 1,200 students had backed

the SDS demands. "We're on strike for these demands and we'll stay on strike until they're met," he said.

The demands include abolition of all ROTC training at Harvard, amnesty for 200 arrested after 400 police stormed University Hall Thursday, a halt to university expansion until local housing issues are clarified and substitution of Harvard scholarships for ROTC students.

Despite the enthusiasm over the faculty action, sentiment at the meeting began to turn away from the faculty concessions.

The precipitant was a revolution proposed by Alexander Korns of Washington, D.C., aimed at the seven-man university Corporation. It stated: "We repudiate the right of seven men to close our university."

The speech was followed by unanimous applause and cries with clinched fists of "Strike—Strike—Strike."

The moderates' sympathy for the faculty, at its height during Prof. Hoffman's speech, ebbed further.

"STATEMENT WAS RHETORIC"

"Hoffman's statement was rhetoric," Tom Saltonstall, a moderate commented just before the final vote. "A lot of people can say 'let us reason together.'

"This is the first time we have gotten together as a community. That community has now raised serious issues. We got the response of the Corporation, that showed us the only way we get a response is to strike.

"For me, I will strike, I choose to strike, I will do so," the former McCarthy press aide said.

Following the tabling of a motion to call an unconditional strike a motion to call a three-day strike passed by a voice vote.

Mike Kazin, a chairman of SDS, called the meeting "great—the administration has to publically state its position on our demands."

SDS WINS BACKING

General student response to the gathering was that SDS had won a concensus of support of the students.

The faculty appeared to be the loser.

Late yesterday, in reaction to growing fears of polarization, the faculty remained distant from the students.

Prof. Michael Waltzer said he would continue to give classes. A member of the liberal clique, Waltzer stated that there was no strike. "Students can't strike, students can only boycott classes: they can only boycott classes when classes are held."

Prof. George Wald said that before the meeting yesterday many of the faculty felt ROTC should be deprived of credit, but saw no great objection to its continuance. "We see it differently now," he said, fighting a faculty move to rid the campus of ROTC entirely.

Late last night, students taped a bed sheet to the spacious gothic arch of Sever Hall, upon which they played slithering psychedelic lights.

Afterward, students gathered on the steps of Sever Hall, then marched through Harvard Yard singing "We Shall Overcome."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

COLLEGIATE PRESS HITS AT ROTC

(By Robert Walters)

Twenty-nine of the nation's leading college newspapers today published a joint editorial calling for the abolishing of Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) courses at all of the country's college and university campuses.

Publication of the editorial came after a week of disturbances on the Harvard University campus, touched off by a demand from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) that all ROTC programs be immediately and permanently halted at that school.

The appearance of the editorial also marked what was believed to be the first time such a substantial number of college newspapers simultaneously took the same position on a controversial issue.

The coordinated effort was initiated by Jim Heck, an editor of the University of Michigan Daily. The cooperating newspapers have a combined readership of more than 500,000 students.

PUBLICATIONS CITED

Among the papers carrying the editorial were the Cavalier Daily at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville and the Diamondback at the University of Maryland in College Park, as well as those serving the following schools:

University of California campuses in Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara; the Universities of Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, New Mexico, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Washington and Wisconsin; Rutgers, Boston, Duke, Tulane, Ohio and Michigan State Universities; and Antioch, Amherst and Harpur colleges.

"One of the unintended domestic consequences of the war in Vietnam has been the growing awareness of the dangers of the intimate connections between the military and academia," the editorial said.

"Perhaps the most blatant example of colleges and universities willingly performing functions that are rightly the exclusive concern of the military is the ROTC," it added. "It is difficult to avoid the blunt assertion that training soldiers whose ultimate aim is to kill is totally hostile to the principles of academia."

CREDIT REVOCATION

The editorial noted that in recent months such universities as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth and Stanford "have all taken steps toward revoking academic credit from their ROTC program," then added:

"Academia's traditional function is to inspire critical thinking about man and his society aloof from partisan or superficial considerations. But it is impossible for colleges and universities to even pretend to perform this unique role if they are also subsidizing the brutal militarism of the outside world . . .

"At a time when the military is an integral element in an expansionist foreign policy opposed by a sizable segment of the population both inside and outside academia, it is clear that the ROTC program is as partisan in its own way as SDS."

The editorial said "the bulk of the ROTC program consists of technical courses . . . the teaching methods employed tend to emphasize rote learning and deference to authority . . . (and) the intellectual vacuity of many ROTC courses is directly related to the rather limited educational backgrounds of the preponderance of ROTC faculty."

Nevertheless, the editorial added, "ROTC instructors are accorded a status comparable to professors in more rigorous disciplines. And due to the high degee of autonomy of the ROTC program, colleges and universities have little direct control over the hiring, firing or promotion of these ROTC instructors."

The editorial concluded:

"It was the simplistic 'my country right or wrong' patriotism of the first World War which spawned the original ROTC program. But one of the clearest lessons of the Vietnam tragedy is that such unquestioning support of government policy is not only morally bankrupt, but counter to the long-range interests of the nation as well as the campus . . .

"It is necessary to end the universities' role as the unquestioning servant of government and military. The abolition of ROTC as a sanctioned course offering would be a major step in this direction."

[From the Evening Star, April 16, 1969]

HARVARD CALM AS DIRECTION OF STRIKE REMAINS UNCLEAR

(By Lance Gay)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—An atmosphere of calm expectation pervaded Harvard University today as the strength and direction of the student strike remained unclear.

Most classes were being held as scheduled, but there were no accurate figures on attendance. Best estimates of the number of students participating in the strike were around 3,000, but some student leaders said there were as many as 5,000. There are 15,000 students at Harvard.

A second three-day strike was called Monday at a meeting of about 10,000 students in the stadium at Soldiers Field.

Support appeared to be rising in the student body today for a newly formed Committee For Radical Structural Reform, representing the views of some moderates on the campus.

Students for a Democratic Society called a general meeting for tonight reportedly to consider a proposal calling on students to occupy business and administrative offices of the university tomorrow.

A three-hour special meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences ended in an uproar yesterday after a list of resolutions was adopted, among them the inclusion of five students on a 15-member committee to investigate the causes of the occupation of University Hall last week, the subsequent police action and the discipline of students.

The meeting, presided over by president Nathan N. Pusey, was business-like until a dispute opened on a motion to clarify faculty intentions on student demands, including those for abolition of ROTC training. Opponents jumped up to argue that it would be "disgraceful" to "rebuke" the military.

Dean of Arts and Sciences Franklin L. Ford, attempting to calm the meeting, said there was "grave danger of destruction" of the university, and called on the assemblage not to forget that the faculty held the final responsibility to keep the university going. He received a standing ovation.

But boos and hisses greeted his statement that a "part of a university building is still occupied." He was referring to the philosophy building, Emerson Hall, the third floor of which has become the headquarters of Students for a Democratic Society.

"That's not true—it's not occupied in the same sense as University Hall," Prof. Morton H. White said. White's office is in the building, and faculty members, students and reporters have not been denied access to the floor since it became SDS headquarters.

The meeting adjourned after adoption of a resolution by Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith postponing action on the ROTC proposal until a meeting tomorrow.

The meeting was broadcast live for the first time over the campus radio station.

Afterward Pusey issued a mimeographed statement saying that student demands "will, of course, be kept under consideration, but there can be no hasty decision-making regarding substantive issues under duress."

Pusey also called for the speedy restoration of the educational and scholarly activities of the community.

DAY FOR DECISION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, not long ago Allen N. Peltier wrote a composition,

entitled "Day for Decision." With a musical background it was narrated on a recording by Johnny Sea, of which more than a million were sold.

The essence of this recording is old-fashioned patriotism, an appeal to reason and realism in this troubled time in which we live. Having received permission, I include a copy of the recording. It follows:

DAY FOR DECISION

(By Allen N. Peltier)

The other day I heard someone say: "You know, America is in real trouble!"

It's true. Old Glory has never fallen so close to earth. Our embassies are being stoned; our diplomats are often in fear of their lives; and we're involved in a half dozen nameless, winless conflicts, spilling American blood on foreign soil. Our young men are dying for ideals which don't seem to mean too much to Americans any more.

The truth is, America's real trouble doesn't lie in the rice paddies of Viet Nam, in the masses of Red China, or in the diabolical intrigues to the south of us. The real trouble lies in the playgrounds of St. Louis, the hillside mansions of San Francisco, and in the slums of Chicago. The disease which is slowly eating away at the heart of America lives in the small southern towns, the fishing villages of New England, and in the hot, dusty streets of the Midwest.

This is the age of the American cynic, the year of the unbeliever, the day of doubt. We've killed all the sacred cows and destroyed all the images, and there's nothing left to respect. Old-fashioned love of God, country and family is passé.

We stare at our shoe laces when they play The National Anthem. We wouldn't want to be seen at a political rally or a Town Hall meeting, and we don't want to be caught with our eyes closed during public prayers. We've decided that the only way you can get in public office is to buy it. Our heroes are the fast-guys who get away with things. Patriotism, the old hand-over-the-heart, flag-waving marching singing patriotism has been condemned.

Think about this: Patriotism, when you tear away the fancy phrases and crepe paper, is plain and simple pride; a new car, prettier girl, bigger house, sort of pride in your country. Somewhere along the way we've lost that pride. Our form of government is the same; we still say America stands for the same things; But next time you're at a party, ask someone to sing America with you and see what happens. The basic ideals and structure of America hasn't changed; we have, you and me!

Our enemies know it. They've seen the news-reels of the discontented marching around the capitol. They've distorted and blown up our mistakes; they've been putting wedges in the cracks in our wall of solidarity. The new idea is: "Don't attack America, wear it down gradually; it'll eventually fall under the weight of its own corruption". And did you know: It's working! !

This sneering complacency, once stamped out by the bloody feet of a tattered Continental Army in 1776, once drowned beneath the keel of the U.S.S. Arizona in Pearl Harbor Bay, has risen again. This deadly "Let-George-Do-It". attitude lights the way for the Viet Cong in the swampy jungles of Viet Nam. This "Better-Red-Than-Dead" cancer is more feared by the American soldier than all the Communist mortar shells; it kills the vitality and spirit of America. Democracy is a frail and fragile instrument made of hope, prayer and Yankee ingenuity. It is held together by flag-waving patriotism, and we've almost exhausted our supply of it.

Try this test. Lift your eyes to a flag, then sing out as loud as you can that old, outworn, antiquated freedom hymn you learned so many years ago:

"For purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain! America! America! God shed His grace on thee!" Now, if you feel a little pride welling up inside you, if you feel a little mist in your eye; Then, Thank God for you, mister You're *still* an *American!*

"WHITE IMPERIALISM" AND "BENEVOLENT RACISM" IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, although race relations is a dominant theme in any discussion of domestic problems in the United States today, the role of race in our foreign policy is seldom mentioned. Yet race has played and does play an important part in American relations with the rest of the world, as is dramatically pointed out in the following paper by Franklin H. Williams, director of the Urban Center at Columbia University.

RACE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Despite the paramount importance of race in our domestic life very little has been written of its role in American foreign affairs. But every now and then something appears that gives some insight into this important subject.

A small news story in the center pages of the February 23rd issue of the *New York Times* graphically demonstrates *Africa's* place as a continent of concern in shaping American foreign policy. The article reads:

"Chelsea House Publishers announced last week that Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the historian, will be general editor of a five-volume "Documentary History of American Foreign Affairs, 1945–1970."

Few events have more influenced the form and character of international relations during this period than the emergence into independence of more than 30 African states. Yet note the titles of the volumes to be included in the history: "East Europe and Soviet Union . . . Asia . . . Western Europe . . . United Nations . . . and Latin America."

Africa? Apparently, as far as American foreign affairs is concerned, the second largest continent in the world, with millions of people, has not existed from 1945 to the present. This to me is especially upsetting since for almost three years I represented our nation as Ambassador to a Black African country. It seems that in the view of Chelsea House and Professor Schlesinger, it either wasn't there or somehow did not count.

Ralph Ellison has characterized the plight of the Black man in America as that of the "invisible man." He is simply ignored as a living, breathing, sentient person. This tendency to treat Black people as if they weren't there also seems to apply to Africa, and to the problems of race in international affairs generally. If you look at practically any textbook on international relations published in recent years, there is virtually no discussion of racial factors. In eleven texts published in America since 1960, the entry "race," or its equivalent, can be found in only five of their indexes, and in three of the five the index refers the reader to less than three paragraphs of text. Yet with the possible exception of the Western European colonial empires, no nation's foreign affairs have been more influenced by racial considerations—positive and negative—than America's.

Domestically, race is a matter of deep national concern and divisiveness, and inevitably, our resolution of this national problem will directly effect our role in world affairs and our influence as a world power. Though we often refer to our country as an ethnic melting pot, America is invariably seen and sees itself as a white Anglo-Saxon Christian nation. As a result, our policies towards non-white peoples have been marked by what can fairly be called "white imperialism," on a political level, and "benevolent racism," on an ethnic level.

Domestically, our immigration laws, from the early Oriental Exclusion Acts to our present statutes, have established national immigration quotas in direct proportion to the whiteness of the country of origin. Further, the internment of the Nisei—but not citizens of German descent—during World War II reflected a national uneasiness with citizens of darker hue.

It should be noted that these are matters of contemporary history: Asians were barred from naturalized citizenship until 1946. Finally, the long-continued, almost total absence of Black, brown or yellow Americans from our foreign policy-making councils not only supports this uneasiness but invariably influences our policy-making decisions relative to the world's majority.

Externally, the Boxer rebellion; our economic support or racist South Africa; our military alliance with colonial Portugal, and our apparent readiness to resist colored in contrast to white communist aggression suggest the existence of a double standard in our international relations. It appears, indeed, that we have a bi-partisan ethnic foreign policy: one operating favorably for countries most similar to our own—predominantly white—and the other taking a more negative posture toward those countries whose inhabitants are predominantly non-white.

Over a hundred years ago, in 1854, Martin R. Delaney, a physician, author and Negro leader, spoke these prophetic words:

"The white races are but one-third of the population of the globe—or one of them to two of us—and it cannot much longer continue that two-thirds will passively submit to the universal domination of this one-third."

By 1900, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, a distinguished Black scholar and intellectual, was no longer predicting. He stated unequivocally that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line."

Contemporary history validates this prediction. The two great white nuclear powers, locked in a battle for world supremacy, are attempting to win the allegiance of the uncommitted nations. But the uncommitted—with few exceptions—are colored—and China's entry into the nuclear fraternity, with its unabashed effort to speak for the non-white peoples of the world, has complicated the struggle. Russia's advantage flows from its revolutionary and supposedly non-colonial history. Ours comes also from our revolutionary history, as reflected in the language of our basic documents and the rhetoric of our founding fathers. But this advantage has been eroded if not totally offset by past practices of slavery and segregation and the fact that America is still dominated by essentially racist institutional structures.

Black Americans, who suffered and still suffer from these conditions, have always known that American life was permeated with racism; but it took the Kerner Report to drive this point home. At one point the report states: ". . . White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II . . . What white Americans have never fully understood—but what the Negro can never forget—is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it."

Today we run the risk that our immersion in day-to-day crises may blur our memory of the past, and that the press emphasis on Black demands may gloss over the systematic and cruel exclusion of the non-white American from the mainstream of national political and economic life throughout our history.

Let me refresh your recollection just a little.

In 1901 [sic], President Wilson, the man who was to make the "world safe for democracy," described the colored American as a "homeless class, unpracticed in liberty, unschooled in self-control; never established in any habits of prudence, bewildered and without leaders, and yet insolent and aggressive: sick of work, covetous of pleasure—a host of dusky children untimely put out of school."

The treatment of Black Americans—including 360,000 soldiers—during and after the war to make the world safe for democracy, proved that Wilson did not have them in mind when he talked of defending freedom. The last six months of 1919 saw 25 bloody race riots, and in that year more than 70 Black people were lynched, including ten soldiers in uniform.

The despair that gripped the Black ghettos following the war spawned the Garvey Back to Africa Movement, which attracted over 2 million dues-paying members. His goal was similar to that of some advocates of Black power today: economic and political control by Black people over their own Black communities. But in 1933 it was estimated that two-thirds of the Harlem labor force was unemployed. World War II created jobs, of course, but institutional racism insured, as usual, that they were on the bottom of the ladder of opportunity. The President of the North American Aviation Company, for example, stated in 1941 that "while we are in complete sympathy with Negroes, it is against company policy to employ them as aircraft workers or mechanics, *regardless of their training*. There will be some jobs as janitors for Negroes."

After the war, returning Black veterans were expected to fall back into their traditional inferior places. The same old conviction, rooted in slavery, was still in general currency: "Black people are inferior, and we're going to keep it that way." In the armed services itself, Black volunteers and draftees had to fight for the right to fight. For example, Black soldiers overseas were assigned to unskilled non-combat duties until the Battle of the Bulge, when they were organized into platoons and assigned to the front, one platoon to a white company. It was not until 1948 [sic], when our segregated army landed in South Korea to defend a colored nation, that harsh military necessity forced President Truman to order the elimination of this embarassing contradiction.

It cannot be denied that there have been major modifications of our domestic racial policies since that time. Some have been fundamental; for example, the judicial rejection of the constitutionality of enforced racial segregation. In the main however, such changes have affected more the form of our behavior than the content of our racial ideologies. From the day our founding fathers—some of them slave holders—committed the nation to the achievement of a domestic society within which all men shall be free and equal, to the present where Black Americans still live in substantial insulation and isolation, it would be fair to say that racism based on color differences has been an incipient, if not indigenous characteristic of our country. As James Conant phrased it, slavery has the "congenital defect" in the making of the country, for it built self-deception into the very matrix of the American image.

The ancestors of the more than 500,000 Black Americans who survived the voyages from Africa still seek the "promised land" of freedom and unrestricted opportunity. Mutiny aboard ship, unremitting slave rebellions, the underground railroad, experiments with resettlement in Africa, sit-ins, riots, and alternative present-day schemes for Black status and Black communities with Black capitalism all mark unrelenting efforts on the part of Black Americans to find some solution to their American condition.

Unless we bring the Black American fully into the main-stream of life in our nation, this important body of nationals—12.5% of the population—will be able to contribute little to our international relations. Unfortunately, we seem to be making little progress in this direction. A new administration has recently assumed leadership without a single Black person in a key State Department post. On the international scene, we have dropped from seven Black Ambassadors, including two in Europe, one in the Middle East, three in Africa and one at the United Nations to a total of four: one in Malta and three in Africa. Though there has been a small increase in the number of non-whites in the Foreign Service at the junior level, the number of senior grade Black officers is at a standstill, with less than a dozen based in Washington or abroad.

The mounting domestic racial crisis has emerged, next to Vietnam, as the major inhibiting factor in achieving respect, communication and support for America and its policies not only throughout the non-white world, but in Scandinavia and elsewhere as well. The gravity of race as a United States domestic problem and as an international crisis is summarized in a recent statement of the Institute of Race Relations in London:

"It is no longer necessary to emphasize the importance of race as a domestic issue in the United States. In Britain, too, this has become a national issue; we may still be in time to learn from American experience and prevent the problem reaching the gravity it has in the United States, but only if exchange of ideas is urgently sought and quickly translated into action.

"It is less generally recognized that ideas about race play a part in every major confrontation of the world today. World poverty, world hunger, world population, and the operation of aid programmes, are all affected; efforts for peace, the activities of the United Nations, the working of international agencies are frustrated by the suspicions and resentments which arise from race. Failures to solve the domestic problem in the United States and Britain; failure to enforce the views of the United Nations in South West Africa and in Rhodesia, failure to achieve peace in Vietnam—all increase the sense of frustration among the developing nations. The line between rich nations and poor and the line between white and non-white are dangerously near coinciding and the polarization of the world into camps divided by these lines becomes increasingly serious. In the power struggle between the United States, Russia and China, political use is made of this polarization and it is a major contribution to instability. There are influential people who speak of a 'race war' on a world scale as inevitable if not already in progress. But surely more reasonable courses are open if men apply their minds to the possibilities".

Dr. James Moss of the University of the State of New York has found that in spite of the long tradition of African students studying in the United States most African students experience some form of racial discrimination during their stay in the United States. Indeed, he reported that one group of African students studying in the midwest became more disaffected the longer they stayed in the United States. When we consider the history of discrimination towards African diplomats and other distinguished visitors during their stay in this country, coupled with the documented evidence that some of the most damaging effects upon our American-African relations derive from experiences with racially and culturally unsophisticated white Americans on varying assignments in Africa, is it any wonder that we are so disliked in that continent? Dr. Joseph Kennedy's research findings and conclusions five years ago are just as relevant today as then:

"Today, the entire world is caught up in a great twopronged struggle—a struggle for material and human equality. The American Negro quest for civil rights, the independence of nations, world revolutions, are a part of this larger struggle. For most countries the dissolution of old alliances and the formation of new friendships and relations will be determined by the outcome of this great struggle.

"Where this struggle takes on racial overtones, as it must in Africa, (for the African, like the American Negro, has lived with minority status within the concept of white superiority and Black inferiority) the United States finds itself in an extremely sensitive, tenuous position—much more so than the Soviet Union or England, or any other country in the world. The United States is the major force in the 'free world' standing for democracy, individual expression, and human rights. The United States has the largest Black population any place in the world outside Africa itself. Yet, the United States has an extremely negative racial image in Africa and around the world."

If our country therefore is to alter its image as one of the most hated nations in the world by non-white peoples, nothing short of a major transformation in our racial posture and priorities domestically and internationally will suffice.

The United States and our Western allies must begin to deal with the reality of an international community of non-white peoples, bound together in a common struggle against white racism and imperialism, in which our country is one of the major protagonists. I must here confess my own doubts on this score. Far too many of our policy-makers seem to consider that, in the context of world wide priorities, non-white peoples are of too little consequence to merit the kinds of activities on the massive scale that I believe are essential if racial polarization is to be reversed.

From our founding this nation and the Black man have been inextricably committed to each other. America's commitment rose out of the contradictions of slavery and democracy—a contradiction which had to be resolved if the republic was to endure. "Indeed, I tremble for my country," Thomas Jefferson told the Virginia House, "when I remember that God is just." Recognizing the contradiction inherent in his plight, and using the Christian ethic and democratic rhetoric as his tools, the Black man hewed his way out of first slavery then enforced segregation. He looked upon his activity as self-liberation; the deeper truth is that the Black man's struggle is the struggle of America itself seeking its *true* identity.

It was not by accident that as America came into its own as a world power during and after World War II, the Black man came to represent the conscience of the nation and he advanced in direct proportion to his ability to embarass America in times of international crises. My point is clear, I hope;—The fate of America and the fate of the Black man are one and the same. The challenge to the one is mirrored in the increasing freedom of the other. I submit that with the advent of national independence abroad and increasing racial opportunity at home the question of color will steadily dissolve into a question of economics. The residual issue then that will have to be faced during the remainder of the 20th century is the struggle between the haves and the havenots.

The danger lies in the fact that the historical events of the past 350 years have doomed the majority of the non-white peoples of the world to the category of the

have-nots. Our domestic danger is that we may lack sufficient national concern or commitment to make of our Black minority an asset rather than a liability. It would be a pity if the United States, which held such hope for the world's needy and oppressed, found itself isolated and alone because of its own inability to root racism out of its national body at a critical point in its own survival. Where then would we turn? How impregnable would our white defense be?

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the problem of race in U.S. foreign affairs has been recognized by the Ford Foundation, which recently announced the funding of a center on international race relations at the University of Denver. The center will be the first of its kind in this country. The university's announcement of the Ford grant follows:

A $150,000 Ford Foundation grant awarded to the University of Denver today (March 19) will establish a Center on International Race Relations, first of its kind in the United States, at the University of Denver's Graduate School of International Studies.

The three-year award for the unique center will provide programs of advanced research and training in comparative race and international relations.

"Race conflicts are becoming increasingly important in world affairs," Dr. Josef Korbel, dean of the DU Graduate School of International Studies, declared. Until recently, he noted, race has been considered "only a national problem that stopped at a country's borders." Examples of race conflicts with international implications cited by Korbel include South Africa's apartheid government, Chinese minorities in Southeast Asian countries, and domestic race problems as they affect American foreign policy.

"If we cannot understand the role racial factors play in international affairs, we cannot hope to find solutions to the problems facing us," Dean Korbel said. "We are left at the mercy of one of the key issues of the 20th century."

Dr. George W. Shepherd, Jr., professor of international relations at the Graduate School of International Studies, will be director of the new center. International race specialists to be associated with the center include Profs. Rupert Emerson, a prominent expert on African affairs of the government department at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; James Rosenau, chairman of the political science department at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Paul Seabury, of the political science department at the University of California, Berkeley; and Franklin Williams, director of the Urban Center at Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Associate fellows of the center from Colorado include Profs. W. A. E. Skurnik and James Scarritt, political science department, and Ragaei El Mallakh, economics, all from the University of Colorado, and Leo Cefkin, political science department, Colorado State University at Fort Collins, Colo.

Prof. Ali Mazrui, a leading African expert from Makerere College in Uganda, will join the center staff spring quarter as a visiting fellow. Author of *Pax Africana* and other books, Prof. Mazrui will deliver three lectures on race and the changing British Commonwealth.

Initially, the center will support and publish research on race factors in American foreign policy and on the relationship between Africa and black Americans in the United States, according to Shepherd. Expansion into other world areas is planned. Programs to train college teachers and government personnel will begin next fall.

Publications underway include "Race Factors in American Foreign Policy," edited by Prof. Shepherd, with a chapter by C. Eric Lincoln, sociology professor at Vassar College and Union Theological Seminary in New York, who wrote the first study of Black Muslims in America. "Aspects of Race Relations in Africa and the Middle East," another book, will include articles primarily by Colorado area faculty.

A monograph series on race will be published. "Africa Today," a periodical published at GSIS since 1967, will include articles on race.

As a preliminary to establishing the Center, the DU Graduate School invited 20 leading scholars to a three-day symposium Feb. 6–8 on the theoretical approaches to international race studies. Nationally known experts attending included Prog. Karl Deutsch, president of the American Political Science Association; Wayne Fredericks, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, now director of the Africa and Middle East Division of the Ford Foundation; Prof. John Letiche, professor of international economics, University of California at Berkeley; Prof. James A. Moss, Associate Dean of International Studies at State University of New York at Buffalo; Prof. Peter Rose, chairman of the sociology department, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

The small group of international race specialists discussed research methods in the critical but seldom studied field, recommending a set of priorities. Among crucial topics they listed for immediate attention are:

(1) The economics of racism—what groups benefit from it and in what ways. Prof. Deutsch suggested that the theories of international trade might well apply to the economic relationships between races within a single country.

(2) Academic supports of racism, a comparative study of the national biases of civil service and university entrance exams that reinforce the dominance of privileged groups, was proposed.

(3) Elimination of ethnocentrism from race studies. American race specialists have a "myopic concern with race and ethnic problems in the U.S., and with little else," according to Prof. Rose.

(4) Conditions under which racism operates in the international system. Prof. Rosenau proposed a series of hypotheses to test this.

(5) Elimination of the double standard in American foreign policy, which Prof. Moss charged was racist in its application. He cited World War II internment of American citizens of Japanese descent but not those of German origin, as one example.

(6) Research on the role of the non-white ethnic groups on American foreign policy. Work in this area has been devoted almost entirely to groups of European origin.

(7) Research on the increasingly critical black-white confrontation in Southern Africa and its implications for American and European foreign policies.

"The conference has helped us see more clearly the tremendous gaps in our knowledge of how race factors operate in world politics," Prof. Shepherd said. "The center has a big job ahead, trying to focus on just a few of these problems."

The DU center is contracting the Institute of Race Relations in London, and a few similar centers throughout the world, to develop and coordinate research projects at the international level.

A MAN OF VISION, FAITH, ENERGY AND DETERMINATION

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the year 1969 marks the 100th anniversary of Claflin College, an outstanding institution of higher learning located in Orangeburg, S.C., which is in my congressional district.

Under the able direction of its president, Dr. H. V. Manning, this predominantly Negro college has made remarkable progress in the past few years. Dr. Manning has received well-deserved acclaim for his dedication to young people, and in my State of South Carolina, he is numbered among our most respected educators.

In an article appropriately titled "A Man of Vision, Faith, Energy and Determination," which appeared in the April 6, 1969, issue of the Orangeburg, S.C., Times and Democrat, we can readily see why Dr. Manning is so successful as a college president. I commend this article to the Congress and the Nation and include it as a part of my remarks as follows:

A MAN OF VISION, FAITH, ENERGY, AND DETERMINATION

Dr. Hubert Vernon Manning, president of Claflin College in Orangeburg, is determined to make Claflin a school that places the greatest emphasis possible on the development of "the complete man."

Dr. Manning, a native of Cheraw, has been in the educational field for 29 years and has definite ideas as to what course Claflin should follow in the next quarter century.

"If we chart our course carefully," he said recently in an exclusive interview, "and continue with our basic philosophy, I think Claflin College will expand and provide a quality education—but, it has to be a controlled growth and not one that will suddenly put us in a position where we are overburdened with students to whom we cannot provide the necessary services of instruction, living quarters and referral facilities."

As the president of an independent predominately Negro college, Dr. Manning is acutely aware of the task cut out for him and his staff. At the same time, he is conversant with the advantages of being a small, independent school.

"When you speak of an independent school," he pointed out, "you're speaking of a struggle, in most cases, to acquire sufficient funds to fully exploit the responsibility of education. But, at the same time, you've got to recognize the more flexible course an independent school can follow as opposed to a college or university that is supported by the state."

Dr. Manning acknowledged that the role of the independent school is gaining in importance but pulling no punches, he also pointed out that the predominately Negro independent college has the same problems of other like schools. "Those problems and plus," he said.

A 1940 graduate of Claflin College, Dr. Manning gained his Bachelor of Divinity Degree in 1945 from Gammon Theological Seminary in Atlanta, Ga.

Not being satisfied to rest on his achievements, he went on to earn his MA from Boston University in 1947; his Doctor of Divinity degree from Gammon in 1956 and took an intensive course of study in college administration at the University of Michigan in 1958.

In 1947 Dr. Manning joined Claflin College as the school chaplain but was appointed in 1951 to serve as head of Wesley Methodist Church in Charleston, a position he held until 1956 when he was elected president of Claflin College.

Dr. Manning had acquired a positive philosophy concerning higher education during his years of study and travel—a philosophy he brought wholly to Claflin when he assumed the presidency.

"I haven't changed that philosophy," he

said, but, perhaps I've had to forgo it at times in the face of realities of the instant."

That philosophy is, "Education should have the purpose of developing the whole man for total service——and not luxury."

Dr. Manning continued, "The predominately Negro college should not be exempted from maximum demands of academic excellence, nor should students not be expected to perform at their highest capacity irrespective of their, quote, 'poor background,' unquote, that is often referred to."

Dr. Manning went on to say he was a firm believer in a solid general educational base, especially in freshman and sophomore years, to expose students to the entire gamut of educational possibilities and then urge them to pick their specialities during their junior year.

However—and there is always a "however" according to Dr. Manning—the practicalities of educational realities have interfered with his philosophy to a degree.

"Simply put," said Dr. Manning emphasizing his point with a pencil tapped lightly on his desk, "want-to and can-do are two different things.

"An independent college wants to do the best job possible and sets goals to that effect. But funds, primarily, dictate what a school can do.

"For example," he said, "I reduced the number of majors from 13 to 7 because I felt that with the resources we had it was better to do a creditable job in a few select areas than a poor job in a variety of areas."

According to Dr. Manning, the reduction of majors was a simple exercise in supply and demand. "We couldn't supply the funds necessary to hire the instructors to meet the demand of the number of majors," he said.

However, he hasn't forgotten those dropped majors. "I fully intend to restore those majors especially in the areas of science. The science fields are wide open and I think that in time this college could fully exploit the tremendous possibilities open to us."

Funds, the bugaboo of the independent school, also dictate the student body level.

"We cannot meet our needs in full," said Dr. Manning, "due to this lack. We operate on an anticipated budget whereas state supported institutions operate on regularly approved budgets. We have to have cash in hand."

But, being an eternal optimist, Dr. Manning looks at the bright side of things. "We have, since 1956, increased the student enrollment from 330 to 818 . . . it was deliberately held to 818 due to limited space facilities.

"But our student-faculty ratio is almost ideal. In 1956 it was one professor to every 35 students. Now the ratio is one to 18. That's an excellent ratio and allows a closer participation by the students in the conduct of the course," said Dr. Manning, referring briefly to the large universities of the nation where, in some instances, there is one instructor for some 200 students in each class.

Asked what was one of the major differences between the independent college, such as Claflin, and state supported schools, Dr. Manning chuckled.

"Besides the question of funds, there is what we call our Ace—ability to choose courses."

He explained Claflin College had the freedom to choose its curriculum on the basis of what their studies indicate would best benefit the student in the future years.

"Of course, there are certain required courses set by the State Board of Education, but from that base we can go where we choose."

Dr. Manning is almost between the horns of a dilemma. He has a virtual flood of applications for admittance but has chosen to keep Claflin College with a relatively small enrollment.

"You hate to turn down an applicant who is qualified for entrance," he said, "but, at the same time, as an independent school with limited funds, we have to pick and select those persons we feel have the potential to develop further than the degree they earn from us."

Claflin College, according to Dr. Manning, spends a great deal of time investigating prospective students beyond the black and white facts on their academic records.

"We talk to people who know them, and hopefully, try to come to an accurate assessment of the student's potential ability.

"Tests are fine, but they don't really show the individual—his hungers, hopes and dreams. We try to find those qualities and hone them to a sharp edge of intelligence by adding the drive to be curious about all things and to seek answers to that curiosity."

Being an educator, besides a minister, Dr. Manning is a practical and realistic man. "We hope never to become a large institution. Claflin will move into the next 25 year period retaining what it has and slowly adding on to the physical property.

"The college," he said, "has estimated a student ceiling of 1,500 to 1,600 and will not go beyond that level.

"I can foresee dangers in too rapid a growth, and would rather have a growth that is considered too slow by some and controlled, rather than jump greatly in numbers and end up with uncontrolled factors," he said.

The most pressing need of Claflin College at this time, 100 years after its founding?

"Exactly what it was in 1869," said Dr. Manning, "a larger endowment."

THE ROAD TO RENEWAL

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to call to the attention of all Members of Congress an article in the Word, official publication of the National Council of Catholic Women, written by Miss Joanne M. Moran. The article is called "The Road to Renewal" and it tells the story of cooperative efforts of Federal, State and private agencies to assist in the rehabilitation of men and women with mental and physical disabilities. As a new member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, I am vitally concerned with our present efforts to provide the best rehabilitation opportunities for men and women who wish to return to the mainstream of society. I commend this article to all Members:

THE ROAD TO RENEWAL

(By Joanne M. Moran)

"And that one talent which is death to hide,
Lodged with me useless, though my soul more bent
To serve therewith my Maker . . ."

These despairing lines from Milton's "Sonnet on His Blindness," written in the 17th century, seldom pass by the scrutinizing eyes of scholars of English literature. Equally poignant thoughts, not as richly poetic perhaps, sear the soul of any individual confronted with a handicap.

And yet how many of the rest of us pass through life reflecting little on the mysterious marvels of our own humanity. Stop and think for a moment what it would be like . . . never to view again a setting sun, the face of a friend, a work of art . . . never to hear again the roar of the sea, a burst of laughter, the sound of a symphony . . . never to move freely again, to "hop" a bus, take a stroll, or to very literally "move a finger." Unfortunately these marvels take on sudden relevance only after someone has been actually deprived of one of them. Even more striking is the fact that some of us have to go so far as to surmount a narrow brush with death before we can experience more fully the profundity of life.

Having reflected on the "what ifs," let's transcend ourselves and focus on the problems, the programs underway, and yes, the tremendous accomplishments of those individuals who are handicapped. According to a National Health Survey more than 22 million men, women and children in the U.S. (12 percent of the population) have some chronic illness or impairment that is severe enough to limit what they can do. Of these, 18 million (12 million of employable age) are limited in the amount or kind of major activity they are able to perform, whether it is working, keeping house or going to school. Add to this some 19 million Americans (one in every ten) suffering from some form of mental or emotional illness and six million more who are mentally retarded and you come up with a startling 47 million.

You might ask, who are the people most likely to suffer from mental or physical handicaps? According to a federally-funded study recently completed by Roper Research Association, "the poorer you are, the greater your chance of being handicapped physically or mentally," and ironically, "if you are both poor and handicapped, the greater your chances of not knowing where to go for rehabilitation or other help." One could speculate that the reverse is equally true: the greater the handicap, the poorer you are apt to be. Why? Because the road to renewal is usually a long and rugged one. It requires a courageous decision on the part of the traveler to shift the focus from what has been lost to what remains. It requires a determination on the part of rehabilitation personnel to see to it that not only every avenue of opportunity is open to the handicapped person, but to strive toward the creation of new occupational areas where the handicapped individual can engage in productive activity.

From both a psychological and economic point of view, improving the disabled person's living conditions via welfare assistance won't help for long unless he can eventually find a job. A job won't help unless he is both suited and trained to perform it, and he cannot be trained without the basic conviction that he has a chance to succeed. Understandably, the quality and quantity of therapy, of training programs and of job placement—the three main spokes on the rehabilitation wheel—cannot be overlooked.

WHAT'S BEING DONE

One cannot discuss the main features of rehabilitation programs without describing the agencies responsible for them. The federal agency primarily involved in the funding, planning and coordination of rehabilitative activities across the country is the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA). RSA is one of four formerly separate components of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) which were united as the "Social and Rehabilitation Service" in 1967. (The other three units are: the Administration on Aging, the Welfare Administration and the Division of Mental Retardation of the Public Health Service.)

The major role of RSA is to support the state-federal program of rehabilitation services. It does so by alloting funds to each state, based on a formula involving the state population and fiscal capacity, measured by its per capita income. RSA's budget for fiscal

1968 was $388 million, a substantial increase over previous years. As a result of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (from which RSA derives its authority), federal allotments to state agencies were increased from seventy-five to eighty percent, and a minimum rate of $1 million to each state was established in order to assure the smaller states an equitable share. "We don't believe in playing a big daddy role concerning the utilization of funds," says Norman Subotnik, RSA information officer. We believe that each state can best handle its own unique rehabilitation problems in an atmosphere which promotes freedom and responsibility rather than in a rigidly structured one." However, each state, of course, is obliged to provide RSA with detailed reports on the nature, extent and progress of its programs. In addition to this, the Associate Regional Commissioner for Rehabilitation Services in each of the nine HEW geographic regions is responsible for improving coordination with state and local governments and with volunteer agencies.

Among the services provided by the federal-state program are: comprehensive evaluation, including medical study and diagnosis; medical, surgical, hospital care, and related therapy; braces and limbs; counseling, guidance and training services; construction and maintenance of facilities; services to families (when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of the handicapped client); job placement and follow-up services.

Any individual with a handicap serious enough to impede his chances of gainful employment is eligible for assistance from a local agency. This includes handicapped youth as well as the aged, the mentally retarded, the mentally ill and restored, alcoholics, special disability groups (the blind, the deaf and speech-impaired), those with heart disease, cancer, stroke, spinal injuries, and even juvenile delinquents and convicted criminals.

RSA also provides special "Project Grants" to state agencies for research and demonstration, for expansion of services and construction of new facilities, for research and training the mentally retarded, grants to better serve disabled migratory agricultural workers, contracts or cooperative projects with business and private industry to provide training in a realistic work setting, and special grants for recruiting and training handicapped and other individuals who wish to embark on careers in vocational rehabilitation.

The rehabilitation of convicted criminals is a relatively new area of activity for RSA. Realizing the importance of raising the quality of personnel who staff prisons, in 1966 the agency awarded a $2.1 million grant for a three-year period to the nonprofit Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training to study problems of training and expanding personnel for prison programs, probational services and parole systems. In 1967 it awarded more than $500,000 to the New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation for an intensive four-year rehabilitation project involving approximately 200 maximum-security prisoners. The state put up almost $900,000 for the project.

In 1961, the agency embarked on a program of developing rehabilitation research and training centers in medical schools around the country; there are now 19 centers in 18 schools.

The pulse of progress in rehabilitation has been a rapid one. Over 200,000 cases were successfully closed in fiscal year 1968; placement of the handicapped by local public employment offices reached 303,000, the highest number since World War II; a record 174,000 were rehabilitated under the already mentioned state-federal program, 16 percent above the previous year; more than 8,000 disabled veterans were in training under Veterans' Administration rehabilitation programs, and the Civil Service Commission reported that 14,500 handicapped men and women were employed by the federal government.

BARRIERS TO GROWTH

Nevertheless, there are still many disabled not reached by rehabilitation programs. RSA estimates that there are some two and one-half million disabled persons in need of vocational rehabilitation services or job opportunities. To this add 270,000 persons who become disabled each year. That means, according to RSA calculations, 300,000 a year must be rehabilitated if we are to make an inroad on the problem. However, it seems that if we are to open the road of renewal to more handicapped Americans, certain weaknesses—certain cracks in an otherwise sturdy pavement must be obliterated.

One distressing factor which struck this writer in reading RSA's statistical reports is the marked discrepancy of total numbers rehabilitated among states. This was true even among states showing both similar percentages of handicapped in their populations and similar amounts of federal and state matching funds. The answer seems to lie somewhere on the turbulent battlegrounds of quality and quantity.

The National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation notes (June 26, 1968 Report to HEW) that "a disabled person in the more populous and wealthy states sometimes has less chance for rehabilitation service than the disabled person in the less populous and poorer states." For example, "on a population basis, West Virginia rehabilitates five times as many of its citizens as New York and seven times as many as California." However, not forgetting the importance of quality, the Committee notes that such factors as pressure for case closures, the problems of the increasingly overburdened counselor, and the amount of monies available can often lead to a preference for "relatively quick, cheap service over the more expensive, long-term service that would lead to greater personal and economic independence." The effect is "to dispose the counselor to seek out the 'easy' case, the person who can be made employable with a minimum expenditure of agency time and money. As a result the difficult case—the severely disabled, multiple handicapped person who most desperately needs help—is shunted aside as 'not feasible.' Quality of service is thus sacrificed for expediency."

Yes, as previously mentioned, the converse of the Roper Report may be equally true: the greater the handicap, the poorer you are apt to be.

Other barriers to growth stem partially from a lack of knowledge of rehabilitation services on the part of the handicapped and their families, and partially from adverse misconceptions of society concerning the handicapped.

To reach the former, Warwick and Legler, a part of the Advertising Council, a volunteer group of representatives from nationally known advertising agencies, is working closely with HEW. TV commercials, bumper stickers, newspaper ads and other media will be utilized to urge the afflicted or their families to write for help. One arresting headline reads: "This man has a disability and he's giving it the best years of his life."

Public opinion surveys cast a gloomy shadow on the sunny performance record of the handicapped. In the previously mentioned Roper Study persons interviewed were shown three hypothetical case histories—a retarded person, a blind man and a young man crippled by a birth defect. "Half favored institutionalizing the retardate; over one-third favored institutionalizing the blind man; over one-fifth the crippled young man." Concerning competitive employment, "only 16 percent believed the retardate should work side-by-side with others at a regular job, 44 percent the blind man, and 36 percent the crippled youth. A deplorable percentage favored sheltered workshops instead.

What can be done to break through the heavy current of public opinion that has been impeding the flow of rehabilitated handicapped into the mainstream of society? To answer this question and to put the answers to work is the task of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, a non-political committee founded in 1947 at the suggestion of President Truman. The Committee does not duplicate the activities of RSA and other agencies (i.e. it does not train, employ, rehabilitate or counsel people). It supplements and complements them. It does so by operating in a strictly "missionary" capacity—using its public relations talents to spread the true story of the handicapped across the nation. Mass media is widely and effectively used, handbooks and guides for the use of state and community committees are prepared, and there is continual communication with federal agencies as well as the Governor's Committee on the Handicapped in each state to assure maximum coordination of activities.

Because the majority of persons serve on the committee as volunteers—some 750 appointed members and alternates, including the chairman and vice chairman—the committee has been able to operate on an annual budget of less than half a million dollars.

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED: MYTHS AND REALITIES

Various studies covering a twenty-year span consistently reflect the favorability of hiring the handicapped. A survey of 111 major corporations, conducted by the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, revealed that 93.5 percent of the companies polled rated the impaired worker average or better in job performance than the unimpaired worker. A survey of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics comparing large samples of impaired and unimpaired workers gave the handicapped a slight 1 percent edge in work performance.

Attendance records of the handicapped are equally impressive. Of the companies surveyed by the President's Committee, 91.5 percent rated the impaired worker average or better in attendance. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the handicapped worker missed less than a half-a-day more per year than the unimpaired worker.

In the realm of safety performance, the President's Committee report revealed 90.4 percent of the companies rated the impaired average or better in his accident record. In the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics survey the handicapped worker had an 8.9 injury rate as compared to a 9.5 percent for the unimpaired.

Despite these factors, many drawbacks persist. One of the major ones, according to the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation (June 20, 1968), is "the employer's fear of incurring economic loss by hiring the disabled." The Committee notes that "there is the opinion that, in some states, workmen's compensation commissions and courts may be going beyond the original intent of workmen's compensation (to assure an adequate livelihood after injury) and awarding exorbitant cash grants to individuals. The case of an individual in California was cited in which the family alleged that the worker's increased smoking and subsequent lung cancer were the direct result of mounting emotional tensions on the job. The court agreed and awarded $150,000. The Committee heard evidence that the courts were increasingly inclined to find for the plaintiff, even in cases where the causal relationship between work and the disability was speculative at best." While the Committee notes that it is in no position to determine

whether this is "fact or fancy," it strongly recommends studies in this area. The President's Committee is currently studying the workmen's compensation problem and is trying to convince employers that properly placed handicapped workers have fewer injuries, that the states should have strong second-injury laws, and that the states should establish machinery for the early rehabilitation of injured workers.

Related to this (workmen's compensation), the Citizen's Committee says, is the problem of unrealistic screening criteria adopted by certain firms. Some companies set physical and mental requirements for employment so high as to virtually exclude all handicapped persons. This is frequently done without reference to job tasks within the company. "Ironically," the Committee points out, "such companies often arbitrarily screen out disabled persons whose skills the company badly needs. We are of the opinion that these rigid standards may have evolved as a reaction to company losses in cases such as those just cited." One anxiety that has no basis in reality stems from the employer's belief that workmen's compensation insurance rates rise as a result of hiring the disabled. The Committee notes that "this myth persists despite many pronouncements by the insurance companies indicating that insurance rates are not affected in the least by hiring the handicapped."

In the category of mental aberrations, the outlook is gradually improving. With good treatment at least seven out of ten patients can leave mental hospitals well enough to hold down jobs. To assist the mentally restored, the President's Committee has been encouraging the nation's mental hospitals and community mental health centers to take steps to involve employers in their daily activities. Several hundred hospitals have formed employer committees in which employers provide advice and guidance on employment to newly discharged patients. "We have discovered," says Bernard Posner, deputy executive secretary of the Committee, "that once employers are given an opportunity to become really involved, they become so committed that they usually volunteer to hire the mentally handicapped without having to be asked."

Concerning the retarded, 25 out of every 30 can achieve at least marginal independence through proper employment placement. IQ isn't the only way to measure ability. For example, The Pennsylvania Department of Employment Security gave a battery of aptitude tests to retarded men and women and found that of 109 cases, 90 scored high on all job aptitudes except general intelligence. Mr. Posner notes that, contrary to popular opinion, "a survey of 2,000 retarded employed by the government revealed that in most cases no job restructuring was required." Furthermore, once properly trained, retardates are better able to cope with repetitive work than are employees of average intelligence.

If you've read this far, it may be safe to say that your sensitivity quotient is more than satisfactory. It's people like you this country needs. It's people like you who, through total acceptance of the handicapped and through community action, can help the handicapped to more fully accept themselves and to become the confident, independent and productive people that they wish to be. The road to renewal will never be a smooth one. However, as Nietzsche once said, "He who has the WHY to live can bear with almost any HOW."

WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. Contact your Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped or local Rehabilitation Agency to find out where volunteer help is most needed in your state. Further information may be obtained by writing to: The President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, 14th and Constitution Avenues, Washington, D.C. 20210 and The Rehabilitation Services Administration, HEW, 330 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201.

2. Make your community aware of the problems of the handicapped; seek out the handicapped in your community to inform them of assistance available to them.

3. Consider the following as possible community projects:

a. Elimination of architectural barriers in your community inaccessible to the handicapped.

b. Enlisting the services of professional people (retired teachers, counselors, therapists, artists) in creating and participating in workshops for the handicapped.

c. Improvement of public transportation facilities in your community which, in most cases, are painfully inadequate. Many disabled persons are unable to participate in rehabilitation programs because they cannot get to the source of the service. You might offer to chauffeur a handicapped person in your area.

d. In addition to your community get your immediate family interested. Some college youngsters have started committees to assist their fellow handicapped students on campus. (Reading for the blind, helping paraplegics, etc.)

e. Your doctor could and should be an important source of information concerning assistance available to the handicapped. However, a recent study revealed that a large percentage of doctors had no idea of publicly-supported rehabilitation facilities in their area. Most of them believe their role extends to seeing to it that patients get physical rehabilitation; only two-thirds say their role extends to vocational training. You might talk to your doctor about the possibility of having free brochures in his office, all of which can be obtained from the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped.

f. If you are interested in resuming your education and going into the field of rehabilitative services, you may write to the Rehabilitation Services Administration or local agency to see what grants might be available in your field of interest. There is an acute shortage of occupational therapists, speech therapists, social workers, counselors, persons trained in therapeutic recreation.

PUBLIC CONCERN FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup organization recently completed a nationwide poll on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation, designed to determine what the attitude of the public really is toward protection of our environment.

It came as no surprise to me to learn that the public—the voting public, I might add—is deeply concerned about the problem. I was interested to learn that the public feels that the issue is so important that it is willing to pay for more adequate environmental protection. Most heartening of all is the fact that the greatest degree of concern was expressed by the youngest members of the group sampled—those in the 21 to 34 age group. These are the decisionmakers for the future and the prime movers in the effort to improve the quality of our life.

The National Wildlife Federation is to be commended for having sponsored this important study—its value is clear and will become even more apparent as time goes on. Our duty is equally clear—to listen, and to respond, adequately and in time.

The above mentioned follows:

INTRODUCTION

Objective of the study

The overall objective of the study was to provide information about the public's attitudes toward our natural surroundings. Specific objectives included:

1. Finding out to what extent the public is concerned about the degradation of our environment;

2. Investigating preferences for urban versus suburban or rural living;

3. Learning what is considered the most pressing problem with regard to our natural surroundings and what the public thinks should be done about the problems;

4. Determining whether or not the public favors setting aside more public land for conservation purposes.

Design of the research

The objectives of the study were carried out by means of a personal interview survey conducted with a national sample of 1503 adults, 21 years of age and older. The interviewing took place during the last ten days in January, 1969. The following questions were asked:

1. You may have heard or read claims that our natural surroundings are being spoiled by air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, destruction of wildlife and so forth. How concerned are you about this—deeply concerned, somewhat concerned, or not very concerned?

2. How much would you be willing to pay each year in additional taxes earmarked to improve our natural surroundings—a small amount such as $10.00 or less, a moderate amount such as $50.00, or a large amount such as $100.00 or more?

3. It has been said that it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population (number of people) if our present living standards are to be maintained. Do you think this will be necessary or not?

4. Which of these kinds of places would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

Respondents were shown a card which read as follows: "Mountains, Seashore, Rural area, Small city, Suburbs, Large city, Somewhere else?"

5. In this country, which one of these do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

Respondents were shown a card which read as follows: *"Air pollution, Water pollution, Soil erosion, Wildlife preservation (birds and animals), Preservation of open green spaces, Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)."*

6. In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem? (Problem chosen in the above question)

7. Are you in favor of setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, and so forth, or not?

Information about the composition and design of the sample and tables of sampling tolerances to have in mind when reading the report will be found at the end of the report.

SOME HIGHLIGHTS OF THE STUDY

Concern About Our Natural Surroundings.—About half (51%) of all persons interviewed stated that they are "Deeply concerned" about the effect of air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, and destruction of wildlife on our natural surroundings. About one-third (35%) said they are "Somewhat concerned" about the problem and twelve per cent said they are "Not very concerned." A greater proportion (62%) of those

who have attended college than of those with less formal education are deeply concerned about these environmental problems. More of the men (56%) than of the women (46%) said they were deeply concerned. Also more of the people living in the western and midwestern states than of those in the East or South are deeply concerned.

Willingness To Pay Taxes To Improve Our Natural Surroundings.—When those interviewed were asked about their willingness to pay additional taxes to improve our natural surroundings, almost three of every four people interviewed said they would be willing to pay something. It was found that those who had said they were "Deeply concerned" about our environmental problems were willing to pay more in taxes to help solve the problems than those who did not express as much concern.

The Most Pressing Environmental Problem.—When those interviewed were shown a list of problems affecting the environment and asked which one they consider most pressing, replies divided as follows:

	Percent
Air pollution	36
Water pollution	32
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	7
Preservation of open green spaces	6
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	5
Soil erosion	4

In cities of over 1,000,000 in population 55 per cent said air pollution was the most pressing problem while only twenty-three per cent of those in small communities and rural areas gave this answer. Preservation of wildlife was of greater concern to people in rural areas than to those in the urban areas.

Those interviewed were also asked what they think can be done to correct the problem chosen as most pressing. Results were as follows:

Problem and most frequently mentioned corrective action

Air pollution: Find way to control auto exhaust. Control of chemical and industrial wastes. Provide filters, smoke control devices.

Water pollution: Stop industrial pollution. Enforce present laws, pass new legislation.

Soil erosion: Plant or maintain vegetation. Use proper agriculture methods.

Wildlife preservation: Enforce game laws. Reduce hunting. Establish wildlife reserves, parks.

Preservation of open green spaces: Set aside land for parks, forests. Better zoning.

Pesticides: Use different, improved pesticides. Government controls, laws.

Will It Be Necessary To Limit Human Population?—The U.S. public is evenly divided as to whether or not it will, at some time, be necesary to limit human population if our present living standards are to be maintained. Younger adults, those who have attended college, and those in the upper income brackets are more inclined to consider limitation of human population necessary than other groups.

Areas Thought Most Pleasant As A Place To Live—If a pleasant place to live were the principal consideration influencing the public there would be a marked reversal of the trend away from rural areas. Those interviewed were shown the following list of areas and asked which of them they think would be most pleasant as places to live. Results divided as follows:

	Percent
Rural area	30
Small city	25
Suburbs	18
Mountains	15
Seashore	9
Large city	6
Other	1

Analyses by size of community show that many big city dwellers have a yearning for smaller places and those in rural areas have no yen for the big city.

Should More Land Be Set Aside For Conservation Purposes?—Three of every four people interviewed favor setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, etc. Young people, those who have states are more inclined to this view than attended college, and those in the eastern other segments of the population.

THE FINDINGS

CONCERN ABOUT OUR NATURAL SURROUNDINGS

The question: You may have heard or read claims that our natural surroundings are being spoiled by air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, destruction of wildlife and so forth. How concerned are you about this—deeply concerned, somewhat concerned, or not very concerned?

	Percent					Number of interviews
	Deeply concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	No opinion	Total	
National results	51	35	12	2	100	1,503
By sex:						
Men	56	31	10	3	100	744
Women	46	38	14	2	100	759
By age:						
21 to 34 years	51	41	7	1	100	403
35 to 49 years	50	38	10	2	100	476
50 years and older	52	28	16	4	100	605
(Undesignated, 19.)						
By education:						
College	62	32	6	(1)	100	395
High school	52	37	10	1	100	748
Grade school	39	34	20	7	100	352
(Undesignated, 8.)						
By annual family income:						
$10,000 and over	58	34	8	0	100	449
$7,000 to $9,999	53	38	8	1	100	336
By annual family income—Continued						
$5,000 to $6,999	55	35	8	2	100	237
Under $5,000	41	34	20	5	100	463
(Undesignated, 18.)						
By size of community:						
1,000,000 and over	51	36	8	5	100	277
250,000 to 999,999	52	35	11	2	100	296
50,000 to 249,999	55	35	9	1	100	235
2,500 to 49,999	52	31	16	1	100	233
Under 2,500	46	37	14	3	100	462
By region of country:						
East	46	38	12	4	100	425
Midwest	56	34	9	1	100	400
South	44	36	16	4	100	428
West	59	31	10	(1)	100	250

[1] Less than half of 1 percent.

WILLINGNESS TO PAY TAXES TO IMPROVE NATURAL SURROUNDINGS

The question: How much would you be willing to pay each year in additional taxes earmarked to improve our natural surroundings—a small amount such as $10 or less, a moderate amount such as $50, or a large amount such as $100 or more?

	In percent						Number of interviews
	Small amount	Moderate amount	Large amount	None	Don't know	Total	
National results	51	18	4	9	18	100	1,503
By sex:							
Men	49	21	6	9	15	100	744
Women	53	16	2	9	20	100	759
By age:							
21 to 34 years	53	25	5	5	12	100	403
35 to 49 years	52	20	3	8	17	100	476
50 years and older	49	13	4	12	22	100	605
Undesignated—19							
By education:							
College	45	30	12	5	8	100	395
High school	52	20	2	9	17	100	748
Grade school	54	6	1	12	27	100	352
Undesignated—8							
By annual family income:							
$10,000 and over	45	28	10	6	11	100	449
$7,000 to $9,999	52	20	3	10	15	100	336
$5,000 to $6,999	59	15	2	8	16	100	237
Under $5,000	52	10	1	11	26	100	463
Undesignated—18							
By size of community:							
1,000,000 and over	52	19	5	4	20	100	277
250,000 to 999,999	43	28	6	8	15	100	296
50,000 to 249,999	53	16	2	12	17	100	235
2,500 to 49,999	49	18	4	12	17	100	233
Under 2,500	56	13	2	9	20	100	462
By region of country:							
East	49	17	6	9	19	100	425
Midwest	56	19	3	11	11	100	400
South	51	15	3	6	25	100	428
West	47	24	3	9	17	100	250

THE MOST PRESSING ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM

The question: In this country, which one of these (Respondent shown card) do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

[In percent]

	National results	By sex		By age		
		Men	Women	21 to 34 years	35 to 49 years	50 years and older
Air pollution	36	33	40	42	39	31
Water pollution	32	36	27	32	32	31
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	7	6	8	3	6	11
Preservation of open green spaces	6	4	7	7	7	4
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	5	6	4	6	4	5
Soil erosion	4	6	3	2	3	6
Don't know	10	9	11	8	9	12
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of interviews	1,503	744	759	403	476	605

Note: Undesignated, 19.

The question: In this country, which one of these (Respondent shown card) do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

[In percent]

	By education			By annual family income			
	College	High school	Grade school	$10,000 and over	$7,000 to $9,999	$5,000 to $6,999	Under $5,000
Air pollution	40	39	29	42	42	36	28
Water pollution	34	31	31	32	32	33	30
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	5	8	7	6	7	6	8
Preservation of open green spaces	8	5	4	9	5	5	3
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	4	5	7	3	5	7	7
Soil erosion	3	4	5	3	1	5	7
Don't know	6	8	17	5	8	8	17
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of interviews	(395)	(748)	(352)	(449)	(336)	(237)	(463)
Undesignated		8			18		

The question: In this country, which one of these (Respondent shown card) do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

	By size of community					By region of country			
	1,000,000 and over	250,000 to 999,999	50,000 to 249,999	2,500 to 49,999	Under 2,500	East	Midwest	South	West
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Air pollution	55	41	41	29	23	43	34	26	47
Water pollution	22	33	32	34	34	31	38	30	24
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	6	5	5	8	10	5	6	10	6
Preservation of open green spaces	6	5	5	8	6	6	5	6	6
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	1	3	3	6	10	3	5	7	6
Soil erosion	2	4	4	4	5	2	4	6	5
Don't know	8	9	10	11	12	10	8	15	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of interviews	277	296	235	233	462	425	400	428	250

What public would do to correct environmental problems

Following the question reported on the immediately preceding pages under the heading: "The Most Pressing Environmental Problem," those interviewed were asked the following question with respect to the problem chosen as most pressing:

In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?

The following tables summarize replies:

Air pollution

	Percent
Find way to control auto exhaust	24
Control of chemical and industrial wastes	17
Provide filters, smoke control devices	16
Enforce present laws or pass new legislation	10
Careful study, research	7
Do away with gasoline engine	6
Control burning of rubbish or garbage	3
Move industry to the suburbs	2
Educate the public	1
Other answers	3
Don't know	31
Total [1]	120

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 538.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent air pollution include:

"More federal money put into this problem."

"Get in a specialist and see what he could do to get it corrected."

"Move some of the industry to the suburbs instead of in the city."

"Maybe if they would take some of these chemical places way out."

"If there was some way they could control filtering and doing away with gases if possible."

"Education of the general public. Tax according to displacement of the engine instead of weight of cars. Industry tax rebate to encourage new equipment."

"Stricter control and very heavy fines on offenders—especially large corporations."

"Industry's the guiltiest. Open burning should be stopped by individuals. Perhaps a control center could tell us proper air currents to burn in."

"Quit burning old cars—put things on cars to stop the gas pollution."

"I wonder if they couldn't have an airplane go over and fumigate everyplace."

"Get after those technical facilities that cause this in cities primarily."

"Leave it up to some government official with that knowledge."

"Apply the same sort of policy here as has been applied to problems of national defense—sponsored research, an educational element."

"Let the government get more involved in finding the solutions."

"Through the federal government—by spending money. Make a study of it."

"The present laws regarding air pollution should be enforced."

"I think it's pretty much up to the state to make and enforce legislation to take care of it. Make whoever is causing this to pay out of the pocket for whatever they're contributing. Each one should take care of whatever he's causing."

"Electric cars for less pollution."

"Hurry up and put on the market new cars that go gasless; no pollution from cars would help."

"They talk about these new cars which wouldn't have much exhaust. That would be one thing. I've also heard that industry could do something different if they wanted to."

"Really I think the auto manufacturers must do something about it. We'll have to pay dearly for it. It's up to the auto makers."

"Find means of eliminating the poisons going up in the air, like burning garbage, gasoline fumes."

"Get rid of cars and do something about airplane fumes."

"Take care of the earth first and the moon second."

"We'll probably have to start putting factories way out into the suburban areas. Not allow new buildings that would pollute air to build in cities."

"New highways to eliminate truck traffic in communities."

"Start new cities where there is land."

"Close down places which do not make an honest effort to correct air pollution."

"Educate people not to pollute and respect all forms of anti-pollution requests."

"Cut out all the automobiles and go back to horses and buggies."

"More chemical research to eliminate by-products of the combustion process."

"Stopping or doing away with carbon monoxide gas in cars."

"Be more careful the way they use chemicals and gases and what you have that creates all this."

"They should find out something about it. The automobiles and the sewage is terrible."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Water pollution

	Percent
Stop industrial pollution	26
Enforce present laws, pass new legislation	23
Keep sewage out of water	12
Individuals should be more careful	8
Careful study, research	5
Sewage conversion plants	5
Educate the public	3
Chemically purify the water	3
Use filters	2
Other answers	2
Don't know	27
Total [1]	116

[1] Total exceeds 100 percent due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 475.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent water pollution include:

"Every city and town should have sewage conversion plants; also laws for factories to quit dumping in rivers."

"Find another way to get rid of the scraps from the factories."

"Correct industrial waste being dumped into rivers and lakes. Also educate the farmers to take care of streams—insecticides and so forth are allowed to enter them."

"A lot taken out of sea water so that it can be used for drinking—a substitute."

"Watch fertilizer and application of herbicides and pesticides getting into our water supply."

"The only thing I know is to spend a lot of money to try to clean up the rivers and the streams and then restrict the use of them."

"Putting responsibility to the ones who are polluting it."

"Well all they do is spend money! The factories should clean up their mess and use different soap—no detergent."

"They should do something to keep people from throwing things in the water, and companies dumping junk in it."

"Quit dumping all these sewers in the streams."

"Give industry tax incentive to reduce the amount of pollution dumped into streams and force cities and towns to cease dumping raw sewage into streams."

"We need to get on to all our big local plants as they are polluting our streams."

"Stop throwing garbage in water—especially factory wastes. Should be treated. Government should induce, not force, responsible parties."

"Stricter law enforcement as to things put into the water by factories, including the packing houses."

"Big plants should not dump waste in water we have to use."

"Start on largest amount—industrial pollution—and reduce it 50%. That's what's killing all the fish."

"Put medicine in the water—chemicals."

"Clean up areas that drain into main river. Stricter enforcement of litter laws."

"All government involved should bear down on those polluting our waters."

"Just have better laws."

"Quite a bit. Complicated, takes a lot of money. Government control. Federal industry could help."

"That would have to be attacked on many fronts. Stricter policing. Well, those persons that are responsible for water pollution will have to be pulled up on a shorter leash."

"Get after the industries and have more control on the state level. Have the state control it."

"To use more of our tax money for this purpose rather than war. Clamp down on large corporations who pollute waters."

"Put teeth in the law; increase fines to be stiff enough so that people won't throw waste and garbage in the water."

"Do like Sioux City has done—build the sewage disposal plant. These small towns in Iowa are the big offenders."

"More educational programs to direct the people."

"Experts are paid to do this."

"Curb industry's use of it or make them clean it up. Sewer facilities—improve the private facilities; some of them are inadequate."

"Have a committee and deeply look into the situation and correct it."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Soil erosion

	Percent
Plant or maintain vegetation	27
Proper agriculture methods	14
Have government sponsored program	11
Research, new methods to retain soil	7
Other answers	8
Don't know	37
Total [1]	104

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 74.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent soil erosion include:

"Let the soil conservation people and the county take care of the job."

"Plant grass, trees, shrubs to hold soil."

"Starting with the soil—keep it in good condition and other things will be helped."

"Work on this more than they have before."

"Keep the land planted. Sow or plant trees."

"Leave more of our hilly land covered with grass or trees."

"Plant more pastures."

"Not give raises to public officials and use it for conservation."

"Sponsor a program to help make the land richer and more fertile."

"Build levees or such every so often to keep soil from washing away."

"You would have to control all streams that overflow and do damage. Proper planting of vegetation to control the runoff."

"I think problems such as these are best taken care of by following recommendations of a good agriculture college."

"People have to learn to take care of property."

"I work with soil conservation, erosion control—dam the creeks, contour plowing, cover crops."

"Sowing grass and legumes."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Wildlife preservation

	Percent
Enforce game laws	40
Reduce hunting	25
Establish wildlife reserves, parks	20
Control air and water pollution	7
Other answers	9
Don't know	16
Total [1]	117

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 76.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to preserve wildlife include:

"Doing a pretty good job. Growing population causes loss of birds and animals. Better hunting controls and better park control—danger of unbalancing nature at present time."

"Stricter enforcement of game laws. Control over snowmobiles."

"Enforce the laws such as hunting and fishing."

"Make sure game wardens enforce the law like they should."

"More enforcement of present laws."

"Keep areas for this purpose. Have wildlife reserves wherever possible."

"Development of areas, such as game preserves."

"Cut down on hunting and amount of tags issued. Control fishing and have more reserves, more national parks."

"Set aside more places for preservation of wildlife which is becoming scarce."

"Shorter hunting season."

"Be more careful—not to kill too many."

"We can prevent forest fires."

"The big industry leased all the land, so we have no wildlife to enjoy. Stop this."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Preservation of open green spaces

	Percent
Set aside land for parks, forests	31
Better zoning	31
Limit the spread of commercialization	11
Other answers	4
Don't know	30
Total [1]	107

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 83.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to preserve open green spaces include:

"They should set aside more government property for national parks for people to enjoy the outdoors."

"More land for parks, etc."

"More state and federal parks and reservations maintained."

"More sewage treatment, better treatment plants, more national forests."

"Could give us more parks for more outdoors."

"Create more parks and plant more trees. I miss the forest we had in Germany."

"Don't ruin the countryside by building large throughways. Better government control of scenic areas. Don't allow commercialization of them and keep them open for all citizens to enjoy."

"Should be some type of control for these junk heaps, billboards, and the ruination in areas by industry and by waste."

"Better planning, better zoning."

"Limit housing developments and construction and better maintenance of it."

"Limit population."

"Laws are restricted. Pass legislation for parks and for wildlife reserves. Air and water pollution are also very important. Limit ex-

pansion of cities and making parks and so forth."

"Zoning."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Pesticides

	Percent
Use different, improved pesticides	26
Government controls, laws	18
Use with discretion	14
Stop using pesticides	7
Other answers	6
Don't know	31
Total [1]	102

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 112.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent the harmful effects of pesticides include:

"Stronger government controls over pesticides. I don't use it on this piece of property. I'm a bird feeder."

"They should put a restriction on home owners using pesticides. Government controlled."

"Laws to control use of sprays and content of chemicals such as DDT."

"Programs for eradication by the Department of Agriculture."

"They are not labeled right. They are deadly if not used right. They are improperly advertised and used excessively. The government should regulate usage."

"The person who uses pesticides should try to understand the uses and danger of these. Read directions and use carefully."

"Be careful of the kinds used, so there is no harm to people and our foods."

"Stop using it."

"The sprays and the fertilizers wash into the rivers and kill the fish. It's overdone entirely. Go back to good old manure for fertilizing."

"Use some space money maybe for better sprays and powders."

"Use liquids rather than dust—won't spread so."

"Try to find other ways to eliminate pests."

"Correct pesticides by spraying and dusting."

WILL IT BE NECESSARY TO LIMIT HUMAN POPULATION?

The question: It has been said that it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population (number of people) if our present living standards are to be maintained. Do you think this will be necessary or not?

	Percent				
	Necessary	Not necessary	Don't know	Total	Number of interviews
National results	44	43	13	100	(1,503)
By sex:					
Men	47	42	11	100	(744)
Women	41	45	14	100	(759)
By age:					
21 to 34 years	55	37	8	100	(403)
35 to 49 years	44	43	13	100	(476)
50 years and older	36	48	16	100	(605)
Undesignated, 19					
By education:					
College	60	34	6	100	(395)
High school	45	44	11	100	(748)
Grade school	29	51	20	100	(352)
Undesignated, 8					
By annual family income:					
$10,000 and over	53	38	9	100	(449)
$7,000 to $9,999	52	39	9	100	(336)
$5,000 to $6,999	41	45	14	100	(237)
Under $5,000	32	50	18	100	(463)
Undesignated, 18:					
By size of community:					
1,000,000 and over	50	36	14	100	(277)
250,000 to 999,999	48	40	12	100	(296)
50,000 to 249,999	43	46	11	100	(235)
2,500 to 49,999	42	47	11	100	(233)
Under 2,500	38	47	15	100	(462)
By region of country:					
East	45	39	16	100	(425)
Midwest	44	47	9	100	(400)
South	36	47	17	100	(428)
West	54	39	7	100	(250)

AREAS THOUGHT TO BE MOST PLEASANT AS A PLACE TO LIVE

The question: Which of these kinds of places (respondent shown card) would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

		By sex		By age		
	National results (percent)	Men (percent)	Women (percent)	21 to 34 years (percent)	35 to 49 years (percent)	50 years and older (percent)
Rural area	30	30	30	27	32	30
Small city	25	24	27	20	22	31
Suburbs	18	17	19	16	22	17
Mountains	15	17	12	20	15	11
Seashore	9	10	9	11	11	6
Large city	6	5	7	8	4	6
Other	1	(1)	1	1	(1)	1
Don't know	1	1	1	2	1	1
Total [2]	105	104	106	105	107	103
Number of interviews	(1,503)	(744)	(759)	(403)	(476)	(605)

[1] Less than one-half of 1 percent.
[2] Totals exceed 100 percent since a few respondents named more than one area.

The question: Which of these kinds of places (respondent shown card) would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

[In percent]

	By education			By annual family income			
	College	High school	Grade school	$10,000 and over	$7,000 to $9,999	$5,000 to $6,999	Under $5,000
Rural area	20	31	36	23	31	32	32
Small city	24	24	29	22	24	23	30
Suburbs	18	20	14	23	19	14	16
Mountains	15	15	14	16	15	17	12
Seashore	19	8	3	17	7	9	5
Large city	9	5	6	6	8	6	6
Other	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
Don't know	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
Total [1]	107	106	103	109	106	103	103
Number of interviews	395	748	352	449	336	237	463
Undesignated		8			18		

[1] Totals exceed 100 percent since a few respondents named more than 1 area.

The question: Which of these kinds of places (respondent shown card) would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

[In percent]

	By size of community					By region of country			
	1,000,000 and over	250,000 to 999,999	50,000 to 249,999	2,500 to 49,999	Under 2,500	East	Midwest	South	West
Rural area	13	14	16	20	64	23	33	39	20
Small city	22	21	35	44	16	16	30	27	32
Suburbs	28	27	22	11	8	27	17	14	10
Mountains	14	13	15	16	15	14	11	14	24
Seashore	13	15	11	8	3	13	7	8	9
Large city	13	13	4	2	1	9	6	5	4
Other	1	1	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	0	1
Don't know	3	1	1	(1)	1	2	0	1	3
Total [2]	107	105	105	101	108	104	105	108	103
Number of interviews	277	296	235	233	462	425	400	428	250

[1] Less than half of 1 percent.
[2] Totals exceed 100 percent since a few respondents named more than 1 area.

SHOULD MORE PUBLIC LAND BE SET ASIDE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES?

The question: Are you in favor of setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, and so forth, or not?

	Yes Percent	No Percent	Don't know Percent	Total Percent	Number of interviews
National results	75	19	6	100	1,503
By sex:					
Men	76	19	5	100	744
Women	74	19	7	100	759
By age:					
21 to 34 years	83	13	4	100	403
35 to 49 years	76	18	6	100	476
50 years and older	69	24	7	100	605
Undesignated: 19					
By education:					
College	82	15	3	100	395
High school	78	18	4	100	748
Grade school	64	26	10	100	352
Undesignated: 8.					
By annual family income:					
$10,000 and over	81	16	3	100	449
$7,000 to $9,999	81	15	4	100	336
$5,000 to $6,999	75	18	7	100	237
Under $5,000	66	25	9	100	463
Undesignated: 18.					
By size of community:					
1,000,000 and over	79	15	6	100	277
250,000 to 999,999	78	17	5	100	296
50,000 to 249,999	80	16	4	100	235
2,500 to 49,999	78	19	3	100	233
Under 2,500	66	25	9	100	462
By region of country:					
East	82	12	6	100	425
Midwest	76	20	4	100	400
South	68	24	8	100	428
West	75	21	4	100	250

TECHNICAL APPENDICES

Composition of the sample

NATIONAL

	Percent
Sex of respondent:	
Men	46.6
Women	53.4
Total	100.0
Age of respondent:	
21 to 34 years	27.6
35 to 49 years	32.2
50 years and older	39.2
Undesignated	1.0
Total	100.0
Education of respondent:	
College (complete and incomplete)	22.5
High school (complete and incomplete)	50.5
Grade school or no schooling	26.8
Undesignated	.2
Total	100.0
Annual family income:	
$10,000 and over	27.4
$7,000 to $9,999	22.5
$5,000 to $6,999	16.1
$3,000 to $4,999	13.2
Under $3,000	19.5
Undesignated	1.3
Total	100.0
Size of community:	
1,000,000 and over, including urban fringe	19.3
250,000 to 999,999, including urban fringe	20.1
50,000 to 249,000, including urban fringe	15.8
2,500 to 49,999	15.0
Under 2,500	29.8
Total	100.0

REGION OF COUNTRY

East: Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia	29.6
Midwest: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri	26.8
South: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana	27.3
West: Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, California, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Hawaii	16.3
Total	100.0

NOTE.—Allowance for persons not at home was made by means of a "times-at-home" technique rather than by "call-backs." Either procedure is a standard method for reducing the sample bias that would otherwise result from under-representation in the sample of persons who are difficult to find at home. All results reported including the composition of the sample are based on data in which a "times-at-home" weighting has been incorporated. The actual number of interviews made for various population groups are reported in the findings.

DESIGN OF THE SAMPLE

The design of the sample is that of a replicated probability sample down to the block level in the case of urban areas, and to segments of townships in the case of rural areas.

After stratifying the nation geographically and by size of community in order to insure conformity of the sample with the latest available estimate of the Census Bureau of the distribution of the adult population, sampling locations or areas were selected on a strictly random basis. The interviewers had no choice whatsoever concerning the part of the city or county in which they conducted their interviews.

Interviewers were given maps of the area to which they were assigned, with a starting point indicated, and required to follow a specified direction. At each occupied dwelling unit, interviewers were instructed to select respondents by following a prescribed systematic method and by a male-female assignment. This procedure was followed until the assigned number of interviews was completed.

Since this sampling procedure is designed to produce a sample which approximates the adult civilian population (21 and older) living in private households in the United States (that is, excluding those in prisons and hospitals, hotels, religious and educational institutions, and on military reservations), the survey results can be applied to this population for the purpose of projecting percentages into number of people. The manner in which the sample is drawn also produces a sample which approximates the population of private households in the United States. Therefore, survey results can also be projected in terms of number of households when appropriate.

SAMPLING TOLERANCES

In interpreting survey results, it should be borne in mind that all sample surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the extent to which the results may differ from what would be obtained if the whole population surveyed had been interviewed. The size of such sampling errors depends largely on the number of interviews.

The following tables may be used in estimating the sampling error of any percentage in this report. The computed allowances have

taken into account the effect of the sample design upon sampling error. They may be interpreted as indicating the range (plus or minus the figure shown) within which the results of repeated samplings in the same time period could be expected to vary, 95 per cent of the time, assuming the same sampling procedure, the same interviewers, and the same questionnaire.

The first table shows how much allowance should be made for the sampling error of a percentage:

RECOMMENDED ALLOWANCE FOR SAMPLING ERROR OF A PERCENTAGE

[In percentage points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)] [1]

	Sample size						
	1,500	1,000	750	600	400	200	100
Percentages near 10	2	2	3	3	4	5	7
Percentages near 20	2	3	4	4	5	7	9
Percentages near 30	3	4	4	4	6	8	10
Percentages near 40	3	4	4	5	6	8	11
Percentages near 50	3	4	4	5	6	8	11
Percentages near 60	3	4	4	5	6	8	11
Percentages near 70	3	4	4	4	6	8	10
Percentages near 80	2	3	4	4	5	7	9
Percentages near 90	2	2	3	3	4	5	7

[1] The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

The table would be used in the following manner: Let us say a reported percentage is 33 for a group which includes 1500 respondents. Then we go to row "percentages near 30" in the table and go across to the column headed "1500." The number at this point is 3, which means that the 33 percent obtained in the sample is subject to a sampling error of plus or minus 3 points. Another way of saying it is that very probably (95 chances out of 100) the average of repeated samplings would be somewhere between 30 and 36, with the most likely figure the 33 obtained.

In comparing survey results in two samples, such as, for example, men and women, the question arises as to how large must a difference between them be before one can be reasonably sure that it reflects a real difference. In the tables below, the number of points which must be allowed for in such comparisons is indicated.

Two tables are provided. One is for percentages near 20 or 80; the other for percentages near 50. For percentages in between, the error to be allowed for is between that shown in the two tables:

RECOMMENDED ALLOWANCE FOR SAMPLING ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE

[In percentage points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)] [1]

TABLE A.—PERCENTAGES NEAR 20 OR PERCENTAGES NEAR 80

	Size of sample			
	750	600	400	200
Size of sample:				
750	5			
600	5	6		
400	6	6	7	
200	8	8	8	10

TABLE B.—PERCENTAGES NEAR 50

	Size of sample			
	750	600	400	200
Size of sample:				
750	6			
600	7	7		
400	7	8	8	
200	10	10	10	12

[1] The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not arger than the figures shown.

Here is an example of how the tables would be used: Let us say that 50 per cent of men respond a certain way and 40 per cent of women respond that way also, for a difference of 10 percentage points between them. Can we say with any assurance that the 10-point difference reflects a real difference between men and women on the question? The sample contains approximately 750 men and 750 women.

Since the percentages are near 50, we consult Table B, and since the two samples are about 750 persons each, we look for the number in the column headed "750" which is also in the row designated "750." We find the number 6 here. This means that the allowance for error should be 6 points, and that in concluding that the percentage among men is somewhere between 4 and 16 points higher than the percentage among women we should be wrong only about 5 per cent of the time. In other words, we can conclude with considerable confidence that a difference exists in the direction observed and that it amounts to at least 4 percentage points.

If, in another case, men's responses amount to 22 per cent, say, and women's 24 per cent, we consult Table A because these percentages are near 20. We look in the column headed "750" and see that the number is 5. Obviously, then, the 2-point difference is inconclusive.

LAKE ERIE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to give my very strong support to the amendments proposed by the gentlemen from Illinois. This amendment parallels very closely the legislation which I introduced last year. The problems of pollution in the Great Lakes have been one of my central concerns since I came to the Congress. I have been in continuous contact with the Corps of Engineers, demanding that the dumping of polluted materials into Lake Erie be halted at once. Although the responses I received from the Corps of Engineers, have been polite and they have assured me of their willingness to "cooperate whenever possible," the dumping of polluted material has not stopped. Apparently assurances of good will have little effect on final policy.

I very strongly feel that the Congress must take affirmative action now. After years of attempting to halt the dumping of polluted materials through persuasion, it appears that only forceful legislation can correct the problem.

Certainly Lake Erie is among the most seriously polluted bodies of water in the world today. What was once a tremendous fishing ground is now nearly devoid of fish life. What were once beautiful beaches have now been taken over by slime and refuse and grassy growths. There has been talk about the problem for years, both here in the Halls of Congress and in hundreds of meetings in the Lake Erie States. The time for talk is over. The time for action is now. We cannot afford to wait until Lake Erie deteriorates any further. We cannot afford to wait until the pollution levels in the other Great Lakes reach the deplorable level of Lake Erie.

There is simply no excuse for the Government to willfully participate in the further pollution of the Great Lakes. In 1967, more than 5.5 million cubic yards of dredged, polluted materials were dumped in Lake Erie by the Government or by private firms under Government contract. That amount increased in 1968. We cannot tolerate a situation by which the Government continually ignores the best interests of the Nation and the national commitment to halt water pollution.

It would be two-faced for this Congress to impose strict regulations and responsibilities on private firms polluting our waters while refusing to accept equal responsibility for Government actions.

The stoppage of Government dumping of dredged materials will not, of course, solve the entire problem. But it will be a significant step in the right direction. It will illustrate for once and for all that there is a national commitment to clean up our waters.

Clean water is essential to continued growth and well-being of the Nation. There has never been a better opportunity for the Congress to recognize the responsibility for assuring that future.

I support this amendment and I urge the Congress to approve it.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S BUDGET: MORE OF THE SAME

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, after 3 months of waiting, Congress has at last been given a glimpse of President Nixon's recommended budget priorities for the coming fiscal year. The priorities embodied in the revised fiscal year 1970 budget leave little doubt that the Nixon administration has no plans for effecting the drastic reordering of our national priorities that is so urgently needed. Rather, the President's message indicates the administration intends to pursue a status quo course that continues to allocate billions to the Pentagon and economizes on already inadequate domestic programs.

The President's revised budget provides no relief for the millions of Americans now suffering from poverty and inadequate employment, housing and educational opportunities; indeed, the Presi-

dent's recommendations provide no relief for those most affected by inflation—the aged and others dependent on fixed payments and benefits. In fact, the President's budget proposes to take away from the elderly $1 billion in social security benefits. President Johnson's fiscal year 1970 budget had proposed a 10-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits, effective January 1, 1970. The Nixon administration's budget reduces the increase to 7 percent effective February 1, 1970.

While President Nixon has recommended a significant reduction in the rise in social security payments proposed by the Johnson administration, reductions in the Pentagon's budget are scant and illusory. In the face of cuts in nearly every domestic program, the Nixon administration's budget, nevertheless, calls for an increase in non-Vietnam military spending of about $6 billion.

As economists have pointed out, the greatest cause of our inflationary problems is increased military spending. Yet, the revised budget totally ignores that fact. Instead the administration has decided to economize on domestic programs, and concurrently, to pour more billions in non-Vietnam expenditures into the coffers of the military-industrial complex. The budget recommendations will only aggravate the crisis in the cities and, additionally, will fail to curb the inflation which will only be significantly reduced by the prompt termination of the war in Vietnam and large cuts in military spending.

I want to call my colleagues' attention to a column by Joseph Kraft which appeared in the Washington Post of April 15. Mr. Kraft's cogent analysis of the real effects of President Nixon's budgetary proposals emphasizes the need for Congress independently to fashion a budget which gives first priority to our domestic needs, and which attacks inflation at its real course, namely, increased military spending. Congress should take seriously its own responsibility to establish budgetary priorities that reflect our urgent domestic crisis:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1969]

GOP No Better Than Johnson at Curbing Defense Spending

(By Joseph Kraft)

Hard-nosed anti-inflationary Republican skinflints turn out to be no better at controlling defense spending than the unbuttoned loose livers of the Johnson Administration. That is the basic message of the revised 1970 budget now being submitted to the Congress by the Nixon Administration.

Accordingly, even sophisticated men with an aversion to the indiscriminate must now consider the possibility that the only way to control defense spending is through the favorite crudity of the Congressional conservatives. That is by putting an arbitrary ceiling on defense spending for next year.

The Nixon budgetary revisions offer a particularly good measure of just how monstrous the defense spending monster really is. For it is possible to compart directly cuts made in nondefense projects as against cuts made in military spending.

On the non-defense side, the Nixon Administration has recommended cuts of $2.9 billion—which is nearly three times what is coming out of the defense hide. Moreover, some of the non-defense cuts raise serious questions of equity, while others raise political risks.

Old people, for example, are probably the principal victims of the inflation the present budgetary cuts are supposed to arrest. But one of the major cuts now recommended comes from a reduction in the scheduled rise in Social Security payments.

Substantial reductions are also recommended for the Departments of Agriculture and Transportation. These cuts will adversely affect two of the most potent political forces in the country—the farmers and the road-builders.

Set against the suggested cuts in non-defense spending, the effort to make economies in the military field is pathetic. A little less than half the $1.1 billion cut recommended in military expenses is real. The biggest chunk—an estimated $600 million—comes from a reduction in B–52 sorties flown in Vietnam that will be very difficult to sustain.

Left intact in the defense budget are a vast range of dubious expenditures that were in fact sharply questioned by the Budget Bureau in the course of the most recent review of military spending. Billions, for example, are spent on diesel submarines that do not serve to meet any conceivable threat, and on fighter planes that come at several million dollars apiece whereas the Soviet planes they would presumably oppose cost about $800,000 each.

The upshot of this unsavings program can perhaps best be felt when Vietnamese costs are abstracted from military spending. For while reductions are being made in Vietnamese spending, and virtually everything else in the budget is either being held or reduced, non-Vietnamese defense spending will go up this year—by nearly $6 billion.

It would be nice to think that there are available good, sophisticated ways to control the defense budget that the Nixon Administration would apply in time. But it is not easy to see Defense Secretary Melvin Laird using those tools. On the contrary, he seems bent on currying favor with the military brass, and in whittling down the clout of the civilian skeptics in the offices of Systems Analysis and International Security Affairs.

Neither is there any sign that the White House has the stomach for a confrontation on military spending. And without White House backing, the Bureau of the Budget, with all due respect, is not potent.

If a leash is going to be applied, it will have to be done by the Congress. For practical purposes that means an alliance between the liberals who want to cut defense spending to get funds for domestic purposes, and the conservatives who oppose virtually all government spending.

It just happens that the conservatives have invented a device for chopping expenditures. It is the device of the arbitrary ceiling, which was enforced against the Johnson Administration last year as the price for putting through the surtax by Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Sen. John Williams, the Republican Scrooge from Delaware.

This year President Nixon has to go to the Congress for renewal of the surtax. And if they are serious about cutting defense, the liberals should be thinking hard about striking an alliance with the conservatives to make the Administration accept a flat ceiling on defense spending—a ceiling that might, appropriately, be set at pre-Vietnam levels.

A PROPOSED "WORKABLE ALTERNATIVE" IN VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most clear-eyed assessments of where we stand in Vietnam that I have read in some time was a guest editorial in the March 22 Saturday Review. Author of the editorial was Arthur M. Cox, a writer, consultant, and former senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.

Mr. Cox weighed several possible means of bringing the conflict to an end. As a "workable alternative," he suggested a new interim government in Saigon that would include representatives of all major political factions, including the NLF. An international peacekeeping force would be an important part of such a plan, which would be complex and difficult to put into effect. As Mr. Cox acknowledged:

This solution will undoubtedly require months of negotiations with frequent periods of doubt and frustration, but if we keep our eye on the objective of genuine self-determination it may be successfully achieved. Certainly the negotiation of such a solution is preferable to other choices such as another escalation of the war, or unilateral withdrawal, or the festering cancer of indefinite stalemate. This war cannot be solved by military victory; it must be ended by political compromise.

Following is the complete editorial:

Is Peace in Vietnam Possible?

(By Arthur M. Cox)

There will be no peace in Vietnam unless the U.S. jettisons the unwarranted optimism that has characterized its policy up to now. There is still a possibility that the war can be ended by a settlement based on the principle of self-determination for which the U.S. has been fighting. But this can be done only if we grasp both horns of our dilemma. This means giving up the illusions of military victory and accepting the requirement for genuine political compromise. Such a political compromise can occur only if the Communist abandon their goal of forcible take-over, and only if we accept Communist representation in the Saigon government.

It is possible to envisage a settlement based on the principle of one man, one vote which the U.S. has always supported. The North Vietnamese and the Soviets favor a settlement based on the program of the National Liberation Front (NLF). That program calls for an election for the people in the territory of South Vietnam based on universal suffrage and secret ballot.

Unfortunately, our position has been ambiguous and inconsistent. While always professing that our presence in Vietnam was only for the purpose of ensuring self-determination, we nevertheless helped to draft a Constitution that excludes Communists from the political process. Article 4 of that Constitution says: "The Republic of Vietnam opposes Communism in any form. Every activity designed to publicize or carry out Communism is prohibited." When Thieu and Ky won an election in September 1967 by only 34 per cent without any opposition from the Communists, they were guaranteed power for four years under the terms of the Constitution. Last July in Honolulu, President Johnson added to U.S. backing when he endorsed President Thieu's plan for a settlement of the war which stated that "full participation in political activities will be offered to all those who abide by the Constitution of Vietnam." In other words, no Communists.

If there is to be a free election in Vietnam, the Constitution obviously will have to be amended or abandoned. It is just as obvious however, that Thieu and Ky are not about to negotiate themselves out of office. Their survival depends on a continuation of the war. So long as the Saigon government

is armed with a veto, a negotiated settlement is almost inconceivable.

At one time our powerful influence could probably have inspired the formation of a more representative government in Saigon, but we supported Thieu and Ky, at least partly, because we had decided to try to win the war. Our policy-makers believed that the militantly anti-Communist junta could pursue the objective of defeating the enemy more single-mindedly and efficiently than a government which included men who might support an accommodation with the Communists. Now we have given up the objective of military victory, but our ties to Thieu and Ky make the alternative of political compromise much more difficult to achieve.

The two-track theory advanced by Henry Kissinger will not solve this problem. Mr. Kissinger has suggested that a withdrawal of forces be negotiated between the U.S. and North Vietnam, while a political settlement in Saigon is worked out between the NLF and Thieu and Ky. This will not work because the objectives of the NLF and those of Thieu and Ky are absolutely incompatible. Also, unless the withdrawal of U.S. troops is directly tied to a political solution the main bargaining leverage with the Communists will be lost.

There is no way to straddle this dilemma. Either we opt for a negotiated settlement that provides sufficient compromise so that a genuinely free election can be held, or we continue to back Thieu and Ky, recognizing, as we must, that such a decision means a continuation of the war.

Former White House adviser McGeorge Bundy has presented a plan which represents the thinking of those who are unwilling to accept Communist participation in the government in Saigon. In essence, Mr. Bundy has suggested the gradual reduction of U.S. forces at a rate of 100,000 to 150,000 men a year with an annual saving of $5 billion to $8 billion. At the end of three or four years, assuming that negotiations had failed to bring satisfactory results, we would have a small permanent force of around 100,000 that, according to Mr. Bundy, would, with a strengthened South Vietnamese Army, be sufficient to prevent Communist take-over.

An appealing feature of Bundy's plan is that the draft would be gradually replaced with voluntary service. Volunteer soldiers would serve for longer periods than the present twelve-month limit, and would be rewarded with significantly increased pay and attractive veterans' benefits.

An argument can be made that, in any case, the presence of U.S. forces should be maintained indefinitely in Vietnam as a long-term deterrent against Chinese aggression and as an indication of our continuing determination to prevent the forcible overthrow of governments in Southeast Asia, such as Thailand. The American public has accepted the deployment of a substantial force of American troops in West Germany for more than twenty years as a guarantee of the U.S. commitment to the NATO shield protecting Western Europe from possible Soviet military aggression.

But the NATO force is not analogous to the force in Vietnam. There is no war in West Germany, where our troops live in peace and relative comfort. In South Vietnam, even if our troops were regrouped in enclaves surrounding the major cities and bases, they would be vulnerable to rocket and mortar fire, and would be subject to constant harassment and surprise attack with resultant casualties. Another important difference is that the West German government is strong and stable, supported by a booming economy, while the South Vietnamese government is weak and dependent upon the U.S. for its political and economic survival.

If the U.S. decided, as Bundy suggests, to maintain an indefinite presence in Vietnam with a greatly reduced force, the Communists, in time, probably would control most of the countryside, while the major cities would become almost totally dependent on U.S. supplies. The Saigon government would become even more corrupt and ineffective, with social rot and atrophy setting in as the South Vietnamese people became aware that they were living in an unending state of siege. This would be less costly than the present situation, but would still require many billions of dollars. The American public might accept it for two or three years, but as casualties and costs continued to pile up with no final solution in sight, it is difficult to imagine the U.S. Congress or the voters tolerating it for long. President Nixon, interested in a second term in office and the future of the Republican party, will be acutely aware of the political consequences of accepting an indefinite stalemate.

A better course would be to embrace a policy of negotiating a political compromise settled by genuine free elections. Such a policy would be dynamic and would capture the support of world opinion. The North Vietnamese might refuse to accept a solution providing sufficient assurance that free elections would actually take place, but the pressure both external and internal would be substantial. The presence of 540,000 American troops is a significant bargaining counter. Hanoi and the NLF should be made aware that our troops will be withdrawn only in return for a free election, and if that is not accepted, they should be aware that we will maintain a permanent presence as Bundy has suggested.

Though we started bombing North Vietnam when Soviet Premier Kosygin was in Hanoi, and though we rebuffed several Soviet attempts to start negotiations because they were predicated on a bombing halt, it may still be possible to obtain Soviet help for a negotiated settlement. This would probably have to develop in the broader context of U.S.-Soviet diplomacy including such matters as arms control and a Middle East settlement. If U.S.-Soviet relations improved the Soviets might use their influence in Hanoi. They are still supplying substantial military and economic assistance to North Vietnam. Also, the Soviets would like to see an end to the war, which would curb Chinese Communist ambitions.

We should have no illusions about the Chinese Communist position. They are on record as vigorously opposing any form of negotiated settlement. They want the war to continue until the U.S. has been forced to withdraw. The Chinese are delighted to have American troops committed on the mainland of Asia in a war of attrition which bleeds our economy and reduces our prestige. Thus, there is small prospect that the Chinese will participate, or even accept the results of any negotiated settlement.

The most difficult problem in the negotiations will not be the opposition of the Communist Chinese, but rather the problem of how to govern South Vietnam after a cease-fire and during the period leading to an election. A minimum of a year and probably more will be required while troops are being withdrawn and political forces are being organized to campaign for the election. There are several possible arrangements, none of them very satisfactory, which might be adopted to provide government during the pre-election period.

One approach would be the one adopted in the Geneva Accords of 1954. At that time the country was temporarily partitioned at the 17th parallel with the Communists moving north and French moving south, it being understood that an election would be held in two years to settle the matter.

If a new line were drawn in South Vietnam it would mean that the Saigon government would temporarily have to give up control of several important cities, and the Vietcong would have to give up its strongest bastion in the Mekong Delta.

Almost as unlikely would be a cease-fire and stand-fast with the territory held at the time of cease-fire occupied by the forces in place, and the incumbent regime remaining in power in Saigon. This is unlikely because so much of the territory is in contest marked like leopard spots by areas that are not contiguous and that are not firmly controlled by either side. It is also unlikely that the Communists would risk a cease-fire while Thieu and Ky are in power and in command of a large police force capable of influencing the course of the election campaign.

A more workable alternative would be the formation of a new interim government in Saigon with representatives from all major factions of South Vietnamese politics, including the NLF. Obviously this process will be extraordinarily complex involving the most difficult and patient diplomacy. Once the process has been started, however, the yeast of political action will be at work and those desiring accommodation on both sides will be strengthened, while those holding extreme positions will be weakened.

Any such process will require a substantial international peacekeeping force with more potent authority than was granted to the International Control Commissions established by the Geneva Accords. The peacekeeping force would observe and report on the withdrawal and demobilization of troops, and would also observe the implementation of the pre-election procedures and the actual conduct of the election itself.

This solution will undoubtedly require months of negotiations with frequent periods of doubt and frustration, but if we keep our eye on the objective of genuine self-determination it may be successfully achieved. Certainly the negotiation of such a solution is preferable to other choices such as another escalation of the war, or unilateral withdrawal or the festering cancer of indefinite stalemate. This war cannot be solved by military victory; it must be ended by political compromise.

RACE-SEX EDUCATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the mothers and dads of schoolchildren can expect a further innovation in sex education. Apparently their children are to be educated not to discriminate sexually because of race, creed, or national origin.

According to the reported discussions at the recent American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors annual conference we are to believe that many teenaged white female patients expressed interest in interracial sex to show their concern and atone for white guilt. Our poor brainwashed children.

What next will the antimorality crowd come up with? Perhaps a "civil rights" amendment to prevent legal marriage of any two people of the same race, religion, creed, or national origin. Sound impossible? Nothing is beyond the challenge from education these days.

I present the report on the "concern and guilt" of our race-sex attitudes which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star for April 13 to follow my remarks:

[From the Sunday Star, April 13, 1969]

CONCERN AND GUILT: RACE-SEX ATTITUDES SCORED

American attitudes toward interracial sex—and thus toward race itself—will never be fully understood until positive aspects of sexual attraction between races are more thoroughly examined.

That suggestion came yesterday from Dr. Gertrude Hunter, medical director of the nationwide Head Start program, as she led a free-wheeling "Sex and Racism" discussion at the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors' annual conference here.

Dr. Hunter, a Negro, said black militant Eldridge Cleaver's recent writing on the black man as a "superbody" and the white man as an envious "supermind" turned her to one of the few scholarly studies on the topic, the late J. A. Rogers' three-volume "Sex and Race," published in 1940.

THE NEGATIVE APPROACH

"We go at this problem in the negative," Dr. Hunter said, referring to the Cleaver thesis that the black man seeks revenge against the white man by attracting the white woman.

Rogers, she said, indicated there may be more to interracial liaisons than just "getting even."

"He said the white man is attracted to black women but can't always acknowledge it," Dr. Hunter continued. "Is this just lust? Or is he afraid black women will reject him in favor of black men?"

Noting that white slaveholders apparently turned with some frequency to black women for their sexual outlets, Dr. Hunter suggested it was possible these men preferred black women, even though the relationships were admittedly less complicated than with white women. If so, she asked, why?

Stressing that she is not an expert in matters of sex and race, merely an intrigued and concerned citizen, she called for more research on why "the object of the most intense hatred in our society is the black man," and why such hatred is not directed at the black woman.

"We also have to look at what is motivating whites," she added. "Most of the analysis is from the viewpoint of blacks."

Her questions drew a wide variety of reactions from the predominantly white and female audience of about 75.

LEGACY OF SLAVERY

One black woman maintained that "sex is sex anywhere," and that feelings about interracial sex are rooted in economic problems and the legacy of slavery. This was vehemently denied by a young black man, while a middle-aged white man posed the theory that opposites attract ("Capt. John Smith and Pocahantas").

"Until we start to address ourselves to this question (of sex and race)," Dr. Hunter warned in conclusion, "we will not have come to a final answer to our current problem."

The extent of concern over interracial sex was illustrated by a white listener, who said a local psychiatrist had many teen-age white female patients who expressed interest in interracial sex to "show their concern" and atone for white guilt.

A young black man immediately retorted that the white psychiatrist had described his patients' problems in those terms rather than admit white girls could normally be attracted to black men. "We don't accept anything the white establishment says any more," the young man added.

The three-day conference, attended by some 1,000 sex education teachers, counselors, Planned Parenthood workers and others, concludes today at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 17, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day.—John 9: 4.

God of our fathers and our God, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit that we may truly love Thee and worthily serve Thee this day.

May our hearts be with Thee as we seek solutions to the grave and global problems that confront us and our Nation.

In this dear land of our birth, help us to close ranks in a greater unity of spirit as principalities and powers without seek to destroy our heritage of freedom, with liberty and justice for all.

Make us great enough in spirit that we may be equal to every experience, ready for every responsibility, and adequate for every activity.

In the name of the Master Workman, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WE HAVE RUN OUT OF "OTHER CHEEKS"

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, North Korea, which was allowed to wallow in propaganda and self-glorification over the *Pueblo* incident, now has committed another act of war against the United States. There should be retaliation in kind. It should be immediate, and sufficiently drastic that there will be no further problems of this nature with North Korea. It is incomprehensible that we not be aroused when Americans are killed or tortured at will by irresponsible powers and U.S. planes and ships destroyed or captured. We took no action on the *Pueblo* except to prostrate ourselves before the world, and this undoubtedly has led to the assumption that similar acts can be committed at will. I would hope we have not reached this point. America must stand for something. We cannot continue to turn the other cheek. We have run out of cheeks to turn.

I trust that our country has reached the end of the line in patient acceptance of acts of warfare against us by Communist nations. The Red Chinese have charged that we do not have the courage to stand by our principles. Our enemies must not be permitted to be secure in the knowledge that hostile acts can be committed without forceful action from the United States to protect our own interests.

I have listened as one commentator after another has urged on the networks that there be no retribution against North Korea. No consideration was shown to the fact that Americans were shot down in cold blood, that the flag has again been fired upon, that these are acts of war pure and simple. To me it is sickening that there are those who publicly will urge this country to do nothing to protect its own interests. Surely they realize such a course is a deadend street. America must stand up for its flag, its people, its property. When this involves a retaliatory strike against the offenders, we must get on with it. That is now the case. Otherwise, we shall soon find ourselves stripped of pride at home and leadership in world affairs.

I am introducing a resolution which states in substance that it is the sense of Congress that armed protection should be provided for all manned U.S. intelligence-gathering planes and ships in danger areas. Neither the *Pueblo* nor the missing aircraft were afforded this protection, nor was an effort made to send help. Either condition is intolerable. Congress should express itself at least to this degree in an effort to insure a greater interest in the protection of the lives of our servicemen who are assigned on dangerous missions.

LIBERALIZING THE CHILD CARE PROVISIONS OF OUR TAX LAWS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the deductibility of child-care expenses of working mothers require drastic change.

There are many women who want to work in order to supplement their family's income. In a period of inflation, many families desperately need such additional income. Yet our tax laws provide no deduction for child-care expenses to a family whose adjusted gross income exceeds $6,000.

I am introducing a bill today that completely removes any family income limitation. If a businessman is entitled to deduct expenses for wining and dining a customer, surely any working mother should be able to deduct the expenses for the care of her children.

In addition, my bill would increase the maximum deduction allowed from $600 to $800 for one child and from $900 to $1,200 for two or more children. This is a reasonable increase considering that the cost of living has risen 33 percent since 1954 when the original dollar limits were established.

I would venture to guess that any revenue loss resulting from my amendments